

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND



**AN EVALUATION OF REDD+ IN
COMMUNITY MANAGED FORESTS: A
CASE STUDY FROM NEPAL**

A Dissertation Submitted by

Shiva Shankar Pandey

**MSc (Biodiversity Management), MA (Sociology and Anthropology), BSc
(Forestry)**

For the award of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2014

CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION

I certify that the ideas, research works, results, discussions and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted to earn academic awards.

Signature of Candidate
Shiva Shankar Pandey

Date

Endorsement

Signature of Principal Supervisor
Professor Geoffrey J Cockfield

Date

Signature of Associate Supervisor
Dr Tek Narayan Maraseni

Date

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND AWARDS

List of journal papers during the PhD study

1. **Pandey, S.S.**, Maraseni, T.N., Cockfield, G. and Gerhardt, K. 2014. Tree species diversity in community managed and national park forests in mid-hills of Central Nepal. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 33,796-813 (Rank “B” Journal in ERA 2010)
2. Maraseni, T.N. and **Pandey, S.S.** 2014. Can vegetation types work as an indicator of soil organic carbon? An insight from native vegetation in Nepal. *Ecological Indicators* 46, 315-322 (Impact factor 3.2)
3. **Pandey, S.S.**, Maraseni, T.N., and Cockfield, G. 2014. Carbon stock dynamics in different vegetation dominated community forests under REDD+: A case from Nepal. *Forest Ecology and Management* 327, 40–47 (Impact factor 2.76; Rank “A” Journal in ERA 2010)
4. **Pandey, S.S.**, Cockfield, G. and Maraseni, T.N. 2014. Dynamics of carbon and biodiversity under REDD+ regime: A case from Nepal. *Environmental Science & Policy* 38, 272–281 (Impact factor 3.5)
5. **Pandey, S.S.**, Cockfield, G. and Maraseni, T.N. 2013. Major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries and REDD+. *International Journal of Forest Usufructs Management* 14, 99–107

Awards/Scholarships during the PhD study

1. *USQ Publication Excellence Awards* for: **Pandey, S.S.**, Cockfield, G. and Maraseni, T.N. 2014. Dynamics of carbon and biodiversity under REDD+ regime: A case from Nepal. *Environmental Science & Policy* 38, 272–281
2. *Student scholarship* to attend IUFRO Conference on Forests for People. Traverse City, Michigan on May 19–23, 2013
3. *Full travel grants* to attend “Major groups-Led Initiative in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) under the theme *Forests & Economic Development: Positioning Forests to Contribute to Green*

Economy". National Institute of Tropical Botany, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil on March 18–22, 2013

List of conference papers during the PhD study

1. Cockfield, G., Dhakal, A., Maraseni, T.N. and **Pandey, S.S.** 2013. Factors influencing carbon sequestration potential in Nepalese forests and agro-forest. In: *International conference on forests, people and climate: changing paradigm*. Institute of Forestry, Tribhuvan University, Department of Forest Research & Survey, Government of Nepal and Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen. Pokhara, Nepal (August 28–30, 2013)
2. **Pandey, S.S.**, Cockfield, G., Maraseni, T.N., and Subedi, B. 2013. Carbon enhancement in community based forestry: A case from early REDD+ project Nepal. In: Burns, R.C. and Highsmith, J. (Eds.) *Book of Abstracts*. IUFRO Conference on Forests for People. Traverse City, Michigan (May 19–23, 2013) p.55
http://www.recpro.org/assets/Conference_Proceedings/ffp_abstract_book_final.pdf
3. **Pandey, S.S.**, Cockfield, G., and Maraseni, T.N. 2013. Conservation of the forests with linking livelihood of local communities and REDD+ in Nepal. In: Burns, R.C. and Highsmith, J. (Eds.) *Book of Abstracts*. IUFRO Conference on Forests for People. Traverse City, Michigan (May 19–23, 2013) p.56
http://www.recpro.org/assets/Conference_Proceedings/ffp_abstract_book_final.pdf
4. **Pandey, S.S.**, Cockfield, G. and Maraseni, T.N. 2013. Economic development activities in community forests and REDD+ in Nepal. In: Major groups-Led Initiative in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) under the theme *Forests & Economic Development: Positioning Forests to Contribute to Green Economy*. National Institute of Tropical Botany, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (18–22, March 2013) jointly organized by Friends of Siberian Forests, International Tropical Timber Organisation, Government of Brazil and Government of Germany.

