Table S3. Proposed REDD+ BSMs and BSMs already applied in study countries

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Benefit Sharing Mechanisms  | Experience with other BSM |
| Bolivia | A non-market approach, financial resources are transferred directly to the implementation agencies: public, community and private entities. The Plurinational Fund for Mother Earth was created to obtain, administer and assign financial resources to the mechanisms. The Green Climate Fund is mentioned as an important funding source but there is still no plan for an alternative, secure form of funding. | Bolivia has a strong history of community forestry. Supreme Decree No. 29643 on Community Forest Organizations dated 16 July 2008 establishes a set of financial and economic incentives to promote and implement integrated forest management by community forest organizations. |
| Brazil | National accounting of emissions reductions with decentralized implementation of benefit sharing. Sub-national agencies and actors will be able to receive and re-distribute benefits relative to achieved reductions in deforestation. With such an aim, they will apply their own criteria for benefit sharing under the guidance a REDD+ national entity, to be created by the strategy. | PES is already being introduced at state levels. Amazonas state was the first to establish PES in 2007. Amazon Fund administered by the National Bank for Social and Economic Development aims to implement actions for reducing deforestation in the Amazon on a voluntary basis. |
| Peru | A “nested approach” to REDD+ benefit sharing with national accounting and sub-national or project level implementation. Preliminary presentations from MINAM suggest that once a national approach is adopted, monetary benefits will flow from the national government to regional governments based on each region’s contribution to deforestation and forest degradation reductions and also to maintenance of national carbon stocks. Regional governments would then disburse payments to sub-regional actors including indigenous communities, private landholders, concessionaires and government actors managing protected areas and uncategorized forests. | The National Forest Conservation Program established in 2010 as a voluntary national commitment to conserve 54 million hectares of forest through forestry conservation incentives agreements with the sub-national governments as well as native and peasant communities.  |
| Burkina Faso | Burkina Faso Readiness Preparation Proposal mentions the establishment of a National Fund which is in line with the promotion of private REDD initiatives, and it will fund projects that contribute to the country’s performance as a whole. Intended to establish a pre-financing mechanism in which advances will be made based on expected emission reductions.  | Participatory management of natural forest, where forest is managed by local population organized in forest management group in partnership with forestry service. Significant achievement of this program are the amount of revenues generated from the managed forests (CFAF 700 million for the year of 2009 alone), and the consensus with regard to the principle of redistributing these revenues. |
| Cameroon | Cameroon’s approach to national REDD+ benefit sharing is not far advanced. The 2012 Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) merely states that the national BSM will be based on the experience of other revenue sharing mechanisms currently in place. | The forest and wildlife taxes distribution mechanism covers various categories of revenue: annual forest fee, council forest, community forest, community-managed hunting zones, tax on recovery of products from non-council and non-community forest, and social and economic realization in forest concessions. Revenues are distributed between state, council and village bordering forests. |
| DR Congo | The R-PP proposes to create a national fund to oversee and manage all public and private REDD+ funding received. The fund will be managed by an independent organization that will adhere to revenue management rules set by the National Committee. Division of a national fund into provincial funds is noted as a potential method for channeling resources to the local level. | The 2002 Mining and Forest Codes ordains that a portion of the proceeds from natural resources exploitation should be transferred to the provinces and territories in the following proportions: 40% for the provinces, including 15% for the territories. |
| Mozambique | The REDD+ Technical Unit, operating under the authority of MICOA, will be responsible for establishing systems for financial management and equitable distribution of benefits. But the discussion on benefit sharing mechanism is not far advance. R-PP proposes to develop benefit sharing options for REDD+ by reviewing existing benefit sharing mechanisms between the state and communities and exploring potential to expand revenue sharing schemes to mining and other sector activities.  | Regulation of Forests and Wildlife stipulates 20% of the revenue derived from the management of forest and fauna resources to local communities (at a lower level than the district). Payments for environmental services at the local level especially in Sofala and Cabo Delgado provinces. |
| Tanzania | The REDD+ National Strategy will establish a National REDD+ Trust Fund through which the central government will receive and distribute REDD+ payments (market and non-market), but important aspect of institutional design to share REDD+ benefits are yet to be defined. | Joint Forest Management, allowing communities manages and benefits from forest protection and catchment forest. Wildlife management areas, allowing community to get a share of revenues from safari and hunting operations taking place on their land. |
