



This is a repository copy of *Payment for Ecosystem Services and the Green Economy: Green Washing or Something New?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/94126/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wilkinson, K. (2014) Payment for Ecosystem Services and the Green Economy: Green Washing or Something New? *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, 5 (2). pp. 168-191. ISSN 1759-7188

<https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2014.03.04>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

© Kate Wilkinson 2014. The definitive, peer reviewed and edited version of this article is published in *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, [volume 5, issue 2, pp 168-91, 2014]. DOI: [10.4337/jhre.2014.03.04](https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2014.03.04)

The author strongly advises the reader to follow the DOI and cite from the published version of this article.

Payment for ‘Ecosystem Services’ and the ‘Green Economy’: Green-washing or something new?

Using an ecofeminist critical analysis, this paper examines the extent to which two forest-related payments for ‘ecosystem services’ (PES) schemes maintain a mainstream anti-nature and exploitative conceptualisation of human/nature relationships. It does so by integrating various ecofeminist themes to analyse the two PES schemes and to assess the extent to which they can protect women and nature while marketising and commodifying the environment. The author examines the justifications for integrating PES into a green economy, including the proposed benefits resulting from the implementation of PES, and safeguards ensuring the inclusion and participation of local communities. The author concludes that an ecofeminist examination highlights the inherently exploitative nature of PES and its continuation of the currently exploitative free market paradigm.

Key Words: Ecofeminism, green economy, payment for ecosystem services, ecosystems, environment, capitalism, free market, economics, REDDES, REDD+, UNFCCC, ITTO, forests, natural resources, gender, participation

‘A new type of thinking is essential if [hu]mankind is to survive and move toward higher levels’.¹

* I would like to thank the reviewers and editors for their extremely helpful comments and suggestions. This research was conducted as part of an AHRC PhD Studentship from the University of Sheffield.

¹ Albert Einstein, *Einstein on Peace* (Otto Nathan and Heinz Norden eds, Methuen: London 1963), 376.

1. Introduction

Forests are immensely important for the well-being of the Earth. They are often referred to as the lungs of the planet for their vital function in maintaining healthy, functioning ecosystems² and play a significant role in carbon absorption, recycling atmospheric moisture and soil stabilisation.³ They protect humans from natural hazards and ensure food security through erosion control.⁴ They provide shelter for innumerable—many as yet unknown— species and provide the ingredients for current and future pharmaceuticals.⁵ They have cultural and spiritual significance for communities, contribute to individual and collective identities, and operate as a source of livelihood.⁶ In sum, forests are immeasurably important for everything and everyone. For this reason, all of these different forest properties and processes have been classified as ‘ecosystem services’⁷ and are to be protected for the benefit of future generations.

One proposed method of protection is to integrate these ‘services’ within the global economy through a process called ‘payment for ecosystem services’ (PES). Such schemes are intended to promote economic growth and development in developing countries while protecting the

² University of Exeter, ‘Lungs of the planet reveal their true sensitivity to global warming’ *ScienceDaily*, (6 February 2013) <www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/02/130206131050.htm> accessed 24 March 2014; ‘The World’s Lungs’ *The Economist [electronic version]* (25 September 2010) Special Report: Forests <<http://www.economist.com/node/17093495>> .

³ WWF Global, ‘Forests’ (*World Wildlife Fund*, , ND) <<http://worldwildlife.org/habitats/forests>> accessed 24 March 2014; The Nature Conservancy, ‘Forest Conservation: The role of forests’ (*The Nature Conservancy*, ND) <<http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/habitats/forests/howwework/about-forest-conservation.xml>> accessed 24 March 2014.

⁴ TEEB, *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity Ecological and Economic Foundations* (Pushpam Kumar ed, Earthscan, London and Washington 2010), 23; TEEB, *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: An Interim Report* (European Communities, 2008), 12.

⁵ Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, *The Value of Forest Ecosystems* (CBD Technical Series No 4, SCBD, Montreal, 2001), 1.

⁶ Judith Crews, ‘Forest and Tree Symbolism in Folklore’ (2003) 54(213) *Unasylva* 37 , 38; Julia Falconer and Carla RS Koppell, ‘The Major Significance of ‘Minor’ Forest Products: The local use and value of forests in the West African humid forest zone’ (1990) <<http://www.fao.org/docrep/t9450e/t9450e00.htm#Contents>> accessed 24 March 2014, 4.

⁷ It is worth noting that the concept of ‘ecosystem services’ is itself indicative of an exploitative and androcentric construction of the living order which continues to perpetuate a hierarchical way of thinking that separates humans from nature and renders nature subordinate. By redefining ecosystem *functions* as ecosystem *services* in international policy and discourse recasts nature as providing a ‘service’ to humanity, without any interrogation of the gendered and exploitative ideology implicit in the language. Elaine Hughes, ‘Fishwives and Other Tails: Ecofeminism and environmental law’ (1995) 8(1) *Can J Women & L* 502, 503-504; see also Annie Rochette, ‘Stop the Rape of the World: An ecofeminist critique of sustainable development’ (2002) 51 *UN Brunswick LJ* 145; Mary Mellor, *Feminism & Ecology* (Polity Press 1997); Karen J Warren, ‘The Power and the Promise of Ecological Feminism’ (1990) 12(2) *Environ Ethics* 125;

ecosystem for future generations.⁸ They are considered to provide livelihood benefits to poor communities at the local community or household level through cash or noncash benefits, while also developing more environmentally sustainable land use systems. Because of this, PES is promoted as an important component for building a green economy and providing a solution for protecting rapidly degrading ecosystems, while maintaining economic growth. However, I argue that, when examined through an ecofeminist lens, PES schemes have in-built limitations. I shall argue that they do little more than maintain the *status quo*, that they are anti-nature and are embedded in a neoliberal paradigm, leaving its conceptual apparatus of domination and exploitation unchallenged and unquestioned.⁹

Two forest-related schemes emerging from two treaty regimes illustrate these characteristics. REDD+, the first PES scheme under consideration here, aims to reduce carbon emissions by reducing deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries. REDD+ emerged through the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC (1992))¹⁰ and was originally conceived within the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC (1992).¹¹ It was discussed again during the eleventh COP of the UNFCCC (1992)¹² and as part of the Bali Action Plan (2007).¹³ In the Cancun Agreements (2010), the Parties agreed that there was the need to reduce emissions from deforestation, reduce forest degradation and promote conservation and

⁸ Jose Puppim de Oliveira and others, *Governing the Forests: An institutional analysis of REDD+ and community forest management in Asia* (UNU-IAS Policy Report, International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS), Yokohama, Japan, 2013) 17. PES schemes have five basic criteria: It is a voluntary yet conditional transaction in which an ecosystem service (ES) is purchased by an ES buyer from a provider. see also Esteve Corbera, 'Problematizing REDD+ as an Experiment in Payments for Ecosystem Services' (2012) 4(6) *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 612, 612; Sven Wunder, *Payments for Environmental Services: Some nuts and bolts* (CIFOR Occasional Paper No 42, Centre for International Forestry Research, 2005), 3.

⁹ Val Plumwood, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (Routledge 1993), 29.

¹⁰ United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (New York) (adopted 9 May 1992, entered into force 21 March 1994) 1771 UNTS 107, 31 ILM 851 (1992), (UNFCCC) ; Vivienne Holloway and Esteban Giandomenico, *The History of REDD Policy* (Carbon Planet White Paper, Carbon Planet Ltd, Adelaide, 2009), 8.

¹¹ Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (adopted 11 December 1997, entered into force 6 February 2005) UN Doc. FCCC/CP/L.7/Add.1, 10 December 1997, 37 ILM 32 (1998) (Kyoto Protocol), see art 2(1)(ii) and art 3(2).

¹² UNFCCC, 'Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD)' (ND) <<http://unfccc.int/methods/redd/items/7377.php>> accessed 2 September 2013; Holloway and Giandomenico, above n (10), 8.

¹³ Decision 1/CP.13 Bali Action Plan, in Report of the Conference of the Parties on its thirteenth session, Addendum, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties (Bali 3-15 December 2007) (14 March 2008) UN Doc FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1 (*Bali Action Plan*) ¶1(b)(iii).

the sustainable management of forest carbon stocks.¹⁴ REDD+ has been put forward as a way to achieve green growth while also reducing carbon emissions and conserving biodiversity. The way in which REDD+ can contribute to the green economy is set out in the policy document *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy* (2013).¹⁵

The second relevant PES scheme for the purposes of the present analysis emerges from the International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO), whose origin and purpose is significantly different from that of the UNFCCC (1992). This Organisation aims to ‘promote the expansion and diversification of international trade in tropical timber from sustainably managed and legally harvested forests’.¹⁶ The ITTO recognises that greater understanding of non-timber forest products and environmental services is important to ‘enhance the capacity of members ... in the context of sustainable forest management’.¹⁷ It acknowledges the important ‘multiple economic, environmental, and social benefits provided by forests’ in sustainable forest management.¹⁸ In 2009, the ITTO and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) published joint *Guidelines for the Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in Tropical Timber Production Forests* (2009) (ITTO/IUCN Guidelines).¹⁹ During the same year, the ITTO published their programme document on Reducing Deforestation and Forest Degradation and Enhancing Environmental Services from Forests (REDDES).²⁰ REDDES has similar aims to REDD+. ²¹ Like REDD+, the ITTO uses REDDES PES mechanisms to incentivise local populations and/or governments to ensure integration of environmental protection into economic development.²² However, unlike REDD+, there are no explicit safeguards incorporated within the founding

¹⁴ Decision 1/CP.16 The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the Work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention, in Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session, Addendum, Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties (Cancun 29 November - 10 December 2010) (15 March 2011) UN Doc FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1 (*LCA Outcome Decision*) ¶70(1).

