

REDD AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' RIGHTS IN AFRICA

Kanyinke Sena





Two Hadza brothers - on the left a master marksman/hunter and on the right a skilled craftsman of bows and arrows - survey the countryside near Sengere for small antelope known as Dik-dik (genus Mandoqua). From approximately 100 meters, the Hadza hunter kills the Dik-dik with one shot. The Dik-dik is one of the animals that can still survive in the region as it requires virtually no drinking water. Photos: Biorn Maybury-Lewis.



Búke, the community's matriarch, walks through the lodges at Sengere hunting camp, Yaeda Valley, Tanzania Photo: Biorn Maybury-Lewis

Over the last year and a half, over 30% of Africa's 53 countries have expressed interest or are participating in the Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD) proposed climate change mitigation strategy.

Fourteen countries are involved in the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility while two are involved in the UN-REDD program. Others are engaged in bilateral REDD arrangements with developed countries while yet more countries are expressing interest in REDD. Africa's high response is guided by the understanding that REDD will provide financial incentives for countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation while improving the livelihoods of forest-dependent communities.

All 16 African REDD countries are at different stages of developing their Readiness Plans. African Indigenous Peoples face great challenges trying to engage in the development of the national REDD strategy process. It is these challenges that this article attempts to explore.

Funding for REDD in Africa

Several countries and institutions have been competing to establish a financial mechanism for funding REDD programmes since REDD was officially adopted for discussion under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Bali in 2007. Some of the proposed initiatives include a Spanish Fund, a Brazilian Fund, a Norwegian Fund, UN-REDD and the World Bank's Forest Carbon

Partnership Facility (FCPF), among others. Norway is so far emerging as the biggest REDD country investor as it has a stake in both the UN-REDD and the FCPF. It has also entered into REDD bilateral agreements with some developing countries, including Tanzania.

Under UN-REDD, which is a collaboration between UNDP, UNEP and FAO, a multi-donor trust fund was established in July 2008 that allows donors to pool resources.¹ UN-REDD has a total portfolio of US\$ 52 213 730 and, at the moment, six projects have been approved globally with one in the Democratic Republic of Congo² and one in Tanzania³ respectively. The leading institution in mobilizing REDD financing, however, is the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF).

Launched in UNFCCC COP 13, the FCPF is designed to set the stage for a large-scale system of incentives for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, providing a fresh source of financing for the sustainable use of forest resources and biodiversity conservation, and for the more than 1.2 billion people who depend to varying degrees on forests for their livelihoods.⁴

The FCPF aims to build the capacity of developing countries in tropical and subtropical regions to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and to tap into any future system of positive incentives for REDD. In some of these countries, the FCPF will also help reduce the rate of deforestation and forest degradation by providing an incentive per ton of carbon dioxide of emissions reduced through specific Emission Reductions Programs targeting the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.⁵

The FCPF has two mechanisms; a readiness mechanism whereby countries prepare for REDD, and a carbon mechanism whereby a country actually participates in carbon trade. As of April 2009, 30 developing countries are participating in the FCPF readiness mechanism. Fourteen of these countries are from Africa.

The FCPF process in Africa

The FCPF participant countries from Africa include Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Madagascar, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Central Africa Republic, Gabon, Liberia and Ghana. Tanzania is participating only to learn and share but not to receive financial support from the FCPF.

To qualify for participation, a country first submits a Readiness Plan Information Note (R-PIN) for consideration. An R-PIN basically asks a country to give brief information on the country situation in relation to forest governance, law enforcement, forest monitoring and inventories, drivers of deforestation/ degradation, estimates of carbon stocks, cross sectoral program coherence with REDD and data on indigenous peoples, among others. A country's R-PIN is then reviewed by the FCPF Facility Management Team (FMT) and a team of experts in various fields, including indigenous peoples' rights. The reviewed R-PIN is then presented to the Participants' Committee (PC), the highest decision-making body of the FCPF, comprising ten donor and ten recipient countries, for a decision.

Once a country's R-PIN is accepted by the PC, it becomes eligible to receive a grant of US\$200,000 to develop its Readiness Plan Project Proposal (R-PPP).⁶ The R-PLAN outlines the strategy the country intends to put in place to address the issues raised in the R-PIN.

