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 |

Sources: Paudel & Vedeld (2015); Sunderlin *et al.* (2014b); Larson *et al.* (2013); Müller *et al.* (2014); Babon & Gowae (2013); Lestrelin *et al.* (2013); Mpoyi *et al.* (2013); Paudel *et al.* (2013); Piu & Menton (2013); Indrarto *et al.* (2012); Kweka *et al.* (2015); Kambire *et al.* (2015); Pham *et al.* (2012); Sitoe *et al.* (2012); Dkamela (2011); May *et al.* (2011).
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