¹⁵ Charlene Watson and others, *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy Transition: Opportunities and Challenges* (ODI in association with IUCN and UNEP, 2013).

¹⁶ International Tropical Timber Agreement (Geneva) (adopted 27 January 2006, entered into force 7 December 2011), art 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, art 1(q).

¹⁸ *Ibid* preamble (f).

¹⁹ ITTO and IUCN, *ITTO/IUCN Guidelines for the Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in Tropical Timber Production Forests* (ITTO Policy Development Series No 17, 2009), 2.

²⁰ ITTO, *ITTO Thematic Programme on Reducing Deforestation and Forest Degradation and Enhancing Environmental Services in Tropical Forests (REDDES): Programme Document* (International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO) 3 April 2009).

²¹ *Ibid*.

²² ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 36; Puppim de Oliveira and others, above n (8), 9.

International Tropical Timber Agreement, nor within the policy guidelines for implementing PES.

In spite of the nature of the safeguards that may or may not be incorporated into each of these PES schemes, there are indications, discussed below, that both schemes share a conceptual apparatus of domination and exploitation, which subverts the extent to which they will ever be able to protect both vulnerable elements of forest ecosystems and marginalised groups. There are doubts over the role of PES schemes in the burgeoning green economy and how ecosystem services are integrated into the green economy. To investigate these issues, a theoretical framework drawing on elements of ecofeminism and feminist ecological economics is applied in the present article to the relevant policy documents. As will be seen, this critical framework enables a thematic analysis of the PES schemes and an assessment of the extent to which they can protect women and nature whilst deploying concepts that dominate and exploit nonhuman nature and marginalised communities.

2. Reading PES schemes through an Ecofeminist lens

Although ecofeminism embodies 'several different strands of discourse... which reflect...different positions within the ... feminist movement'²³ there is evidence in the literature that an ecofeminist critique can reveal important connections between the exploitation of women and the exploitation of the environment.²⁴ Ecofeminist analysis features human exploitation of

²³ Bina Agarwal, 'The Gender and Environment Debate: Lessons from India' (1992) 18(1) *Feminist Stud* 119, 120. Ecofeminism is not monolithic theory and nor do ecofeminists hold one perspective. Because of this, it is difficult to give a precise definition. For the purposes of this paper, I base my understanding and interpretation of ecofeminism on definition given by Greta Gaard: 'More than a theory about feminism and environmentalism, or women and nature, as the name might imply, ecofeminism approaches the problems of environmental degradation and social injustice from the premise that how we treat nature and how we treat each other are inseparably linked.' Greta Gaard, 'Women, Water, Energy: An Ecofeminist Approach' (2001) 14 *Organization Environment* 157, 158; see also Karen J Warren, 'Introduction' in Karen J Warren and Nisvan Erkal (eds), *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature* (Indiana University Press 1997), xi; Hughes, above n (7), 503; Rochette, above n (7), 150 at fn 28; Elizabeth Carlssare, 'Socialist and Cultural Ecofeminism: Allies in resistance' (2000) 5(1) *Ethics and the Environment* 89, 89; Cecile Jackson, 'Women/Nature or Gender/History? A critique of ecofeminist 'development'' (1993) 20(3) *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 389, 221.

²⁴ Agarwal, above n (23), 119. For further discussion of ecofeminist forest-related activism and scholarship see Niamh Moore, 'Eco/Feminism and Rewriting the End of Feminism: from the Chipko movement to Clayoquot Sound' (2011) 12(1) *Feminist Theory* 3; Rosi Braidotti and others, *Women, the Environment and Sustainable Development: Towards a theoretical synthesis* (Zed Press 1994); Vandana Shiva, *Staying Alive: Women, ecology and development* (Zed 1988). The women/Nature connection within ecofeminism has been criticised by ecofeminists and feminists alike for the assumption that women's nature is inherently nurturing. For a critique of the women/Nature association in ecofeminist history and practice, see Greta Gaard, 'Ecofeminism Revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and

the environment in 'its list of interwoven forms of oppression such as sexism, heterosexism, racism and ethnocentrism',²⁵ and ecofeminist activists campaign to eradicate the social and environmental problems caused by women/nature associations while also dismantling interlocking oppressions such as racism, classism and nationalism.²⁶ An ecofeminism critique is a useful lens through which to examine the PES schemes because it can examine how forests are used in the context of sustainable development and the way in which women are subsumed in these development processes.

In order to analyse the two PES schemes at the heart of the present exploration, three interrelated thematic critiques drawn from different ecofeminist approaches are employed. These are an examination of the ideology inherent in dominant western rationalism; a critique of the systemic consequences of ideology and the materialist implications of systemic and ideological assumptions.

The first theme critiques the Western ideology of rationalism and its basis in logic structures that continue to reinforce domination, marginalisation and a dualist separation between the 'valued' and the 'devalued'.²⁷ Some ecofeminists argue that the connection between the women and the domination of nature is ideological.²⁸ Such analysis focuses on the ideas, values and representations of women and nonhuman nature that portray both as subordinate to men.²⁹ The subordination of women and nonhuman nature is conceived by such approaches as being a framework of domination involving dualisms that represent a cultural 'institutionalisation of power relations' and depict these as a 'logic of colonization'.³⁰ To alter future human/nature relationships, interrogating these ideological assumptions is therefore essential for

Re-Placing Species in a Material Feminist Environmentalism' (2011) 23(2) *Feminist Formations* 26; Plumwood, above n (9), 9; Niamh Moore, 'The Rise and Rise of Ecofeminism as a Development Fable: A Response to Melissa Leach's 'Earth Mothers and Other Ecofeminist Fables: How a Strategic Notion Rose and Fell'' (2008) 39(3) *Devel Change* 461; Charis Thompson, 'Back to Nature? Resurrecting Ecofeminism after Poststructuralist and Third-Wave Feminisms' (2006) 97(3) *Isis* 505.

²⁵ Stephanie Lahar, 'Ecofeminist Theory and Grassroots Politics' (1991) 6(1) *Hypatia* 28, 29.

²⁶ Grace Y Kao, 'The Universal versus the Particular in Ecofeminist Ethics' (2010) 38(4) *Journal of Religious Ethics* 616, 617.

²⁷ See e.g. Val Plumwood, *Environmental Culture: The ecological crisis of reason* (Routledge 2002); Karen J Warren, *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A western perspective on what it is and why it matters* (Rowman & Littlefield 2000); Plumwood, above n (9).

²⁸ Agarwal, above n (23), 120.

²⁹ *Ibid*, 120.

³⁰ Val Plumwood, 'The Politics of Reason: Towards a feminist logic' (1993) 71(4) *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 436, 443. Plumwood characterises a dualism as a 'particular way of dividing the world which results from a certain kind of denied dependency on a subordinated other.'; Mellor, above n (7), 112; Plumwood, above n (9), 61.

reconceptualising the relationship between men, women and nonhuman nature in non-hierarchical ways.³¹ Within this critique, ecofeminists examine how rationalist-dualist frameworks have influenced the foundation of contemporary economic culture.³² Val Plumwood argues that exposing the foundations of conceptual frameworks reveals how male-oriented values, beliefs and assumptions have become the standard in 'contemporary rationalist culture'.³³ Rationalist-dualist constructs are reflected in many different but persistent binaries, such as culture/nature, civilised/primitive, mental/manual, reason/emotion, subject/object, and production/reproduction.³⁴ These binaries form systems of interlocking structures that serve to valorise 'masculine', abstract, disembodied and dispassionate characteristics while simultaneously devaluing and embedding 'feminine' or subordinate characteristics within the body and the natural world. This set of dichotomous constructions continues to privilege the rational faculty as the 'highest element in human life to which others were to be subordinated' and as possessed, archetypally, only by the human (male) elite. These binary concepts and their related rationalist reductivisms have acquired significant cultural dominance and currency, and are evident in the economic systems that govern the global economy and economic development.

The second theme, a critique of the systemic consequences of ideology, examines how systems such as the market economy maintain the subordination and devaluation of women and of nonhuman nature. In particular, the capitalist market economy has faced significant criticisms for incorporating distinctly gendered assumptions. Ecofeminist theorists argue that market ideology prioritises a 'false autonomy as the disembodied and decontextualized choice-theoretic model ... [and] does not represent the reality of most women's lives.'³⁵ Not only does market ideology separate activities defined as 'economic' from those that are 'non-economic', but does so along gendered lines and prioritises 'what men value and what men do and denigrates and undervalues what women do'.³⁶ These inequalities can occur through a number of interrelated 'isms of domination', including class and gender effects of the 'processes of degradation,

³¹ Agarwal, above n (23), 127.

³² Plumwood, above n (27), 20-23; Mellor, above n (7), 112; Karen J Warren, 'Feminism and Ecology: Making connections' (1987) 9(1) *Environ Ethics* 3, 6.

³³ Plumwood, above n (27), 20, 22-23.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 20; Plumwood, above n (9), 43.

³⁵ Mary Mellor, 'Women, Nature and the Social Construction of 'Economic Man'' (1997) 20(2) *Ecol Econ* 129 (7), 130.

³⁶ *Ibid*, 130; Marilyn Waring, 'Counting for Something! Recognising women's contribution to the global economy through alternative accounting systems' (2003) 11(1) *Gender and Development* 35, 36; Marilyn Waring, 'The Invisibility of Women's Work: The economics of local and global "bullshit"' (1997) 17(2) *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme* 31, 31.

statization [sic] and privatization of nature's resources'.³⁷ In relation to the two PES schemes in question, I will examine below the reliance upon, and justifications offered for, the integration of ecosystems into the market economy—and the extent to which such approaches maintain difference or address barriers to achieving gender equality and/or acknowledge the multiple uses of nonhuman nature.