While a country is free to design an R-PLAN according to its needs and priorities, the FCPF emphasises on a consultation and outreach plan.⁷ This is guided by an understanding that the REDD mechanism will have long-term impacts on forest dwellers and forest-dependent communities. They must therefore be involved in the process of developing a national REDD strategy at every stage.

To support consultation and outreach, the FCPF expects governments to use part of the US\$ 200,000 to reach out to forest dwellers and forest-dependent communities. The FCPF has also budgeted US\$ 200,000 annually for the next five years for forest dwellers / forest dependent communities' engagement with the FCPF process.

Country options in developing Readiness Plan Project Proposals

The UNFCCC negotiations are bent towards implementing REDD at the national level rather than at the sub-national level.⁸

To develop a national strategy, a country may opt to address only deforestation (RED) or both deforestation and degradation (REDD). It may also choose REDD, sustainable development and also enhance carbon stocks (REDD++). But it must look at the:

- Scope – what is eligible, which activities, which carbon pools, which sectors?

- Reference level – what is measured, over what period, across what scale?
- Distribution – to whom does the money go? What will be rewarded, on what scale and how?
- Financing – where does the money come from, are there other mechanisms?

- Environmental effectiveness
- Economic efficiency
- Equity in distribution and
- Political feasibility

Governments, non-governmental organizations and the private sector have all made proposals as to how REDD should work. Governments can opt to borrow from the various proposals in a mix and match arrangement. Ghana is leading the way for Africa in developing its Readiness Plan Project Proposal (known as the R-PPP – formerly known as R-Plans). It adopted a consultant-led process with a national REDD committee constantly monitoring and feeding back into the consultant’s work. Other African countries are opting to follow this model.

In the end, however, the governments will decide on the national REDD strategy on the basis of what they think best achieves:

Indigenous Rights and national REDD strategies

There is no doubt that REDD will affect indigenous peoples in one way or another. Given that REDD will operate against a national reference scenario, REDD projects may or may not be undertaken by governments in indigenous peoples’ territories. If REDD projects are undertaken in their territories, they may have to pay a heavy price in terms of land rights, culture and livelihood adjustments.

On the other hand, where REDD projects are not undertaken in indigenous peoples’ territories, governments may regulate land use and land use change activities in indigenous territories anyway so



Maasai women selling jewellery inside of the Kenyan/Tanzanian frontier zone on the Arusha-Nairobi highway. Photo: Biorn Maybury-Lewis



The article's author, Kanyinke Sena (right), interviews Maasai laibon (medicine man/headman), Meshuko Ole Mapi, in his settlement in northern Tanzania. Photo: Biorn Maybury-Lewis

Who is indigenous in Africa?

Peoples claiming to be 'indigenous' in Africa are mostly those who have been living by hunting and gathering or by transhumant (migratory nomadic) pastoralism.

They are distinct peoples whose economies and cultures are different from the national dominant cultures.

They are reliant on the sustainable use of natural resources.

Their cultures are closely linked to the special environmental conditions under which they have for example deserts, savannah drylands and equatorial rainforests. (www.ipacc.org.za)

as not to cause "leakage" in the national REDD reference scenarios. This will also have serious implications for indigenous peoples' land, cultural and livelihood options. In a nutshell, REDD puts indigenous peoples between a rock and a hard place unless it is done right.

Indigenous rights in the African R-PINs

As is to be expected, African governments are still reluctant to acknowledge the existence of indigenous peoples in their territories. In all 14 R-PINs, no single country provided data on indigenous peoples even though the format for the R-PIN specifically demands this. Cameroon, for example, has no data on its Pygmy populations and even has to rely on information from the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR) to pinpoint where the Pygmies are found in the country.⁹ During a one-on-one discussion with the author of this paper, some governments insisted that the term "indigenous" was not applicable in the African context. Their arguments are guided by the "First Peoples" concept, which is relevant mostly to North and South American situations. This is despite the fact that the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights has based indigenes in Africa on self-identity, attachment to land and a history of marginalization.