ABSTRACT

Deforestation and forest degradation contribute between 10 and 25% of total annual greenhouse gas emissions. The REDD+ program for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and promoting forest conservation, sustainable management of the forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks is one mechanism developed in an attempt to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions. Various REDD+ initiatives have been trialled in developing countries, including for community forests (CFs), which are an increasingly common form of resource management. Through the program, incentives are provided to community forest user groups (CFUGs) to encourage changes in management practices likely to increase sequestration stocks. There is, however, limited knowledge about the factors responsible for enhancing carbon stocks in CFs, the likely trade-offs within communities and the potential for increasing sequestration stocks.

The overarching goal of this research is to evaluate the impacts and potential of REDD+ projects in CF systems. Results from this study provide information for the design and development of programs to increase sequestration and conservation benefits in developing countries. This study estimated carbon stocks and change in carbon stock, technical potential (maximum stocks), key factors affecting carbon stock and trade-offs between gains in sequestration and other foregone community benefits. The study covered 105 CFUGs operating within five major dominant vegetation types. Annual data of carbon pools comprising above and below ground biomass were used to analyse carbon stocks and stock changes. Where sufficient data and models for key species were available, the potential carbon stock was estimated. Social, economic and management data, including a review of existing relevant documents, key informant survey and focus group discussion were used to identify major drivers of forest carbon stock changes in CFs and added community effort and foregone cost added for REDD+. Total costs of REDD+ participation were compared with the potential carbon benefits to enable trade-offs to be identified.

This study found variations in sequestration rates between CFUGs. Key variables were species type, canopy cover, elevation, age, forest scale, agriculture landholding size, disturbance levels, biomass extraction and the use of alternative energy sources.

In comparing present carbon stock with the technical potential of carbon stock in forests, the study identified significant potential for REDD+ projects to increase carbon stock in CFs.

On the negative side, changes in management practices added costs to communities, either through loss of forest products or through additional REDD+ activities, to the extent that the pilot REDD + projects were generally not economically beneficial for CFUGs. However, they could be made more beneficial with a reduction in the opportunity cost of community engagement (through scheduling) and the bundling of other non-carbon benefits together with carbon benefits. Outcomes could be improved through reducing ‘leakages’ resulting from a high dependency on forest resources through strategies such as the promotion of alternative energy sources (e.g. improved cooking stove and biogas).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Professor Geoff Cockfield and Dr Tek Narayan Maraseni for their guidance, supervision, coaching and encouragement throughout my PhD. Their continuous support, insightful comments and suggestions have been vital to the completion of this project and to the publication of five papers in peer review journals. It would not be possible for me to publish quality papers as lead author without their constructive suggestions and contribution on manuscripts. Similarly, I gained valuable insights through writing papers with them, particularly in analysing data and contributing to the paper on which I am second author.

I would like to acknowledge the University of Southern Queensland (USQ), Office of Research and Higher Degree for offering me the USQ post-graduate scholarship which was instrumental in enabling me to join the university and move further in my academic career. Similarly, I want to thank my research centre the International Centre for Applied Climate Sciences (ICACS) and Faculty of Business, Education, Law and the Arts (BELA) research staff and administrative staff for their cooperation and support.