The final theme draws on ecofeminist critiques concerning the material effects of the dominating ideology and its systemic inequalities on women's lives, and the way in which environmental usage and environmental harm can often be gendered issues.³⁸ I will examine the two PES schemes for the extent to which systemic processes within social institutions and their ideological foundation exclude and/or occlude the gendered nature of environmental and social harms that materially affect the lived reality of marginalised communities.³⁹ This last theme of the analysis draws on criticisms of the 'western philosophical canon', which values culture and masculinity and transcends the physical realm while simultaneously devaluing women/nature through embedding them in physical, material nature.⁴⁰ These three themes, taken together, form an analytical framework for examining the ideological, systemic and materialist ways in which PES schemes can continue to perpetuate a gendered, exploitative and discriminatory status quo. It is to this analysis that I now turn.

3. PES and the Green Economy: Commoditisation and marketization of ecosystem services

One way in which the ecofeminist critical themes described above can be applied to the discussion of the two PES schemes is by examining how these schemes are incorporated within the green economy. While the green economy purports to be a new economic paradigm that reduces environmental risks and ecological scarcities at the same time as improving human well-being and social equity,⁴¹ critics of the approach argue that it maintains dualist, androcentric and exploitative assumptions and concepts. In this section, I concentrate on the ideological assumptions supporting the contention that it is possible to achieve environmental protection and consistent economic growth while simultaneously improving human well-being. I suggest

³⁷ Karen J Warren, 'Response to My Critics' (2002) 7(2) *Ethics and the Environment* 39, 39.

³⁸ Heather McLeod-Kilmurray, 'An Ecofeminist Legal Critique of Canadian Environmental Law: The case study of genetically modified foods' (2009) 26 *Windsor Rev Legal & Social Issues* 129, 136.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 144; Hughes, above n (7), 509.

⁴⁰ Chaone Mallory, 'Toward an Ecofeminist Environmental Jurisprudence: Nature, law, and gender' (MA, University of North Texas, Denton Texas 1999), 19.

⁴¹ UNEP, *Green Economy Developing Countries Success Stories* (United Nations Environment Programme, 2010), 5.

that treating ecosystem services within the global market as commodities simply reaffirms and extends the operative assumptions of the dominant paradigm, which does not question how ecosystem services are used, but simply focuses on efficiency.

3.1 Ecosystem services and the marketization of Ecosystem Services

The green economy and PES reached international prominence during the recent global economic crisis. In the Outcome Document to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (2010) the green economy was arguably sold as a way to have our cake (i.e. economic development) and eat it (i.e. protecting the environment).⁴² The ‘green economy’ represents the continued belief that ‘growth’ is fundamental for economic well-being and that one method of achieving green growth is to marketize ecosystems services and trade them on ‘green markets’.⁴³ This approach is evident in both the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines and *integrating REDD+ into the Green Economy* (2013)—the relevant documentary sources for analysis of the two PES schemes in question here.

Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy links green growth with positive outcomes in its examples of countries which have adopted PES processes. The Indonesia case study, for example, highlights this continued commitment to ‘growth’ within the green economic paradigm.⁴⁴ The Indonesian Government has committed to an annual target of 7 per cent GDP growth while simultaneously reducing national emissions by 26 per cent.⁴⁵ Similarly, *Integrating REDD+* cites Ethiopian initiatives that incorporate REDD+ to develop an ‘environmentally sustainable growth path in Ethiopia’.⁴⁶ The International Monetary Fund forecast Ethiopia to have achieved ‘real

⁴² The Future We Want, UNGA Res. 66/288 (11 September 2012), UN Doc. A/RES/66/288 ('*The Future We Want*') ¶56.

⁴³ OECD, *A Toolkit of Policy Options to Support Inclusive Green Growth: Revised version (July 2013) of the original submission to the G20 Development Working Group by the AfDB, the OECD, the UN and the World Bank* (Requested by G20 Development Working Group under the Mexican G20 Presidency, 2013); World Bank, *Inclusive Green Growth: The pathway to sustainable development* (Washington DC, 2012); OECD, *Towards Green Growth: Monitoring Progress: OECD indicators* (OECD Publishing, 2011).

⁴⁴ Forest Investment Program: Indonesia forest investment plan, Republic of Indonesia (ROI), Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia. cited in Watson and others, above n (15), 11.

⁴⁵ GGGI, ‘Indonesia’ (*Global Green Growth Initiative (GGGI)*, 2012) <<http://gggi.org/kalimantan-green-growth-planning/>> accessed 8 April 2014; Rizaldi Boer and others, *Reducing Agricultural Expansion into Forests in Central Kalimantan Indonesia: Analysis of implementation and financing gaps* (Project Report, Center for Climate Risk & Opportunity Management, Bogor Agricultural University 2012), 4.

⁴⁶ Watson and others, above n (15), 12; Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, *The Path to Sustainable Development: Ethiopia’s climate-resilient green economy strategy* (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2011) 13.

GDP growth of more than 8% annually' between 2011 and 2015.⁴⁷ The strategy outlines a number of projects which aim to afforest and restore degraded forests and 'unlock economic growths, create jobs for the growing population... [and] directly support new business opportunities for the private sector'.⁴⁸ These arguments are based not only in rationalist economic thinking, but also reflect the desire to maintain growth based in productive measurements.⁴⁹

These approaches have significantly gendered human rights impacts. Poor rural women often have unreliable access to land and insecure land tenure or customary land rights.⁵⁰ In Ethiopia, for example, green growth strategies contain underlying assumptions concerning the perceived usefulness of common land where large-scale projects are being used in 'common' areas, justified by arguments of utility and efficiency.⁵¹ This can disproportionately affect women as being more likely to be directly affected by the loss of access to water, firewood and medicinal plants.⁵² This has a significant impact on women's right to development and access to basic resources, food, and health.⁵³ Therefore, to represent the commons as a passive and empty space which current has no utility excludes the distinctly gendered way in which poor women interact with it for their livelihood and food security. Framing the commons in such a way reflects the continued exclusion of domestic production from dominant economic paradigms.

⁴⁷ Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, above n (46), 6-7.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 11; see also LANDac, 'Ethiopia: food security and land governance factsheet' (*Land Governance for Equitable and Sustainable Development (LANDac), International Development Studies, Utrecht University, 2012*) <<http://www.landgovernance.org/system/files/Ethiopia%20Factsheet%20-%202012.pdf>> accessed 8 April 2014, 5.

⁴⁹ Watson and others, above n (15), 12.

⁵⁰ Julia Behrman, Ruth Meinzen-Dick and Agnes Quisumbing, 'The Gender Implications of Large-Scale Land Deals' (2012) 39(1) *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 49, 51 Bina Agarwal, 'Gender and Command Over Property: A critical gap in economic analysis and policy in South Asia' (1994) 22(10) *World Devel* 1455.

⁵¹ LANDac, above n (48), 7; see also World Bank, *Awakening Africa's Sleeping giant: Prospects for commercial agriculture in the Guinea Savannah Zone and beyond* (World Bank, Washington DC, 2009)

⁵² Behrman, Meinzen-Dick and Quisumbing, above n (50), 53; AWID, 'Africa's Latest Land Rush: The effect of land grabs on women's rights' (*Association for Women's Rights in Development, 2012*) <<http://awid.org/News-Analysis/Friday-Files/Africa-s-Latest-Land-Rush-The-Effect-of-Land-Grabs-on-Women-s-Rights>> accessed 1 May 2014

⁵³ Declaration on the Right to Development, UNGA Res. 41/128 (4 December 1986) UN Doc. A/RES/41/128 (1986), art 8; Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York) (adopted 18 December 1979, entered into force 3 September 1981), UNGA Res. 34/180 (18 December 1979), 1249 UNTS 13 (1981) (CEDAW), preamble and art 14; Paul D Ocheje, "In the Public Interest": Forced evictions, land rights, and human development in Africa' (2007) 51(2) *J Afr L* 173, 200; see also Bina Agarwal, 'Gender and Land Rights Revisited: Exploring New Prospects via the State, Family and Market' (2003) 3(1/2) *Journal of Agrarian Change* 184

The commodification and privatisation of common forests and pastoral land reflects the continuing belief that globalisation, and in particular neoliberal globalisation, is able to ensure the economic wellbeing of a country and its citizens. Privatisation operates on the assumption that private companies are more efficient in their exploitation of them than is government.⁵⁴ This in turn relies upon neoclassical assumptions that free trade, unfettered capital flows and privatisation are necessary and will lead to greater 'efficiency, prosperity, and economic growth'.⁵⁵ PES schemes extend these ideological assumptions to ecosystem services and, as habitats shrink and environmental services grow increasingly scarce, such schemes become potentially tradable in return for the landowners and land users adopting land and resource usage which maintains conservation and restoration. Reliance on efficient markets in the context of PES schemes and the green economy thus reflects a continuation of economic rationalism in the form of the free market: proponents of free markets and trade liberalisation argue that developing markets for the trade of ecosystem services will ensure efficient utilisation of such services thus contributing to ecosystem conservation.⁵⁶

Among other critiques offered of this reductive ideological approach, feminist economists and feminist ecological economists argue that the model is inherently gendered. They demonstrate that the emphasis on choice and efficiency constructed by the manipulation of abstract logic maintains the persistently problematic transcendence of both the body and nature⁵⁷ intrinsic to Western rationalism and re-enacted, albeit in complex forms, in market assumptions. Such critics argue that dominant strands of economics view the economy as a 'massive machine' and as 'populated by creatures who are, by the nature of the system, forced to act in autonomous, and self-interested ways'.⁵⁸ In this economic model the real experience of humanity and of nonhuman nature is separated from, and subordinated to, the 'inhuman, tough world of economics'.⁵⁹ Such a subordinating logic, however, reinforces the devaluation of feminine bodily/natural experience in the rational world of economics, thus legitimising their continued exploitation—a theme further explored below.