This is the definition provided in the report of the ACHPR's Working Group on Indigenous Populations/Communities in Africa, adopted by the Commission in 2003.¹⁰

It also beats logic for African nations to argue as they are because no African country voted against the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which also bases indigenes on indigenous peoples' self-identification, and in which only three African countries abstained.¹¹ The non-recognition expressed by the African governments in their R-PINs may be motivated by the implications of the concepts of self-determination and free, prior and informed consent enshrined in the UNDRIP. African governments are not comfortable with these concepts even though they are considerably diluted in the UNDRIP.¹²

Discrimination and ownership issues

Discrimination against indigenous peoples is evident in all R-PINs. Cameroon, for example, divides the country into three population zones but the indigenous Pygmy population is not considered part of the country as they are not included in the zoning despite occupying 80,000 sq km of the land.¹³ As a result of this non-recognition, none of the countries consulted with indigenous communities or their organizations when developing their R-PINs. While some expressly stated that comprehensive consultations were not



Maasai children herding in southern Kenya along the Arusha-Nairobi highway. Despite the smiles, they were begging for water. The drought conditions are hard on them and their livestock. Photos: Biorn Maybury-Lewis.

necessary at the R-PIN stage of the FCPF process,¹⁴ others stated that consultations with civil society groups that work with indigenous peoples were sufficient, even when discussions were held with only one or two indigenous activists. It is true that other communities may also not have been consulted. But given that indigenous peoples are the most vulnerable, specific efforts should have been made to share with them the concept of REDD and the governments' intentions so that they can start reflecting on it.

This begs the question of ownership of the FCPF and other REDD processes on the part of the communities. It is true that REDD is envisaged to operate at the national level. It is also true that the World Bank only works through governments. So essentially, the FCPF process will be government led. But given that the project areas will be in forest communities' territories and that the communities will be expected to openly embrace such REDD projects in order to save the world from global warming, why should they not be allowed to own the process from inception and, eventually the implementation of the projects?

Low awareness is a key factor. Communities are not aware of REDD, nor that the governments are developing national REDD strategies. But communities are not alone in this. Other than the FCPF focal points, almost no other ministry officials, especially not government officials at the provincial and district

levels, are aware of REDD or that the countries are developing national REDD strategies.¹⁵ This could be attributable to resource constraints. Other than one or two national workshops, African governments hardly have the resources to conduct workshops at the regional, let alone the grassroots level. With these low awareness levels, it is doubtful that the communities will meaningfully contribute to the development of the national REDD strategies.

African governments claim in their R-PINs that they recognise community land rights under various national laws. They argue that all lands in a country are vested in the state. (That is, state interests in land override those of individuals and communities, and thus the government has the power to compulsorily acquire any land in the country.¹⁶

Nevertheless, national constitutions, land laws, customary laws recognised by the state, among other laws and policies, recognise communities as rights holders to their territories. But as Mozambique aptly states, "it is not the law (which strongly defends community rights), but community members' ability to use their rights and defend their interests"¹⁷ that is at stake.

Most R-PINs explicitly recognise the cultural, spiritual, medicinal and livelihood values of forests for forest communities.¹⁸ Others recognise, and are promoting, through legislation, increased roles for communities in forest management,¹⁹ law enforcement²⁰ and monitoring, while others recognise forest

as traditionally associated with communities and encourage village presidents and councils to control access and use of the forest, including the sale of timber.²¹ Most governments, however, also blame forest communities for deforestation and degradation through slash-and-burn agriculture and charcoal-burning activities. The governments recognise these as livelihood challenges that need to be addressed. Proposals for alternative livelihoods and energy are evident in the R-PINs. The big question is: are the proposed alternative livelihoods what the communities really want or are they just another top down solution?

In the R-PINs, governments also recognise civil society groups that work among indigenous and other local communities as the bridges between these communities and governments. Acknowledging the challenges faced by governments in reaching forest communities deep in the jungles,²² governments often rely on information provided by civil society groups that claim to have access to those communities. But the key question governments are asking is how reliable the information given by different civil society groups is, given the different agendas represented by these groups. Most governments, however, are keen to strengthen partnerships with civil society groups in order to reach the forest-based communities more.²³