I would also like to thank Dr Bhisma Prasad Subedi, Executive Director of the Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources (ANSAB) for his encouragement and continuous support to enhance my career. Similarly I would like to thank all the team members of the Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Climate Change department of ANSAB, especially Dr Nabin Joshi, Sanjeeb Bhattarai, Dr Kalyan Gauli, Rijan Tamrakar, Shiva Subedi, Sagar GC and Kabiraj Praja, for their continuous support and being with me always. Similarly, I would like to thank Dr. Bhaskar Singh Karky, resource economist of the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), for his cooperation and sharing of knowledge, and Mr. Tibendra Raj Banskota for his support regarding GIS data processing. I am indebted to the Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN) and three watershed (Kayerkhola, Ludikhola, Charnawati) level REDD+ network members and district forest office staff for their support during field work. Similarly,

I would like to acknowledge the cooperation of members from the REDD+ pilot project which was implemented under financial assistance of the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD).

I would like to thank Dr Badri Basnet, Dr Dev Raj Paudyal, Dr Arun Dhakal, Dr Arjun Neupane, Dr Rohini Prasad Devkota, Sanjib Tiwari, Suman Aryal, Hemang Sharma, Arjun KC, Gobinda Baral and Rohanmuni Bajracharya for their cooperation, encouragement and support throughout my PhD journey at USQ. I would also like to thank colleagues of the Nepalese Association of Toowoomba (NAT) executive committee and all Nepalese communities of Toowoomba for their cooperation and moral support. I would also like to thank Dr Kathryn Mary Reardon-Smith for editing and proof-reading this thesis.

Finally, a word of gratitude and appreciation to my family members, especially to my father Mohan Bahadur Pandey and mother Komal Pandey for their continuous encouragement and brothers (Gouri Shankar Pandey and Shankar Pandey), sisters (Swosthani Pandey, Saraswati Pandey and Kiran Pandey), sister-in-laws (Goma and Sakuntala), brother-in-laws (Prashuram and Madan), nieces (Elina, Garima, Ayushma, Jebina, Prinshi) and nephews (Ayam and Prince) for their continuous support. Similarly, I would like to thank my father-in-law Ram Bahadur KC and mother-in-law Indira KC for inspiration and support. Last but not least, my beloved wife Sangita and son Suyogya deserve my wholehearted thanks for their enormous patience and motivation throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND AWARDS</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>LIST OF TABLES</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>LIST OF FIGURES</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>LIST OF APPENDICES</i>	<i>xviii</i>
<i>ABBREVIATIONS</i>	<i>xix</i>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background.....	2
1.2. Statement of the problem.....	3
1.3. Contentions to be tested in the study.....	6
1.4. Objectives of study.....	6
1.5. Justification of the study.....	7
1.6. Scope and significance of the study.....	7
1.7. Structure of the thesis.....	8
1.8. Conclusions.....	9
2. A REVIEW OF THE CARBON SEQUESTRATION DYNAMICS AND ECONOMICS OF REDD+ IN COMMUNITY FORESTRY	11
2.1. Introduction.....	12
2.2. Climate change and role of forests in mitigation measures.....	12
2.2.1. <i>Climate change and share of forestry sector in global GHGs emissions</i>	12
2.2.2. <i>Global forest management practices and community forestry</i>	14
2.2.3. <i>Forestry sector in climate change mitigation policy</i>	15
2.2.4. <i>REDD+: introduction, challenges and opportunities</i>	17
2.3. Carbon pools and carbon pool measurement in community forests.....	22
2.3.1. <i>Carbon pools in CF</i>	22
2.3.2. <i>Carbon pools measurement methods</i>	23
2.4. Factors affecting carbon stock changes in CF.....	23
2.4.1. <i>Possible biophysical factors</i>	24
2.4.2. <i>Possible socio-economic factors</i>	27
2.4.3. <i>Possible political factors</i>	30
2.5. Economics of REDD+ in CFs.....	31
2.5.1. <i>Costs due to sacrificed benefits of communities for REDD+ mechanism</i>	32
2.5.2. <i>Costs due to added efforts of communities in forest management</i>	34