⁵⁴ Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Making Globalization Work* (Penguin 2007), 142.

⁵⁵ Julie A Nelson, 'Rethinking Development and Globalization: Insights from feminist economics' (2005) 14(5) *The Good Society* 5891, 5; see also Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents* (Penguin Books 2002).

⁵⁶ Terry L. Anderson and Donald R. Leal, *Free market environmentalism* (Palgrave Macmillan Ltd 2001) 79-82; Richard L Stroup, 'Free-Market Environmentalism' in David R Henderson (ed), *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics* (2 edn, Library of Economics and Liberty 2008) <<http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/FreeMarketEnvironmentalism.html>> accessed 8 April 2014.

⁵⁷ Nelson, above n (55), 59.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

3.2 Forest related PES schemes and the continuing commoditisation of nonhuman nature

In the previous section, I examined the ideology underlying rationalist economic markets. I used *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy* as an example of how the justifications for integrating PES into the green economy are based on arguments founded in the language of utility, efficiency, rationalism and pragmatism and reflect rationalist commitments that maintain and perpetuate the disembodiment of, and the distinction between, humanity and nonhuman nature. These narratives not only maintain systems such as the global economy and globalisation, but perpetuate relationships of domination and subordination by attributing greater value to rationality, and in particular, to masculine economy.⁶⁰

In the dominant Western ideology, women and nonhuman nature are seen as embodying the less-than and sub-rational and are excluded from the rational, masculine sphere of productive work⁶¹– a binary outcome reflecting value hierarchies justifying the instrumentalism and commodification of nonhuman nature itself.⁶² This tendency is evident in the reductionist and disembodied language used within the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines and *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy*, including their references to ecosystem services entirely monetary terms and to their future value as ‘commodities’ where they are conserved.⁶³ Furthermore, the integration of economic tools and decision-making methods is representative of the burgeoning quantification and valuation of the economic worth of different ecosystem functions.⁶⁴ Joseph Stiglitz suggests that commonly held accounting and economic models mean that a country with resources may actually become poorer as these resources are used up.⁶⁵ These methods lead to weaker decision-making by pushing developing countries to rapidly privatise and exploit their natural resources without including measures accounting for resource depletion and associated liabilities in their national accounting framework.⁶⁶ Where these are excluded from national accounting, this does not give decision-makers a full picture of the situation.⁶⁷ As a result, they can maintain the eco-

⁶⁰ Mary Mellor, ‘Ecofeminist Political Economy’ (2006) 1(1/2) *International Journal of Green Economics* 139, 143.

⁶¹ Julie A Nelson, ‘Rationality and Humanity: A view from feminist economics’ (2009) 1(1) *Occasion: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities* 1 138; Mellor, above n (60), 140.

⁶² Mellor, above n (34), 130.

⁶³ Watson and others, above n(15) 3; ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 31.

⁶⁴ Stiglitz, above n (55), 153.

⁶⁵ *Ibid* 154.

⁶⁶ *Ibid* 153.

⁶⁷ *Ibid* 154.

destructive separation between the superior, abstract and rational economic system and the biological and cyclical materialities of nonhuman nature upon which it is reliant.⁶⁸

This quantification driven approach is problematic. The ITTO/IUCN Guidelines, for example, refer to economic valuation studies and suggest that these are useful tools with which to assess the 'comparative benefits of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and the value of the full range of ecosystem services from tropical forests'.⁶⁹ Economic valuation predominates in the ITTO/IUCN formulation, and the drive to subject environmental conservation to economic decision-making maintains the perception of ecosystems as mere commodities for economic development. The ITTO further states that 'a greater focus on the management of high-value timber species...and/or increased value-added production could help increase the profitability of natural forest management'.⁷⁰ In the words of Plumwood, such an approach is fuelled 'by the dominance of the control and quantification-obsessed global economy'.⁷¹ It exemplifies a reductionist worldview of ecosystems as the sum of their parts, refracted and diminished through the prism of (apparently) objective and scientific methods of economic decision-making. Moreover, these decisions are framed in a way that is concerned with 'trade-offs and calculating optimal extinction rates'.⁷² The approach reframes environmental protection as purely an issue of economic efficiency, thereby transforming the perception of forest ecosystems into one of commodities and dominated by considerations of economic value.

Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy states that REDD+ addresses markets and institutional failures that 'undervalue the climate change mitigation service provided by the forest ecosystem'.⁷³ This also frames PES processes in terms of utility and the potential value that

⁶⁸ Ibid 154. He advocates a 'Green net national product' as a measure that 'subtracts out not just the depreciation of capital but also the depletion of natural resources and the degradation of the environment.'

⁶⁹ ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 31.

⁷⁰ Ibid, 31.

⁷¹ Plumwood, above n (27), 97.

⁷² The concept of 'optimal extinction rates' is indicative of the reductive and ultimately eco-destructive nature of economic decision-making for environmental conservation. Framing environmental decision-making in economic terms, such as optimisation, trade-offs and value-adding continues to represent nonhuman nature as a service for humanity and therefore separate and subordinate. This reflects a continued assumption within economics that the environment is a passive and exploitable resource and legitimises the optimisation of environment usage, even up to the point of extinction, and manipulation of ecosystems to develop more profitable resources for governments. Clive L Spash, 'How Much is that Ecosystem in the Window? The one with the bio-diverse trail' (2008) 17(2) *Environ Values* 259, 263; Clive L. Spash, 'Paradise Lost? The Ecological Economics of Biodiversity. The Economic Value of Biodiversity. The International Regulation of Extinction' (1995) 105(432) *Econ J* 1318, 1321; see also Nelson, above n (61), 5

⁷³ Watson and others, above n(15), 3; see also ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 31; ITTO, above n (20), 3-4.

nonhuman nature has to 'confer satisfaction to humans'.⁷⁴ Such an approach is further evident in the focus on results-oriented payment within REDD+,⁷⁵ which frames PES as a method of utilitarian decision-making that commits conservation to 'a massive program of ranking, quantification and comparison between beings and species'.⁷⁶ REDD+ transforms questions of environmental conservation into economic questions about forgoing 'financially lucrative alternatives to conserving the forests... [in favour of engaging] in what might be a thirty to fifty year activity where the rewards beyond year 2 or 3 are extremely uncertain'.⁷⁷ Other potential benefits from forest ecosystems are similarly translated into monetary terms in order to contribute to the wider picture of the economic benefits from such ecosystems.⁷⁸

Both the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines and the REDD+ mechanism argue that environmental protection is a 'low-cost mechanism for reducing carbon emissions'.⁷⁹ However, by incorporating economic decision-making within environmental protection, discrete constituents of ecosystems are artificially extracted from their complex system dynamics and valued in monetary terms in order to be traded on economic markets.⁸⁰ Locking ecosystems into the global economy reaffirms again the reduction of the environment to the status of a commodity and as a mere substrate for economic growth.⁸¹ Somehow, implausibly, the very process that has contributed extensively to environmental degradation is seen as the mechanism for its conservation and rehabilitation. The ideological and material implications of economic decision-making as a basis for environmental conservation and protection remain unchallenged by maintaining the view that ecosystems are commodities that humanity needs financial incentives to conserve.⁸²

⁷⁴ Lawrence H Goulder and Donald Kennedy, 'Valuing Ecosystem Services: Philosophical bases and empirical methods' in Gretchen C Daily (ed), *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems* (Island Press: Washington; Covelo 1997), 23-24.

⁷⁵ LCA Outcome Decision, Decision 1/CP.16 (2010) ¶73.

⁷⁶ Plumwood, above n (27), 150.

⁷⁷ Donald P Kanak and Iain Henderson, *Closing the REDD+ Gap: the Global Forest Finance Facility* (2012), 10

⁷⁸ ITTO, above n (20), 5; TEEB, *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Mainstreaming the Economics of Nature: A synthesis of the approach, conclusions and recommendations of TEEB* (2010), 34; Joachim H Spangenberg and Josef Settele, 'Precisely Incorrect? Monetising the value of ecosystem services' (2010) 7(3) *Ecol Complexity* 327, 332. TEEB acknowledged that economic valuation for regulating and cultural services may be difficult, but could be possible by using market information indirectly related to the service, or simulated markets.

⁷⁹ 'REDD: Protecting climate, forests and livelihoods' (*International Institute for Environment and Development*, 2009) <<http://www.iied.org/redd-protecting-climate-forests-livelihoods>> accessed 2 January 2014.

⁸⁰ Clive L Spash, 'Terrible Economics, Ecosystems and Banking' (2011) 20 *Environ Values* 141; Spash, above n (72); Sven Wunder, 'Necessary Conditions for Ecosystem Services Payments' (*Economics and Conservation in the Tropics: A Strategic Dialogue*, San Francisco January 31 – February 1, 2008) 8.

⁸¹ OECD, above n (43); World Bank, above n (43); OECD, above n (43).

⁸² ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 39.

4. Can the proposed co-benefits address systemic inequalities?

This section of my argument examines the systemic consequences of Western ideologies in the market economy and the degree to which these consequences have been incorporated into the two PES schemes. In particular, I examine the extent to which the proposed co-benefits within the schemes address systemic inequalities, particularly gender inequalities.