Key challenges and possible opportunities for indigenous peoples

Some of the key challenges facing indigenous peoples include exercising their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and self-determination in a national REDD context, the rapid urbanization that comes with development projects such as roads, dams, etc on their territories,²⁴ and conflicting interests with other stakeholders such as agricultural communities, logging companies, etc. Political instability in some countries, especially around the Great Lakes Region, affects indigenous peoples directly and will affect any REDD initiatives in this region. While there may not be conflict in some countries, indigenous peoples in conflict-free countries are still the victims of conflict as a result of refugees settling in their territories. Some of the urgent challenges likely to be encountered by indigenous peoples in the context of REDD include:

Sudden increased interest in forest land

The possibility that forests will generate millions of dollars through carbon trade is a threat to forest

communities' rights to their forest lands. Government forest departments suddenly want to renege on laws that encourage community forest management. They now want to control forest lands because of the revenue stream they could generate through carbon trade.

Many governments are also claiming that they have exclusive rights to carbon and the trade in it. There is a danger, therefore, that even where communities gain recognition of their rights to land and forest territories, they will be under tight government control, possibly through militarization, because the government would not want the carbon in the forest or land to be interfered with. Investor nations and private entities, including big environmental NGOs, will want to buy up large tracks of land²⁵ for forest plantations and, eventually, carbon trade. Forest communities therefore need to move quickly to secure their territorial rights before it is too late.

Sudden policy and law changes

REDD is set to address the drivers of deforestation and degradation. In most African countries, policies and laws are the direct drivers of deforestation. These must therefore be addressed urgently if a country is to benefit significantly from REDD. The sudden expected changes in policies and laws will change the usual way of doing things, causing shocks that will resonate more among indigenous peoples, who will have to learn the new laws and policies quickly. There is a risk that the law and policy changes may cause further harm to indigenous peoples if they do not participate in their making.

Indigenous peoples' role in the carbon cycle

Global warming is the result of an industrial culture. The role indigenous cultures play in the carbon cycle is not being explored, however. A strong argument exists that young vegetation captures more carbon than old. On the basis of this argument, the champions of plantation forests are having a field day. Yet indigenous peoples can argue strongly that indigenous forests are constantly regenerating, and therefore absorbing large amounts of carbon daily. This constant regeneration has a lot to do with the co-dependence of biodiversity and indigenous cultures. This requires more research into traditional knowledge systems and practices, and the mainstreaming of these into national REDD strategies.

FAO's definition of forests does not take biodiversity into consideration.²⁶ There is even a feeling that it encourages plantation forests and, therefore, genetically modified trees. There is a strong fear that genetically modified trees may carry the "terminator" characteristic, which impedes the regeneration of species. This will be disastrous for biodiversity.

Data on deforestation

All countries rely on satellite-generated data to estimate deforestation and degradation. However, satellites cannot see below tree canopies and even states acknowledge that they are not accurate. More accurate information could come from the communities living in the forests. Tanzania and the DRC are exploring this option.

Involvement/consultation in the formulation of R-PLANS / R-PPPs

When developing a national REDD strategy, the FCPF insists on a consultation and outreach plan. Countries are asked to use part of the US\$ 200, 000 granted by the FCPF for the formulation of R-PLANS to reach out to communities. African FCPF participant countries are following the Ghanaian model whereby the R-PPP development will be a consultant-led process. The consultant will work closely with a government-appointed national REDD team in developing the R-PPP. Almost all countries are allocating some of the funds for community consultation. Of the US\$ 200, 000 from the FCPF, Kenya, for example, plans to spend Kshs 148,305 on consultancy services, Kshs 30,000 on local trainings/workshop/stakeholder consultations, Kshs 7,200 to purchase goods and Kshs 14,400 as operating costs. The local training/workshop/stakeholder consultations will be geared towards developing a consultation and outreach plan to be used during the implementation of the R-PPP.

Kenya's dilemma is that of who or which community organizations to work with, the depth of the consultations given the diversity of interests motivated by the possibility of receiving "large sums of money", the meagre resources involved, and capacity constraints for both the government and communities, among others.

Coordination at the national level

Almost every indigenous activist has picked up on REDD because it is the issue of the day. Pastoralist activists rightfully feel that they should be part of the

debate because they have dry forests in their territories. Activists from "wet" forest-based communities feel that REDD is exclusively their issue. This partly results from the United Nations' definition of forests, which is based on FAO's Forest Resource Assessment Report of 2000. To FAO, a forest consists of tree canopy cover of 10% or more. The trees should be able to reach a minimum height of 5 metres at maturity. This definition rather excludes the dry forests and savannah grasslands which comprise most of Africa.

