Table S4: Tenure issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country | Tenure issues  |
| Bolivia | * Insecure tenure right that still need to be consolidated even though indigenous (particularly in the northern Amazon) have tenure over their territories
* Tenure rights in most of the forests in the Bolivia lowlands are poorly defined, undefined or conflictive in relation to most of the forests
* Lack of clarification on land tenure and overlapping of land rights threatens several territories and promotes deforestation
* Weak enforcement of both the law and forest policy
* No clear law addressing land conflict resolution mechanisms
 |
| Brazil | * High level of contestation over forest lands though pattern is spatially uneven
* Unclear tenure rights, overlapping rights, extensive areas claimed by squatters (24% of Brazilian Amazon is unclassified public land)
* Problems in the implementation of the Forest Code because minimum forest area requirements are heavily contested
* Pressures on indigenous areas despite clear borders and rights (although in a minority of cases)
* Major inconsistencies in interpretation of the law, failure to implement regulations
* Lack of sufficient funding and staff for land regularisation; very slow progress
 |
| Peru | * Native peoples have alienable land rights rather than broader inalienable territory rights
* Overlapping titles and lack of land registry
* State authorises overlapping rights and obligations among sectors (forest, tenure, mining, water, etc.)
* Reserves and other forest categories declared on paper but without defined borders
 |
| Burkina Faso | * Land tenure insecurity due to conflict between traditional rules and modern law
* Procedures and decision-making authorities on land tenure reorganization seem to have little legitimacy
* Politicisation of the land tenure issue
 |
| Cameroon | * Conflict between customary and formal law; formal law limits local use rights
* Community forestry represents an attempt to make a formal link between communities and forests without recognising customary claims
* Only the elite have the means to register land, which is the only formally recognised ownership right
* Zoning has resulted in constant conflict among stakeholders
* State authorises overlapping rights and obligations among sectors (forest, tenure, mining, water, etc.)
 |
| DR Congo | * Land considered vacant has been subject to appropriation by the state
* Absence of planning tools for possible land allocation
* Overlapping land and mining claims
 |
| Mozambique | * Weak enforcement of laws and regulations may jeopardise equity of results
* Incomplete rights to use and benefit from the land, poor enforcement of laws and regulations
 |
| Tanzania | * Coexistence of state, village, private and collective tenure on forest lands without clear property rights
* No legal recognition at national level of indigenous rights
* Some government bodies interpret formal land categories in such a way that the state owns much of village land (e.g. Forestry and Beekeeping Division)
* Conflicts between farmers and pastoralists
* Conflicts over evictions of pastoralists for environmental purposes
* Contested and overlapping tenure regimes and risk of elite capture
* Customary rights recognised but are not always respected
 |
| Indonesia | * Unclear forest area boundaries, conflicting claims and forest encroachment
* Inaccurate land-use maps
* Reluctance to recognize customary claims and support local access and ownership rights
* National and local governments issue licenses on forest lands in overlapping areas
* Low government commitment to addressing community tenure issues
* Limits on customary use rights in favour of business use of forests
* Absence of rules and procedures for registering community forests
 |
| Lao PDR | * Increasing complexity of the Land Use Planning and Land Allocation system
* Weak law enforcement, hampering efforts to secure land rights for local communities and indigenous people
* Unclear legal aspects related to tenure and land registration
 |
| Nepal | * The government decisions since Nepal embraced REDD+ are mostly oriented towards recentralization of forest management and restriction of local rights
* No explicit law for indigenous rights in relation to land tenure
 |
| Papua New Guinea | * De jure and legal tenure (recognition of customary rights) but not always respected by local authorities
* There is seemingly strong de jure customary rights, but many land-owners are not aware of their rights leaving them vulnerable to exploitation
 |
| Vietnam | * Complex forestland tenure and ownership systems
* Gap between national and customary laws, customary tenure not recognized
* Overlaps between indigenous and colonial land claims
* Lack of human and financial resources for forest land allocation
* Technological problems leading to inaccurate maps
* Inequity in forest allocation; land grabbing
* Limited understanding by forest users of rights and responsibilities associated with forest land allocation
 |
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