| Indonesia | The REDD+ Agency has designed a general framework for a centralized funding mechanism, the Financing REDD+ Instruments in Indonesia (FREDDI), acts as a trust fund instrument for REDD+ that is planned to manage, distribute and mobilize funds through three modalities of REDD+ funding instruments: grants, investments and payments for performance. | Revenue sharing from natural resources (forestry, mining, fisheries, oil, natural gas and geothermal) to central, provincial and district/municipal governments. Community forestry (Hutan Kemasyarakatan), allowing community to access non-timber crops from 30% of land; while the 70% of land is for timber to be left intact. In several districts, benefit sharing from timber is between the forestry district agency and the cooperative based on contribution: 60:40 or 50:50. Indonesia’s National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM) is a small grant mechanism, being fully integrated into the government fiscal system. The fund disbursement is channeled directly from central government to community level. |
| Lao PDR | Creating a REDD+ fund during the implementation phase has been discussed with members of the Ministry of Finance and various fund administrators, but the R-PP describes these as preliminary and elaboration on how to administer the fund and which agency in charge of oversight is not yet established. | Benefit sharing from timber extraction in production forest areas, 70% of the total revenue from timber sales to the National Treasury (with harvesting costs paid from this amount), and the remaining 30% distributed to: a national forest development fund (20%), cover operating costs incurred by provincial and district authorities (40%), and village development funds (40%). |
| Nepal | A hybrid framework for REDD implementation at the national and sub-national levels is proposed, details of the arrangements not yet finalized. In addition, Nepal is proposing to use a trust fund model for financial transaction from which payments are made on the basis of a public carbon registry. | Revenue-sharing arrangements across CBFM modalities: community forestry (CF), collaborative forest management (CFM). The CF groups get 15% royalty charged for two species, sal (*Shorea robusta*) and sissoo (*Dalbergia sissoo*), whenever these are sold in the market. The CFM groups get 15% of the timber revenue. |
| Papua New Guinea | A national fund to consolidate and disburse fund (market and non-market) is considered during the implementation phase. An expert consultation group suggests two flows: continuation of voluntary market and PES under a national commitment (with early voluntary market arrangements incorporated). | The Mining Act 1992 specifies a minimum of 20% of royalties must be paid to the landowning communities of the mining lease area, the balance is currently being paid to provincial governments.Oil and Gas Act 1998: A royalty benefit of 2% is provided by the State to landowners, affected provincial governments and local level governments. |
| Vietnam | A “national approach” where the country as a whole will be rewarded for the reduced emissions through an international finance mechanism under the UNFCCC. The BSM is based on a National REDD+ Fund, will be set up within existing government structures and established at central level only with no additional funds at (Pham *et al.* 2013) the provincial level. The national Payments for Forest Environmental Services Program (PFES) may act as a blue print for domestic disbursement of financial benefits through the REDD+ Fund. The PFES scheme already includes carbon ES as one of four ES considered when determining direct and indirect payments to the services rendered through forest protection activities. | Policies related to management of natural forest and benefit sharing in the three forest category (Prime Minister Decision 08/2001/QD-TTg and Decision 178/2001/QDTTg). The national PFES program identifies forest environmental services users (water supply companies, hydropower plants and tourism companies) to make payments to the suppliers (forest users: individuals, households, communities or organizations) for the services rendered. |

Source: CIFOR country profiles; Loft *et al.* (2015); Pham *et al.* (2013); Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Burkina Faso (2013); Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Mozambique (2013); Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Lao PDR (2010); Expert Consultation Group (2011).

**Additional references not cited in the main text:**

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Burkina Faso (2013) Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP). [www.document]. URL https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2013/Nov2013/13-11-08%20R-PP%20Burkina%20EN%20VFin20h.pdf.

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Mozambique (2013) Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) [www.document]. URL http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2013/Mozambique%20RPP%20Final\_08022013%20cleaned.pdf.

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Lao PDR (2010) Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP). [www.document]. URL http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Sep2011/Lao%20R-PP%20Final%20draft%20revised%2021%20DEC%202010-CLEAN.pdf.

Expert Consultation Group (ECG) (2011) Payments for environmental services in Papua New Guinea: a proposed PES system in PNG. Papua New Guinea: Expert Consultation Group.