The reality on the ground, however, is that activists from non-indigenous communities neighbouring forest areas are taking over leadership of REDD in African countries because of their superior education and government connections. Meanwhile international partners, often at the expense of relying on established REDD experts, continue to focus on their usual local partners, even where the local partners lack the capacity or constituency to address the REDD issue. So who will the governments work with so that communities can feel adequately represented? The tug of war is leading to much wastage of critical time and resources needed to build the capacities of communities to understand and participate in REDD.

Using existing instruments to defend their interests

As Mozambique aptly states, the one constraint for REDD is not the law but community members' ability to use existing laws to defend their rights and interests. The communities' inability to enforce the law through the courts is largely due to illiteracy, ignorance of the law and the failure of governments to exercise their responsibility to implement national laws that are favourable to indigenous peoples. There are many international and national instruments in the REDD countries that communities could use to start claiming their space. In Kenya, for example, the Forest Act 2005 allows communities to manage forest areas through community forest associations. This could be used by indigenous peoples to start taking control of their forest areas. On this basis, the communities could argue along the lines of community conserved areas (ICCA), a concept promoted at the recent IUCN World Conservation Congress. Similarly, communities could start directly negotiating for a slice of the carbon trade. But the indigenous peoples at the village level still lack the capacity to use the provisions of law to their advantage.

In most cases, the globe-trotting IP activists are not really honest about the issues, do not provide feedback

at the local level, and/or lack the resources to put what they know into practice. Take the case of land rights among some communities in Kenya, for example. While activists move around the world arguing that their communities have no land rights, it is those same communities that are pressing the government to assist them in subdividing their communal lands into individual parcels so that they can promptly sell off the lands once they have individual title deeds. Their activists do not address these present dangers. Instead, they choose to linger on historical injustices!

A thematic shift is necessary in order to focus more on retaining the land that is still under the control of communities, on negotiating with governments for more control of forest and protected areas, and on opening up channels of information from the international to the local level and vice versa.

How will indigenous peoples want to be involved in REDD at the national level?

And how much sacrifice are they willing to make? For REDD to work, communities will have to change their livelihoods. The changes may include changing forest-based lifestyles, including their cultures. Will communities want this? Will there be adequate compensation, for example, to meet the energy needs of entire communities if they have to abandon the use of charcoal and firewood? How will communities benefit from REDD?

The most logical argument would be for communities to be engaged in forest governance, monitoring and enforcement. Communities have a wealth of untapped knowledge of forest ecosystems that could be used to create inventories, monitoring, etc.

Emphasis should be placed on the use of cyber tracking and other technology that is cheap and easy to use by IPs so that they can document their expertise. The Forest Peoples Program (FPP) and other organizations have started using these technologies with communities in the Congo forest while IPACC provided training on the same in Namibia at the end of 2008 and has conducted Participatory 3 Dimensional Mapping Exercises in Nessuit and Mukogodo in Kenya, with others in the pipeline in Gabon and Niger. If the wealth of knowledge generated by these activities can reach governments, it will be evident that indigenous peoples have knowledge that will be crucial in monitoring deforestation and degradation.

Donor biases and the way forward

At the moment, it is difficult for both African governments and indigenous activists from Africa to form independent opinions of REDD or to express them when they do form them. This is largely because of donor biases in the REDD debate. When a donor opposes or supports REDD and funds an activist to participate in a meeting, it is very difficult for the recipient to contradict the donor position without jeopardising his or her funding chances in the future. Other donors prefer to channel support to their traditional partners even in situations where they lack expertise on REDD issues. While this is understandable, the effect is that African activists find themselves perpetually in a "being trained mode" - no expertise is being developed while much money is being wasted on travel. If thematic expertise could be identified and supported it could do a lot of good to the indigenous struggle in Africa.