It is often argued that the implications of the continued emphasis on dualist ideology in the global economy continue the devaluation of the caring work traditionally performed by women. Some feminists argue that the market economy valorises culturally masculine traits whilst subordinating culturally ‘feminine’ traits within economic models.⁸³ Feminist ecological economists, in particular, argue that the outcome of this approach is twofold: first, the market economy has separated itself from the material reality upon which it relies; second, the economy devalues and excludes the cyclical nature of biological work.⁸⁴ These insights can usefully inform a gender-sensitive analysis of PES in the two schemes—including in relation to their material outcomes.

Both REDD+ and REDDES suggest that PES processes can contribute multiple benefits to local communities, including the economic value of potential social benefits.⁸⁵ Both schemes suggest that the integration of PES into national environmental and development policies will lead to direct social gains, including poverty reduction, land tenure reform and forest governance.⁸⁶ *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy* frames these multiple benefits in terms

⁸³ Julie A Nelson, *Poisoning the Well, or How Economic Theory Damages Moral Imagination* (INET Research Note No 17, Institute for New Economic Thinking, New York, 2012), 6; Nelson, above n (55), 58-59.

⁸⁴ Mellor, above n (7), 171.

⁸⁵ Barney Dickson and Matea Osti, *What are the Ecosystem-derived Benefits of REDD+ and Why do they Matter?* (*Multiple Benefits Series* 1, Prepared on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, 2010), 2; see also Ingrid J Visseren-Hamakers and others, ‘Trade-offs, Co-benefits and Safeguards: current debates on the breadth of REDD+’ (2012) 4(6) *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 646, 646.

⁸⁶ Romy Greiner and Owen Stanley, ‘More than Money for Conservation: Exploring social co-benefits from PES schemes’ (2013) 31 *Land Use Policy* 4, 4-5; Watson and others, above n(15), 7; Decision 2/CP.17 Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention, in Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventeenth session, Addendum, Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth Session (Durban 28 November - 11 December 2011) (15 March 2012) UN Doc FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.1, (*Outcome of the Work of the AWG-LCA*), preamble; Tapani Oksanen, Marisa Camargo and Karliina Lindroos, *Building a Voluntary Carbon Marketing Scheme to Promote Sustainable Forest Management* (International Tropical Timber Council (ITTC), Forty-Sixth Session 13-18 December 2010, Yokohama Japan, ITTC(XLV)/11, 20 October, 2010), 5; ITTO, above n (20), 15; ITTO, ‘Thematic Programme on Reducing Deforestation and Forest Degradation and Enhancing Environmental Services in Tropical Forests (REDDES):

of their potential economic benefit, stating that REDD+ processes can contribute to development goals, such as poverty reduction through employment and income generation which will enhance human well-being.⁸⁷ While the Cancun decision on REDD+ recognised the need to promote and support the rights of indigenous peoples and full and effective participation of stakeholders, assessment of REDD+ implementation in developing countries suggests that women remain only “partly involved” in almost all activities.⁸⁸ Gurung notes that indigenous groups and communities are viewed as homogenous groups with little effort to differentiate on gender.⁸⁹ This indicates limited insight into how the differentiated roles, rights and resource usage between men and women may determine their access to forest rights and resources and the resulting vulnerabilities in terms of food security, health and fuel.⁹⁰ Therefore, the supposed multiple benefits may not be realised in the way envisaged by *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy*.

In general terms, the policy document reframes the balancing of risks and benefits of REDD+ processes into an economic forecasting process. One proposed method to determine the viability of PES translates potential gains into a simple (or complex) case of cost-benefit analysis. To do this, quantification of non-carbon benefits in the form of monetary valuation because ‘it both facilitates comparison between benefits and potentially makes it possible to include their values in a more comprehensive cost-benefit analysis’.⁹¹ However, this reveals a reductionist approach towards the contextual issues concerning the potential multiple benefits. It frames the entire strategy in terms of monetary rewards, thereby reinforcing the objective, neutral and abstract form of reasoning that maintains the logic of domination and perpetuates a form of social organization that separates itself from the material reality upon which it rests.

Programme Profile’ (*International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO)*, ND)

<http://www.itto.int/files/user/Thematic_Profile_REDD.pdf> accessed 26 March 2014, 2; Stefano Pagiola, Agustin Arcenas and Gunars Platais, ‘Can Payments for Environmental Services Help Reduce Poverty? An exploration of the issues and the evidence to date from Latin America’ (2005) 33(2) *World Devel* 237, 248.

⁸⁷ Watson and others, above n(15), ii, 1.

⁸⁸ Amanda Bradley and others, *Gender and REDD+: An assessment in the Oddar Meanchey Community Forestry REDD+ site, Cambodia* (PACT Cambodia and WOCAN, 2013), 4; Jeannette Gurung and others, *Getting REDD+ Right for Women: An analysis of the barriers and opportunities for women’s participation in the REDD+ sector in Asia* (United States Agency for International Development, prepared by WOCAN and United States Forest Service 2011), 19-27;

⁸⁹ Gurung and others, above n (88), 89.

⁹⁰ Ibid (88), 89; see also Abidah Billah Setyowati, Jeannette Gurung and Yani Septiani, *Integrating Gender into REDD+ Safeguards Implementation in Indonesia* (Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN), 2012); 8; Bradley and others, above n (88);

⁹¹ Dickson and Osti, above n (85), 2.

The ITTO/IUCN Guidelines concentrate on potential reductions in rural poverty, improved access to resources, and increased employment.⁹² These benefits are focused on the productive economy and conceptualise the benefits in terms of economic activity. The Guidelines, however, make little reference to socio-economic benefits to be derived from PES, focusing instead upon the potential ecosystem benefits, which are described as ‘the foundation of the world’s material wealth’.⁹³ These biodiversity benefits are quantified in monetary terms as being worth billions of dollars per year, with further billions gained from indirect benefits such as recreation.⁹⁴ The Guidelines clearly continue to integrate ecosystem services within the global economy in terms of its productive output and to quantify its benefits purely in terms of their monetary value.

The co-benefits outlined in the policy documents prioritise values such as creating employment, self-support and financial self-responsibility and the ‘production of goods and services that support survival and flourishing’.⁹⁵ These reflect, in the main, what Julie Nelson refers to as ‘contemporary probusiness views’.⁹⁶ While enhancing the economic development of poor communities is integral to ensuring environmental protection,⁹⁷ these statements promote a worldview that ignores the ‘totality of human active labour and natural resources’.⁹⁸ The commitment that the documents reveal to the assimilation of all groups into the productive economy continues to promote masculine self-interest as the superior value, at the expense of – in Braidotti’s terminology – Others.⁹⁹ The focus in the documents is placed on ‘material throughput’ rather than acknowledging the valuable, sustainable services – often unpaid – that provide the unacknowledged basis of the productive global economy. This is a point, moreover, with clearly gendered dimensions.

Despite these weaknesses, REDD+ does at least acknowledge the importance of gender as an ‘essential dimension of socio-economic analysis to inform policy making’.¹⁰⁰ The Guidance Note on ‘gender sensitive’ REDD+ implementation makes explicit the importance of addressing

⁹² ITTO, above n (20), 14.

⁹³ ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 12.

⁹⁴ Ibid, 12.

⁹⁵ Julie A Nelson, *Economics for Humans* (University of Chicago Press 2006), 13.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 13.

⁹⁷ Stiglitz, above n (55), 178; see also Tim Jackson, *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a finite planet* (Pbk. ed. edn, Earthscan 2011), 173-176.

⁹⁸ Mellor, above n (60), 140.

⁹⁹ See Braidotti and others, above n (24), 137-139.

¹⁰⁰ UN-REDD Programme, *Guidance Note on Gender Sensitive REDD+* (UN-REDD Programme Secretariat, Geneva 2013), 17.

gender in order to ensure a ‘gender sensitive REDD+ strategy’.¹⁰¹ The Note argues that social, economic and political conditions affect men and women differently, and integrating gender sensitive strategies into REDD+ has the potential to deliver multiple benefits for women by working as ‘an engine for transformational change’.¹⁰² One such example is the potential for REDD+ to create green jobs that ‘would be a critical entry point for utilising women’s expertise and improving opportunities for marginalised groups’.¹⁰³

Unfortunately, this approach can also be seen as an example of assimilating and including marginalised communities within the forms of social organisation that perpetuate and maintain their separation and difference.¹⁰⁴ Framing the potential social gains in terms of their productive (economic) contribution excludes non-monetary social and cultural benefits that groups may obtain from ecosystems. Mary Mellor, argues that the free market and its ‘public sector support systems’ are representative of a masculine-experience (ME) economy that has severed itself from the ‘ecological and social framework of human *being* in its widest sense’.¹⁰⁵ In this form of economy, the ideal is an ‘economic man’ who bears no responsibility for the domestic, nor for the life-cycle of the goods and services that he consumes, ‘any more than he questions the source of the air he breaths or the disposal of his excreta’.¹⁰⁶ As a result of such dissociative ideological tendencies, the economy itself is disembodied, both because as the life cycle of a body is not accommodated in a money-valued economy and because the economy is disembedded from the Earth’s ecosystem. Furthermore, the ME-economy is ‘not limited by local growing seasons and where possible dumps its waste on poor, marginalised communities’.¹⁰⁷ Thus, any form of co-benefit that aims to assimilate and integrate marginalised communities within the productive economy maintains an economic system disconnected from the material world.

Such assimilation and integration of marginalised groups is evident in the justification for including women within forest activities. The *Business Case for Mainstreaming Gender in REDD+* (2013) states that women’s knowledge can ‘add value to community forestry activities’¹⁰⁸

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 36-44.

¹⁰² Ibid, 38.