2.6.	Review of research methods related to CF studies	34
2.7.	Monitoring methods of the REDD+ activities	35
2.8.	Carbon prices in the existing market place	36
2.9.	Review of existing models for forest growth prediction	37
2.10.	Theoretical frameworks related to REDD+ in CF study	39
2.11.	Conclusions.....	41
3.	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS	43
3.1.	Introduction.....	44
3.2.	Description of the study areas.....	45
3.2.1.	<i>Demographic information of the study area.....</i>	<i>45</i>
3.2.2.	<i>Precipitation and temperature of the study area</i>	<i>47</i>
3.2.3.	<i>Vegetation types of the study areas</i>	<i>47</i>
3.2.4.	<i>Forest management practice in the areas.....</i>	<i>47</i>
3.2.5.	<i>REDD+ project activities in the study areas.....</i>	<i>48</i>
3.3.	Method used to estimate stocking rate of vegetations, carbon stock and carbon stock changes in CFs.....	49
3.3.1.	<i>Inventory of vegetation and carbon pool.....</i>	<i>49</i>
3.3.2.	<i>Analysis of vegetation and carbon pool.....</i>	<i>54</i>
3.4.	Method used to analyse potential growth of carbon stock in CFs	59
3.4.1.	<i>Estimation of biomass carbon in undisturbed forests in S. robusta forests</i>	<i>59</i>
3.4.2.	<i>Estimation of carbon stock growth in S. robusta forests under CF.....</i>	<i>60</i>
3.4.3.	<i>Gap in carbon stock in CFs with mixed broadleaf, Schima-Castanopsis, Pine and Rhododendron-Quercus forests.....</i>	<i>61</i>
3.5.	Methods used to analyse demographic data, forest management practices, changed behaviour and costs and benefits consequences of CFUGs for the REDD+	61
3.5.1.	<i>Review of relevant documents</i>	<i>62</i>
3.5.2.	<i>Focus group discussion</i>	<i>62</i>
3.5.3.	<i>Key informant survey.....</i>	<i>63</i>
3.6.	Methods used to analyse factors affecting carbon stock changes.....	63
3.7.	Methods used to analyse trade-off between carbon benefits and community benefits.....	67
3.7.1.	<i>Costs of CFUGs for REDD+</i>	<i>67</i>
3.7.2.	<i>Analysis of total costs and carbon benefits in REDD+ CFs.....</i>	<i>71</i>
3.7.3.	<i>Carbon gain estimation in CFs.....</i>	<i>71</i>
3.7.4.	<i>Price used in carbon revenue estimation.....</i>	<i>71</i>
3.8.	Conclusions.....	72
4.	DYNAMICS OF CARBON STOCK IN REDD+ COMMUNITY FORESTS.....	73

4.1.	Introduction.....	74
4.2.	Distribution of different size trees in CFs.....	74
4.3.	Biomass and carbon stock dynamics in sample plots	76
4.3.1.	<i>Total biomass carbon in the reference year 2010 and year 2013.....</i>	<i>77</i>
4.3.2.	<i>Change in carbon stock in sample plots in CFs between 2010 and 2013.....</i>	<i>81</i>
4.4.	Biomass and carbon stock in individual CF	84
4.5.	Conclusion	85
5.	POTENTIAL BIOMASS CARBON GROWTH IN COMMUNITY FORESTS.....	87
5.1.	Introduction.....	88
5.2.	Technical potential biomass carbon in <i>Shorea robusta</i> forests	88
5.2.1.	<i>Biomass carbon stock in undisturbed forests</i>	<i>88</i>
5.2.2.	<i>Biomass carbon growth in CFs</i>	<i>89</i>
5.2.3.	<i>Carbon growth in undisturbed forests, dense CFs and sparse CFs</i>	<i>95</i>
5.3.	Biomass carbon growth in other vegetation types	96
5.4.	Conclusion	97
6.	CHANGED BEHAVIOUR OF THE COMMUNITIES AND FACTORS AFFECTING CARBON STOCK AND CARBON STOCK CHANGES IN THE REDD+ CFS.....	99
6.1.	Introduction.....	100
6.2.	Evidence of changed behaviour of communities related to biomass reduction in the forests	100
6.3.	Changed practices of CFUGs for the REDD+ project.....	105
6.4.	Elevation of the forests	109
6.5.	Proximity of forests from road head	115
6.6.	Proximity of forests from settlement	117
6.7.	Stand age in CFs	119
6.8.	Socio-economic aspects of CFUGs	119
6.8.1.	<i>Per capita forest areas</i>	<i>120</i>
6.8.2.	<i>Household level landholding</i>	<i>121</i>
6.8.3.	<i>Average change in livestock</i>	<i>122</i>
6.8.4.	<i>Biogas use.....</i>	<i>122</i>
6.8.5.	<i>Petroleum energy use</i>	<i>123</i>
6.8.6.	<i>Biomass extraction</i>	<i>124</i>
6.8.7.	<i>Grazing.....</i>	<i>125</i>
6.8.8.	<i>Caste heterogeneity</i>	<i>126</i>
6.8.9.	<i>Quantity of grass collection.....</i>	<i>127</i>