In conclusion, the FCPF and other REDD processes are moving at lightning speed, with the governments at the fore. If forest communities do not move fast enough to get their rights and interests reflected in the national R-PLANS / R-PPPs, there will be another human rights struggle for the next hundred years. Addressing indigenous peoples' rights is crucial because investors are not likely to waste their money in countries where there will be potential leaks, significant land tenure disputes, weak forest inventories, weak governance, law enforcement and monitoring. If countries want to benefit from the carbon trade, they must therefore address the above issues in the formulation and implementation of their R-PLANS / R-PPPs. Indigenous peoples thus need to reflect hard and fast, given the speed at which the process is moving.

The FCPF realises the potential impacts on communities, and that communities need to be involved at all stages. In addition to urging governments to use part of the US\$ 200, 000 R-PPP grant to reach out to communities, the FCPF has also set aside US\$ 200,000 for the next five years for communities to engage in the process. The two-pronged approach by the FCPF gives the communities a fighting chance to engage in the FCPF process in their respective countries. Indigenous organizations can access these funds by applying directly to the FCPF. But given the size of the kitty, preference may be given to networks operating across countries. These efforts are not enough! Forest communities need to rise up and proactively engage in the process and debate generally.



Hadza women and children at Sengere Hunting Camp, above the Yaeda Valley, Tanzania. Photo: Biorn Maybury-Lewis.

Massive resources need to be mobilized by the communities and their partners in order to ensure full engagement in the national REDD process. □

Notes and references

- 1 <http://www.undp.org/mdtf/UN-REDD/overview.shtml>
- 2 UN-REDD DR Congo Quick Start Programme - Year 1, <http://www.un-redd.net/Portals/25/documents/events/20090309Panama/Signed%20submission%20forms/DRC%20Signed%20Submission%20Form%20PB1.pdf>
- 3 UN-REDD Programme - Tanzania Quick Start Initiative, <http://www.un-redd.net/Portals/25/documents/events/20090309Panama/Signed%20submission%20forms/Tanzania%20Signed%20Submission%20Form%20PB1.pdf>
- 4 <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/>
- 5 Ibid
- 6 For an R-PPP template, Please visit http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/FCPF_R-PLAN_template_and_Guidance_V_2_10_16_08.pdf
- 7 For guidelines on the preparation of a consultation and outreach plan, please visit http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Guidance_for_Consultation_and_Outreach_Plan_09-27-08.pdf
- 8 The Little REDD Book, Global –Canopy Programme, 2008. <http://www.globalcanopy.org/main.php?m=121&sm=174&ssm=192>
- 9 Cameroon's R-PIN, Item 4, Data available on Forest dwellers and IPs.
- 10 <http://www.iwgia.org/sw2186.asp>
- 11 UNDRIP was adopted by the UN General Assembly on 13 September 2007. Kenya, Burundi, and Nigeria abstained from voting.
- 12 Self-determination can only be exercised within existing national boundaries.
- 13 Cameroon's R-PIN, Item 4, Data available on Forest Dwellers and IPs.
- 14 Kenya's argument.
- 15 Other interactions in Kenya, Uganda, DRC, Tanzania and the Republic of Congo.
- 16 Central Africa Republic R-PIN.
- 17 Mozambique's R-PIN submitted to the FCPF on 15 December 2008.
- 18 Central Africa Republic, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, etc.
- 19 Kenya Forest Act 2005.
- 20 Tanzania's 1998 forest policy and Act (No. 14 of 2002) stress the need to empower local communities via CSOs and the need for village governments to play an increasing role in setting local resource use legislation (e.g. village bylaws) and enforcing such regulations.
- 21 Equatorial Guinea "bosque comunal" and "reserva de poblado" concepts and "village environmental committees" in Kenya.
- 22 The Congo Basin states for example.
- 23 Kenya's FCPF focal point is available to attend workshops on REDD.
- 24 Central Africa Republic Bangui – Mbaiki, Bangui Berberati road axis for example.
- 25 Rumours exists that a Swedish company is negotiating the purchase of 1/10 of Tanzania for bio-fuel production.
- 26 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/Y1997E/y1997e00.html>

Kanyinke Sena is a lawyer, IPACC (www.ipacc.org.za) East Africa Regional Representative Technical Advisor, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank, Interim Africa CSO Representative, UN-REDD and CCBA National REDD standards development committee member. The views expressed in this paper are the views of the author and do not represent the views of IWGIA, IPACC, the World Bank, UN-REDD or CCBA.