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Multi-level, multi-actor carbon market governance

- Global level
- National/regional level
- Private sector actors
- Host communities

Axis 1
Axis 2
Axis 3
Axis 4 – within the community

Distributive and procedural justice concerns along each axis
Projects

CDM (India)

VCM (Mozambique)

REDD+ (Tanzania)
Biomass energy CDM projects
Gorakhpur, India
Local vs. global

- Local benefits from the projects were not clearly identifiable. Local community participation hindered due to various barriers.

Local vs. national/regional

- Local communities’ development priorities not taken into account by the DNA. Limited opportunities for direct engagement with the DNA.

Community vs. business

- Communities unable to engage with the industrial units on other pollution impacts that matter to them.

Within the community

- Only those villages and individuals already sharing a close relationship with the industrial units were consulted and benefited.
N’hambita Community Carbon Project, Mozambique
Local vs. global

- Fluctuations in the carbon market at the global level have put the maintenance of local benefits over the longer term at risk.

Local vs. national/regional

- Limited presence of agricultural extension workers; hence local communities have not had sufficient opportunities to influence project decisions.

Community vs. business

- Project relies on donations from the carbon trading company. Delayed payments and poor communications have created conflicts and lack of trust.

Within the community

- Elite-capture of benefits by male-headed, high-income households. Groups excluded due to requirements for formal evidence of land ownership.
The Angai Villages Land Forest Reserve, Tanzania
Local vs. global

- Local communities unable to access carbon markets due to their dependency on international donor support for expertise and resources.

Local vs. national/regional

- Local development priorities and national REDD+ goals are not aligned.

Community vs. business

- Not applicable, given that the project is managed by the inter-village union, MUHIMA.

Within the community

- Limited funds for covering costs for participation in meetings disadvantage the poor, thereby again opening up the possibility of elite capture.
Conclusions

• Re-focuses attention to a broader range of climate justice concerns along multiple scales

  ✓ Broader, holistic, multi-level understanding of climate justice

• Our framework allows us to assess local communities’ positioning in a comprehensive way (existing studies look at one or two axes)

• Host communities (and disadvantaged sections within them) often have limited opportunities to protect their interests
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