¹⁰³ Ibid, 38; see also Kathleen Rutherford and others, *The Business Case for Mainstreaming Gender in REDD+* (UN-REDD Programme, Geneva, 2011).

¹⁰⁴ Plumwood, above n (27), 99-100.

¹⁰⁵ Mary Mellor, ‘Ecofeminist Political Economy and the Politics of Money’ in Ariel Salleh (ed), *Eco-Sufficiency and Global Justice* (Pluto Press 2009) 254.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Rutherford and others, above n (103), 6.

and thereby ‘contribute positively to the sustainable management of forest or forest carbon stocks’:¹⁰⁹ women’s knowledge is used to increase production or value of their local forest within the economic sphere. This suggests that the globalized economic system remains blinkered in its understanding of productive work and to the gendered connotations thereof.¹¹⁰ However, despite the importance of escaping its reductionisms, there is little opportunity to remain outside the ME-economy. The ascendancy and power of the value economy and the dominance of ‘probusiness values’ mean that people have very little choice but to engage in it.¹¹¹ This reality further reinforces gender inequalities by maintaining a system that systematically excludes the value of non-productive work undertaken by women.

Framing the multiple benefits of PES processes monetary terms excludes the non-monetary values of ecosystems. Assimilating marginalised communities within the productive, market economy has led to real and significant erosion of women’s livelihood and material well-being and to increasing the amount of time they spend in household provisioning.¹¹² There is an assumption that household benefits from PES processes will reach women and lead to their empowerment, without ‘addressing the costs of women’s participation in these activities.’¹¹³ Thus, many programs in REDD+ and PES projects lack specific approaches to empower women without acknowledging the ways in which these projects may impact current workloads by reducing women’s access to forest resources.¹¹⁴ This can have a significant effect on women’s access to water, food and other materials for livelihood security.¹¹⁵ Therefore, these programmes can create competition between livelihood resource use and ‘production, privatization and competition for... the local natural resource base’.¹¹⁶ It prioritises the economic and monetary

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ellie Perkins, ‘Diversity, Local Economies, and Globalization’s Limits’ (2002) 21(3) *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme* 183, 187.

¹¹¹ Nelson, above n (95), 13; Mellor, above n (60), 144-145; Perkins, above n (110), 187; see e.g. Braidotti and others, above n (24).

¹¹² Anne Orford, ‘Contesting Globalization: A feminist perspective on the future of human rights’ (1998) 8(2) *Transnat’l L & Contemp Probs* 171, 171-173; Susan Moller Okin, ‘Poverty, Well-being and Gender: What counts, who’s heard?’ (2003) 31(3) *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 280, 285.

¹¹³ Gurung and others, above n (88), 19; Bina Agarwal, ‘Participatory Exclusions, Community Forestry and Gender: An analysis for South Asia and a conceptual framework’ (2001) 29(10) *World Devel* 1623, 1635

¹¹⁴ Gurung and others, above n (88), 19

¹¹⁵ Ibid, 19; H C Peach Brown, ‘Gender, Climate Change and REDD+ in the Congo Basin forests of Central Africa’ *International Forestry Review* <http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/articles/ACIFOR1101.pdf> accessed 2 October 2013, 171.

¹¹⁶ M Dale Shields and others, ‘Developing and Dismantling Social Capital’ in Dianne Rocheleau, Barbara P Thomas-Slayter and Esther Wangari (eds), *Feminist Political Ecology: Global issues and local experiences* (Routledge 1996) 155; LANDac, above n (48), 7.

value of the local environment and undervalues (or even ignores) the ‘resilience of the ecosystem, the unpaid and unrecognised domestic work of women and the social reciprocity in communal societies as represented in non-market economies’.¹¹⁷ The resilience of the ecosystem and social reciprocity in community societies is devalued and subordinated by placing a virtually exclusive value on monetary wealth and privilege.¹¹⁸

Furthermore, given the allegedly eco-responsible aims of PES, it is worth re-emphasising that the integration of dualist ideology within the global economy reinforces the transcendence of the economy from the material world in which it is embedded and perpetuates an exploitative and damaging relationship with nonhuman nature. Concentrating on the productive and monetary elements of PES is indicative of a continued artificial separation of the economy from the ecological and biological systems that maintain it. Meanwhile, in respect of the human impacts of PES, the policy documents pay very little attention to the alternative and differentiated usages of forest ecosystems within local communities. Instead they assume that incorporating marginalised groups into the market economy is the most pragmatic and practical method for preventing deforestation and degradation and that social benefit can adequately be quantified by monetary value. As a result, not only does PES simply incorporate marginalised groups within the dominant ME economy that relies on the unacknowledged and undervalued resilience of the ecosystem, but it does not accept or recognise the domestic work done by women.¹¹⁹ These two interrelated assumptions simply continue the devaluation and exclusion of repetitive, cyclical and ‘caring’ work which is traditionally the purview of women within communities.

¹¹⁷ Mellor, above n (60), 141; See also CEDAW (1980), preamble ‘Bearing in mind the great contribution of women to the welfare of the family and to the development of society, so far not fully recognized’ and art 14; Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, (Beijing, 16 September 1995) UN Doc A/CONF.177/20/Rev.1 (1995), ¶153, ¶155; for a contextualised discussion of the human rights dimension of the devaluation of ‘care’ within neoliberal economies and its effect on gender, see Thalia Kidder, ‘What’s the link between human rights and cooking, cleaning and caring and why does it matter?’ (*Oxfam Blogs*, 2013) <<http://oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/whats-the-link-between-human-rights-and-cooking-cleaning-and-caring-and-why-does-it-matter/>> accessed 1 May 2014; United Nations, *Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights* (United Nations General Assembly, UN Doc A/68/293, 9 August 2013);

¹¹⁸ Mellor, above n (60), 141.

¹¹⁹ Mellor, above n (105), 253; see also Hilikka Pietilä, ‘The Triangle of the Human Economy: household - cultivation - industrial production An attempt at making visible the human economy in toto’ (1997) 20(2) *Ecol Econ* 113.

5. Safeguarding what?

The inclusion of safeguards within some PES schemes may in principle go some way towards acknowledging that environmental harm can often be a gendered issue.¹²⁰ Such inclusion is, however, entirely project dependent. REDDES in particular is circumspect when it comes to integrating safeguards within its process, whereas safeguards were articulated within the Cancun Agreement for REDD+ processes.¹²¹ Safeguards are ‘policies and measures that address both direct and indirect impacts of REDD+ on communities and ecosystems’.¹²² The Cancun Agreement called for Parties to ‘promote, support and report on the implementation of seven social and environmental guidelines including: governance, participation, and the rights of local communities and indigenous peoples.’¹²³ This has acknowledged the underlying human rights dimensions concerning PES and REDD+ activities in ways which will be discussed below. Although this is a positive development, these safeguards are not mandatory and concerns are raised over developing countries’ ability to implement and enforce them.¹²⁴ Accordingly, this section examines the effect of the dominant ideology and systemic inequalities on women’s material lives and the extent to which the safeguards and governance requirements introduced by PES processes can—in real terms—protect women and nature.

A reading of REDDES and REDD+ policy documents highlights a significant emphasis on the importance of governance, participation and inclusive decision-making practices.¹²⁵ These are intended to ensure that the implementation of PES processes does not detrimentally affect the livelihoods of local communities reliant on forests.¹²⁶ Safeguards are defined as a ‘set of norms or *institutions* that guide expectations surrounding social and environmental outcomes ... in

¹²⁰ McLeod-Kilmurray, above n (38), 136.

¹²¹ LCA Outcome Decision, Decision 1/CP.16 (2010) Appendix I.

¹²² Pamela Jagger and others, ‘REDD+ Safeguards in National Policy Discourse and Pilot Projects’ in Arild Angelsen and others (eds), *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices* (Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) 2012) <<http://www.cifor.org/fr/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/3805.html>> accessed 27 September 2013, 301.

¹²³ Ibid (122), 302; LCA Outcome Decision, Decision 1/CP.16 (2010) Appendix I.

¹²⁴ Leo Peskett and Kimberly Todd, *Putting REDD+ Safeguards and Safeguard Information Systems into Practice* (UN-REDD Programme Policy Brief #3, UN-REDD Programme, Geneva, CH), 2. The authors note that there is ‘considerable flexibility for parties to interpret what they mean in practice’ and this has raised concerns that safeguards may not be effectively implemented, or at all. See also: Ashwini Chhatre and others, ‘Social Safeguards and Co-benefits in REDD+: A review of the adjacent possible’ (2012) 4(6) *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 654; Visseren-Hamakers and others, above n (85).

¹²⁵ ITTO and IUCN, above n (19) Principle 1, Principle 3, Principle 4; ITTO, above n (20), 16; Watson and others, above n(15), ii, 7-8, 19; UN-REDD Programme, above n (100), 30-34.

¹²⁶ ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 33; ITTO, above n (20), 9; Watson and others, above n(15), 7.

developing countries’,¹²⁷ and are based on a ‘rights-based approach that emphasises the unique human rights of indigenous people to grant or withhold their free, prior and informed consent for activities affecting the land that they have traditionally occupied and/or used’.¹²⁸ Safeguards, then, ostensibly help to integrate gender sensitive practices in REDD+ processes by progressing institutional and governance reforms for the well-being of traditionally marginalised groups.¹²⁹ However, in practice, a more accurate description of safeguards is as non-binding principles rather than rules,¹³⁰ and accordingly, the extent to which they may be able to deliver broader rights based and specifically gender-sensitive reforms may be limited and/or exacerbate existing inequalities within communities.¹³¹

Both policy documents emphasize the importance of local community participation as this ensures the conservation of biodiversity and the maintenance of forests.¹³² The ITTO/IUCN Guidelines contain numerous references to the participation of local communities in the development of production forests and during the course of their usage.¹³³ However, neither the REDDES programme document nor the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines make explicit reference to gender in this regard. The Guidelines contain generalized references to indigenous people and to local communities, without once appreciating the different ways in which men and women use local forests.¹³⁴ The REDDES programme document states that the target groups for the programme include forest communities, indigenous groups and forest owners or managers.¹³⁵ Activities to establish enabling conditions include developing ‘policy, legal and institutional frameworks and governance structures, related to the reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation’.¹³⁶ This form of gender blindness is problematic because it backgrounds and silences women as forest users. It denies their different needs, relationships and requirements for

¹²⁷ Jagger and others, above n (122), 303.