6.8.10.	<i>Fodder collection</i>	128
6.8.11.	<i>Litter collection</i>	129
6.9.	Conclusion	130
7.	TRADE-OFF BETWEEN SACRIFICED BENEFIT TO COMMUNITIES AND CARBON BENEFITS IN CFS	133
7.1.	Introduction.....	134
7.2.	Contribution of communities for REDD+	134
7.3.	Changed forest product use practices of communities for REDD+.....	136
7.4.	Conclusion	141
8.	DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	143
8.1.	Introduction.....	144
8.2.	Community-based forest management regime, rural livelihoods and REDD+ 144	
8.3.	Tree size distribution in community based forest management under REDD+ mechanism	145
8.4.	Changes in carbon stock in CFs under REDD+ mechanism	147
8.5.	Potential carbon growth in CFs.....	151
8.6.	Key factors affecting carbon stock in CFs.....	156
8.7.	Trade-off between communities sacrificed benefits and carbon benefits in CFs	161
8.8.	Sensitivity analysis of foregone benefits of communities for REDD+ mechanism	164
8.9.	Performance of REDD+ projects in CFs	165
8.10.	Contemporary issues in REDD+ and REDD+ CFs	167
8.11.	Ideal CF for REDD+ benefits	171
9.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	177
9.1.	Introduction.....	178
9.2.	Summary of major findings	178
9.2.1.	<i>Distribution of different sized trees in forests and carbon stock dynamics in CFs by vegetation types</i>	179
9.2.2.	<i>Potential growth of carbon stock in CFs</i>	179
9.2.3.	<i>Key factors affecting carbon stock in CFs</i>	180
9.2.4.	<i>Model CFs for REDD+ projects</i>	180
9.2.5.	<i>Trade-offs between foregone community benefits and carbon benefits in REDD+ CFs</i>	180

9.3.	Contentions made before the study	181
9.4.	Research contributions	183
9.5.	Research implications	184
9.5.1.	<i>Implications for policy making level</i>	184
9.5.2.	<i>Implications for project implementation level</i>	185
9.6.	Limitations of the study	186
9.7.	Suggestions for further research	187
REFERENCES		189
APPENDICES		233

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Ownership of the global forests	14
Table 2.2	Price of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO ₂ e) in three different carbon marketing mechanisms where LULUCF sector is included.....	36
Table 3.1	Demographic information and size of forests in the study areas	45
Table 3.2	Average meteorological information of closely located stations from three watersheds in 1976-2005.....	47
Table 3.3	Wood specific gravity used in analysis	56
Table 3.4	Dry to green weight ration used to convert green biomass to dry biomass of sapling	57
Table 3.5	Methods used for analysing factors affecting carbon stock and change in carbon stock in CFs	65
Table 3.6	Items and data sources used to estimate real time benefits and costs of the communities in CFs for six year (2006 -2012 i.e. three years before and three years during the REDD+ projects)	68
Table 3.7	Unit price of forest products in 2012 in the study areas.....	69
Table 4.1	Comparison of stocking rates of woody vegetation by species and their strata in the REDD+ CFs (in year 2010 and 2013) in the study sites.....	75
Table 4.2	Comparison of change in stocking rates (from 2010 and 2013) of woody vegetation by vegetation types and their strata in the REDD+ CFs in the study sites.....	76
Table 4.3	Comparison of biomass C (both above and belowground, in year 2010 and 2013) by vegetation and their strata in CFs in the study areas	78

