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Objectives of the Study

• What are the benefits and risks of jurisdictional approaches?

• What has worked so far and why?

• What incentives are most effective?

• What are the key challenges that jurisdictions face?

• What can we learn from the progress made?
Jurisdictions studied

- 3-state Yucatan
- Ghana eco-region
- Sao Felix do Xingu
- Mai Ndombe
- San Martin
- Acre
- Berau
- Terai Arc

Different approaches: Challenge to generalize

- Private sector commodity production
- Public policies and finance
- Community forestry and livelihoods
- Traditional forest sector activities
Conclusion #1

Jurisdictional programs are a compelling approach and worth continued attention.

Benefits:
- Manageable scale
- Proof of concept
- Economies of scale
- Policy dialogue
- Institutional collaboration

Risks:
- Capacity for large, complex program
- Coordination
- Misalignment w/national
- Higher uncertainties

Cannot discount value of:
- National action + Project level activity
Jurisdictional programs are endeavors that require patience and long-term commitments.

- Complex relationships, multiple stakeholders
- Changing perceptions about rural development
- Changing behavior on the ground
- Building enabling environment
- Capacity gap
- Country ownership
Political leaders require a compelling value proposition to change course, but many do not have one yet... but early efforts and successes are encouraging.

Success to date based on:
- Political will of government
- Strong legal, policy and regulatory environment
- Community green growth strategies
- External investment and support (mostly ODA)

Incentives for future success:
- Domestic policies
- Leveraging in-country finance
- Market signals / supply chain pressure
- REDD+ finance
- ...but not ODA
What does this mean for REDD+/LED?

- We need to move from a model of paying for opportunity-cost to a model of transformational development
- Jurisdictions need “packages” of finance and incentives
- Flexibility is needed in early stages of piloting REDD+ payments
Top 10 Things **NOT** To Do

1. Assume we know what motivates political leaders and other key stakeholders, without understanding the context.

2. Invest most funding into REDD+ planning and “infrastructure” (e.g. MRV, safeguards, etc.) and expect political leaders to maintain interest and momentum.

3. Offer largely results-based finance to low-capacity countries and expect them to perform.

4. Look to REDD+ payments or corporate supply chains as the sole solution to the problem.
Top 10 Things **NOT** To Do

5. Underestimate the problem of political and bureaucratic capacity and turnover in countries.

6. Push countries to move too quickly.

7. Assume that REDD+ is cheap.

8. Create a model based on paying actors indefinitely to change behavior.

9. Expect others to take risks but not take risks ourselves.

10. Lose optimism.