¹²⁸ Ibid, 304.

¹²⁹ UN-REDD Programme, above n (100), 13.

¹³⁰ Jagger and others, above n (122), 304.

¹³¹ Ibid, 304-310. There is significant divergence in the implementation and enforcement of safeguards. There is a clear distinction between the guidance on safeguards provided at the international level by a range of different international bodies, including the UNFCCC, CBD and NGOs such as the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, Climate Community and Biodiversity Alliance and Care International and that being implemented at the national level.

¹³² Watson and others, above n, (15); ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 35.

¹³³ ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 27-33.

¹³⁴ Ibid. For example Guideline 7 does not recognise the gendered way in which men and women use forests, or indeed their socio-cultural barriers to participation.

¹³⁵ ITTO, above n (20), 7-8.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 16.

natural resources and therefore runs the risk that these schemes may ignore half the population.¹³⁷

The safeguards mentioned in *Integrating REDD+ into a Green Economy* are more rigorous. They require Governments to implement a set of broad goals to avert harm to local and indigenous communities and biodiversity,¹³⁸ including the participation of relevant stakeholders, *particularly* indigenous peoples and local communities.¹³⁹ However, many commentators criticise the non-binding nature, specificity and direction provided on how to implement and monitor them.¹⁴⁰ REDD+ safeguards can also be challenged because those who traditionally rely on the forests for their livelihood are often the most excluded from participation in community, local and national decision-making and in other governance structures.¹⁴¹ These exclusions of marginalised groups can be attributed to the interaction between socio-cultural inequalities, class and economic empowerment.¹⁴² Therefore, an indirect benefit from the implementation of PES may be the greater inclusion of marginalised groups within governance and decision-making forums.¹⁴³

The Cancun Agreement indicates that REDD+ activities can ensure clear and secure land rights.¹⁴⁴ Where local communities have informal rights, they are more likely to be excluded from benefits than those who have formal rights¹⁴⁵ —who are generally included in decision-making

¹³⁷ Abidah Billah Setyowati, 'Ensuring that Women Benefit from REDD+' (2012) 63(239) *Unasylva* 57 (137), 57; Agarwal, above n (50), 1456; see also Bina Agarwal, 'Conceptualising Environmental Collective Action: Why gender matters' (2000) 24 *Camb J Econ* 283; Agarwal, above n (113).

¹³⁸ Visseren-Hamakers and others, above n (85), 646.

¹³⁹ LCA Outcome Decision, Decision 1/CP.16 (2010) Appendix I ¶2(d).

¹⁴⁰ Visseren-Hamakers and others, above n (85), 647; Chhatre and others, above n (124).

¹⁴¹ See e.g. Bina Agarwal, 'Does Women's Proportional Strength Affect their Participation? Governing local forests in South Asia' (2010) 38(1) *World Devel* 98; Bina Agarwal, 'Editorial: Re-sounding the Alert - Gender, Resources and Community Action' (1997) 25 *World Devel* 1373; Agarwal, above n (113); Agarwal, above n (137);

¹⁴² Agarwal, above n (113), 1638-1640; Agarwal, above n (50), 1458-1459; Julie TB Weah, *Women and Forests in Liberia: Gender Policy and Women's Participation in the Forest Sector of Liberia* (Brief #1 of 4, The Rights and Resources Initiative 2012); Nisha Onta, 'When Pigs Fly: Why is including women in managing forests still so unusual?' (*International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)*, 2012) <<http://www.iied.org/when-pigs-fly-why-including-women-managing-forests-still-so-unusual>> accessed 4 May 2014.

¹⁴³ Rutherford and others, above n (103), 19.

¹⁴⁴ LCA Outcome Decision, Decision 1/CP.16 (2010), ¶72

¹⁴⁵ Oliver Springate-Baginski and Eva Wollenberg (eds), *REDD, Forest Governance and Rural Livelihoods: The emerging agenda* (Centre for International Forestry Research, Bogor Indonesia 2010), 5; Andrea Quesada-Aguilar, Eleanor Blomstrom and Raja Jarrah, *From Research to Action, Leaf by Leaf: Getting gender right in the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards* (Lessons from Action Research: Booklet 1, Women's Environment and Development Organisation (WEDO) and the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES) Secretariat, 2013), 24.

and revenue-sharing after REDD+ programmes have been implemented.¹⁴⁶ This is because the ‘essence of REDD+ is to reward those who maintain or enhance the carbon sequestration of forests and compensate them for lost opportunities.’¹⁴⁷ Therefore, where women and other marginalised groups have traditionally exercised customary or informal rights over land, these are often ignored or not formally recognised in law.¹⁴⁸ As a result, they may not receive any benefit from REDD+ or be able to participate in its development.¹⁴⁹ This discrepancy was acknowledged by the Cancun Agreement where it requests land tenure issues and gender considerations to be integrated in the development and implication of national strategies.¹⁵⁰ However, it remains problematic that the safeguards outlined in the Cancun Agreement make no reference to the promotion or support of women’s land tenure rights or of customary rights over land.

Significant research concerning the role of land tenure and community forest participation in the sustainable management of forests reveals the importance of securing land rights for women.¹⁵¹ Within many developing countries, access to land is governed by both formal and informal (customary) law.¹⁵² These systems of property account for significant proportions of land allocation in developing countries,¹⁵³ but within them, women’s ‘*de facto* access to land is restricted by lack of implementation of existing laws, by customary law, [and] traditional social practices’ as well limited legal security to protect women against land grabs.¹⁵⁴ As a result, women

¹⁴⁶ Michael Huettner, ‘Risks and Opportunities of REDD+ Implementation for Environmental Integrity and Socio-economic Compatibility’ (2012) 15 *Environmental Science & Policy* 4, 6.

¹⁴⁷ Anne M Larsen and others, ‘Land Tenure and REDD+: The good, the bad and the ugly’ (International Society of Ecological Economics Conference, Rio de Janeiro, 16-19 June 2012), 3

¹⁴⁸ USAID, *Land Tenure and REDD+: Risks to property rights and opportunities for economic growth* (Property Rights and Resource Governance Briefing Paper #11, United States Agency for International Development, 2011), 3

¹⁴⁹ Larsen and others, above n (147), 4; Lisa Westholm and others, *REDD+ and Tenure: A review of the latest developments in research, implementation and debate* (Focali Report 2011:02, Gothenburg, 2011), 8-9

¹⁵⁰ LCA Outcome Decision, Decision 1/CP.16 (2010), ¶72;

¹⁵¹ Bina Agarwal, ‘Gender and Forest Conservation: The impact of women’s participation in community forest governance’ (2009) 68(11) *Ecol Econ* 2785; Cecile Jackson, ‘Gender Analysis of Land: Beyond land rights for women?’ (2003) 3(4) *Journal of Agrarian Change* 453; Agarwal, above n (113); Agarwal, above n (50).

¹⁵² SIDA, *Quick Guide to What and How: Increasing women’s access to land* (Women’s Economic Empowerment Series, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) Stockholm, Sweden, 2010), 1.

¹⁵³ *Ibid*, 1; Anne M. Larson, Maria Brockhaus and William D Sunderlin, ‘Tenure Matters in REDD+: Lessons from the field’ in Arild Angelsen and others (eds), *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices* (Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) 2012) <<http://www.cifor.org/fr/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/3805.html>> accessed 27 September 2013, 174.

¹⁵⁴ SIDA, above n (153), 1; see also Chhatre and others, above n (124), 655; Rutherford and others, above n (103), 25. Shiva, above n (24), 115. Local community leaders may also sell their rights without sharing the benefits or local communities may have to give up livelihood activities without informed consent and compensation.

are often more vulnerable to inimical national policies and approaches which often place significant barriers to land ownership.¹⁵⁵ In some communities, cultural and social traditions, such as patrilineal inheritance, and land rights vested in men, further limit women's participation in decision-making.¹⁵⁶ This situation, in turn, undermines women's capacity to respond to climate change and environmental degradation.¹⁵⁷ Many women are dependent on their local environment for livelihood activities. Therefore, where 'social and cultural norms surrounding the gendered division of labour, physical mobility and access to decision-making at household and community levels'¹⁵⁸ mean that they are unable to participate in environmental decision-making; and where local resources are deemed economically profitable, women's access to sources of food, water and livelihood security may be restricted.¹⁵⁹ REDD+ could, by its very nature, exacerbate these tendencies and the guidelines, however well-meaning, are not sufficient to address the problems outlined above.

REDD+ activities must, however, respect gender considerations and this approach is evident in *Mainstreaming Gender in REDD+* (2011).¹⁶⁰ The report acknowledges that women's land tenure and participation in environmental decision-making are mutually supportive activities. Subsequent publications have also emphasised the importance of obtaining sex-disaggregated information on land data as part of preparing for REDD+,¹⁶¹ an approach recognising the additional benefits brought to conservation through women's participation. Where women participate in forest management, additional benefits such as better quality forest conservation

¹⁵⁵ Rekha Mehra, *Women, Land and Sustainable Development* (ICRW Working Paper No 1, International Centre for Research on Women, Washington DC, 1995).

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 7; Agarwal, above n (50), 1647; Patricia Kameri-Mbote, 'I want it and I want it now: Women and land in Africa' in Layla Al-Zubaidi, Paula Assubuji and Jochen Luckscheiter (eds), *Women and Land Rights: Questions of access, ownership and control* (Heinrich Böll Foundation Southern Africa 2013)

<http://za.boell.org/downloads/Perspectives_2.13.pdf> , 6; Quesada-Aguilar, Blomstrom and Jarrah, above n (145) (146), 27; Setyowati, above n (137)(146), 60.

¹⁵⁷ Peach Brown, above n (115), 164.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ See e.g. Esther Wangari, Barbara P Thomas-Slyter and Dianne Rocheleau, 'Gendered Visions for Survival: Semi-arid regions in Kenya' in Dianne Rocheleau, Barbara P Thomas-Slyter and Esther Wangari (eds), *Feminist Political Ecology: Global issues and local experience* (Routledge 1996) 134-135; Braidotti and others, above n (24), 26.

¹⁶⁰ Decision 12/CP.17 Guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected and modalities relating to forest reference emission levels and forest reference levels as referred to in decision 1/CP.16 in Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventeenth session, Addendum, Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth Session (Durban 28 November - 11 December 2011) (15 March 2012) UN Doc FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.1, (*Guidance on safeguards relating to forest reference emission levels*) ¶2; Rutherford and others, above n (103) (104), 15-16.

¹⁶¹ UN-REDD Programme, above n (100), 18.

and fewer conflicts have occurred. Access rules can take into account women's particular needs so their "their activities will less likely be criminalised or viewed as infractions".¹⁶² Increased participation and involvement by women also improves control of illegal activities by contributing to the 'actual process of protection' both by participating in formal patrols and acting as informal lookouts when working in the fields.¹⁶³ Agarwal emphasises the greater social standing that women gain through participation—a trend that can be translated into greater cultural and social equality as a whole. As a result of such gains, material inequalities between different sectors of society are likely to be reduced.

In that light, it is possible to appreciate more clearly the fact that the exclusion of gender in the REDDES program programme document and the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines means that women's material well-being in the form of access to forest ecosystems may be ignored entirely. These documents do not acknowledge that gender is a cross-cutting issue and that integrating it into the policy documents will prevent gender-blindness in future decision-making.¹⁶⁴ This much is evident in the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines, which subsume women under the category 'local communities' in its guidelines and priority actions.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, the Guidelines omit gender when addressing national-land use and planning laws.¹⁶⁶ Nor is there any real recognition of the gendered way in which men and women within local and indigenous communities use forest ecosystems, or of local barriers to participation. As a result, the Guidelines do not treat gender as either an 'additive category, to be added onto existing ones, with gender as a special target group' or as a lens 'through which the approach to development should be re-examined'.¹⁶⁷ By omitting gender specific language, the REDDES programme document and the ITTO/IUCN Guidelines may perpetuate gender-blind practices that do not address the different ways in which men and women use and conserve local forests.

The exclusion of women from forestry management may mean that they cannot benefit from any advantages derived from the conservation and usage of the forest. Because women are

¹⁶² Eric A. Coleman and Esther Mwangi, 'Women's Participation in Forest Management: A cross-country analysis' (2013) 23(1) *Global Environmental Change* 193, 194-195.

¹⁶³ Agarwal, above n (151), 2788; Coleman and Mwangi, above n (162), 195.

¹⁶⁴ Kameri-Mbote, above n (156), 7.

¹⁶⁵ ITTO and IUCN, above n (19), 28-29. Principle 5 refers to 'decentralisation, forest tenure and natural resource access rights', but the discussion under this principle is focused at 'local people'.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 33. Guideline 7 states that national land-use planning and environmental laws should 'explicitly address issues of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in forests.' This includes ensuring there is a 'process, established in law or regulation, that is transparent and allows for full public participation in forest land allocations and captures local values, including those of Indigenous and forest-dwelling people.'

¹⁶⁷ Agarwal, above n (50), 1456.

traditionally those who maintain the household, when their access to those basic forestry goods such as food and fuel is denied, many feel under pressure to ignore the conservation and usage rules because of the daily need to survive.¹⁶⁸ This can have a significant impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of conservation and renewal efforts. The results of devaluing and marginalising the role of women in the development and planning of forest protection can, therefore, be both negative and counterproductive. In turn, without addressing the interrelated nature of participation and land tenure, women's work and their contributions within a community are rendered invisible within market economies – a situation that can exacerbate the exploitation of the 'unpaid contribution of women'.¹⁶⁹ Recognition of the situated cultural and gender function of rules, norms, social preferences, culture and household endowments must be fully acknowledged, for PES activities to integrate gender equality within the schemes.¹⁷⁰ These factors make up the complex relationship between socio-cultural differences and the development of community forest management. In this matrix of elements, land tenure is of central importance: many case studies demonstrate that land tenure is one of the primary factors in ensuring participation and protection by women,¹⁷¹ an empirical reality emphasising the importance of improving women's participation and land rights in mutually supportive ways.

In sum, the safeguards contained within the REDD+ framework attempt to address the interrelated barriers to gender equality by incorporating a number of gender mainstreaming considerations within PES schemes' implementation. The safeguards recognise the gendered ways in which local communities utilise their local environment and the resulting differences in knowledge, control and responsibilities. They also support the justification for integrating PES within the green economy by addressing some of the underlying criticisms of previous environmental protection and management schemes—particularly those that continued to marginalise and destabilise vulnerable groups' access to employment and livelihood. By acknowledging the interrelated nature of land tenure and the participation barriers that contribute to gendered *material* inequality, the *ideologically constructed* inequalities that characterise the basis of western thought may also be addressed. However, such outcomes are reliant on the implementation of significant governance and institutional reforms, which are major barriers for governments to overcome.

¹⁶⁸ Agarwal, above n (113), 1636.

¹⁶⁹ Debnarayan Sarker and Nimai Das, 'Women's Participation in Forestry: Some theoretical issues' (2002) 37(43) Econ Polit Weekly 4407, 4408.

¹⁷⁰ Coleman and Mwangi, above n (162), 194

¹⁷¹ Agarwal, above n (50), 1455; Agarwal, above n (141), 1373.

6. Conclusion

This article has examined the explanation and reasoning offered for integrating ecosystem services within the green economy. On the whole, justifications for integrating PES *in particular* into the green economy are driven by an overarching ideological commitment to the market economy. PES processes maintain and perpetuate the type of human-centric and rationalist thinking that has contributed significantly to the degradation and exploitation of the natural environment. While the introduction of safeguards and the recognition that PES projects ought to provide multiple socio-economic benefits to the local community, these continue to be defined in economic terms – a reductivism which, as suggested above, implies that activities which have traditionally been embedded and embodied in the material world may continue to be devalued and distinguished from the productive economy. As a result, PES processes fail to challenge the status quo and do little to protect marginalised communities and nonhuman nature.

Ecofeminists argue that the justification for the integration of PES into the green economy in order to achieve green growth perpetuates value dualisms that serve to distance and to disembed humanity from nonhuman nature. The language of rationalism and utility used as a basis for the increased marketization of ecosystem services reinforces capitalist assumptions about the fundamental importance of continual economic growth. Ecofeminists highlight the prominence of dualist thinking and ideology maintained within the discourse of utility and rationality, such that integrating ecosystem functions within this framework promotes the concept of exploitative growth and legitimates the continued marketization and commodification of ecosystem services – with gendered implications.

Moreover, incorporating ecosystem services into the market economy continues to represent nonhuman nature as a commodity – a reductive approach that shapes the debate concerning environmental degradation, which, rather than examining the implications of the ways in which humanity is embedded within nature, focuses upon how humanity can ‘efficiently’ and ‘rationally’ exploit nonhuman nature. Such a framework maintains the denial of the body and the material reality of our reliance upon, and integration within, nonhuman nature. The opportunity to engage in an appraisal of the nature of our relationship within nonhuman nature has thus been forfeited through the preference for maintaining a free-market economy that contributes significantly to environmental degradation in the first place.

Finally, as was argued above, women and other marginalised groups have been adversely affected by the overwhelming commitment to the free market ideology within development and environmental protection policy. REDD+ at least commits to instigating a rights-based gender-mainstreaming approach within the implementation of its schemes in an attempt to address barriers to women's participation and inclusion in environmental decision making. However, while REDD+ recognises the gendered nature of local communities' interaction with forest ecosystems, it does little to acknowledge the subordination of women and nonhuman nature within masculinist institutions and by systems such as the market economy and the neoliberal capitalism inherent in the 'green economy'.

Redford and Adams warn that 'all the research and policy enthusiasm for ecosystem services may turn sour, in the process costing time and invaluable support'¹⁷² if the concerns raised within academia and grassroots activism are not addressed. This article has presented an ecofeminist critique of the justifications offered for integrating ecosystem services within the green economy and concludes that the approach maintains the ideological commitments fundamental to rationalist and utilitarian justifications for natural resource exploitation. These commitments continue to perpetuate the bounded system that 'embraces activities and functions which are valued predominantly through price (represented by money forms) but also prestige'.¹⁷³ Without a fundamental examination of humanity's material and lived realities within nonhuman nature, the green economy and future reforms of the international economy will do little more than 'green wash' the current exploitative paradigm.

¹⁷² Kent H Redford and William M Adams, 'Payment for Ecosystem Services and the Challenge of Saving Nature' (2009) 23(4) *Conserv Biol* 785, 785.

¹⁷³ Mellor, above n (60), 141