Table 4.4 Pair-wise comparison of p value (assuming unequal variance, two tail) for having similar mean carbon stock (difference in mean =0) in CFs by vegetation and canopy cover differences in 2010	80
Table 4.5 Comparison of changes in biomass C in three year (between 2010 and 2013, both above- and-belowground) by vegetation types and their strata in CFs in the study areas.....	82
Table 4.6 Pair-wise comparison of p- value (assuming unequal variance, two tail) for having similar mean carbon stock (difference in mean =0) for having same changes in biomass carbon in CFs (from 2010 to 2013) by vegetation and canopy cover.....	83
Table 4.7 Average carbon stock (MgC/ha) in different canopy forests within different altitudes estimated from sample plots	84
Table 4.8 Average biomass carbon (above and below ground, in year 2010 and 2013) in CFs by dominant vegetation types in the study areas	84
Table 4.9 Change in biomass carbon (above and below ground, between 2010 and 2013) in CFs by dominant vegetation types in the study areas	85
Table 5.1 Dynamic models of relative total biomass accumulation in dense <i>S. robusta</i> forests	91
Table 5.2 Dynamic models of relative total biomass accumulation in sparse <i>S. robusta</i> forests	92
Table 5.3 Gaps between 10 th percentile and 90 th percentile value of carbon stock in both dense and sparse canopy types CFs by vegetation.....	97
Table 6.1 Summary of the changed practices in CFs for REDD+ in the study areas	106
Table 6.2 Proximity (Road to plots) and average C-stock (MgC/ha in year 2010) and change in C-stock (between 2010-2013, MgC/ha) in forests analysing 21 plots located at farthest away and 21 at closest from the road head	115
Table 6.3 Proximity (settlement to plots) and average c-stock (MgC/ha in year 2010) and change in C-stock (between 2010-2013, t C/ha) in forests analysing 21 plots located at farthest away and 21 at closest from the local settlement	117
Table 6.4 Average age of forest stand, and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010 and 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	119
Table 6.5 Per capita forest areas (ha/person) difference and carbon stock in year 2010 and change in carbon stock between 2010–2013 in CFs by vegetation	120

Table 6.6 Household level landholding size and C-stock in year 2010(MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010–2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	121
Table 6.7 Household level livestock unit and C-stock in the year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types.....	122
Table 6.8 Proportion of biogas using households and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	123
Table 6.9 Proportion of Petroleum energy (LP gas, Kerosene) using households and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and change in C-stock between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types.....	124
Table 6.10 Change in quantity of biomass extraction (both timber and firewood) and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types.....	125
Table 6.11 Grazing (Live Stock Unit days in a year) and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010–2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	126
Table 6.12 Caste heterogeneity and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010–2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	127
Table 6.13 Quantity of grass collection and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types..	128
Table 6.14 Quantity of fodder collection, and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and C-stock change between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	129
Table 6.15 Quantity of litter collection, and C-stock in year 2010 (MgC/ha) and change in C-stock between 2010 – 2013 (MgC/ha) in CFs by vegetation types	130
Table 7.1 Participant number (person/ha/yr) in meetings and general assembly and forestry activities costs in the CFUGs (US\$/ ha/yr).....	135
Table 7.2 Cost of the CFUGs (US\$/ ha/yr) by vegetation type due to changed forest management practices after REDD+ in the study sites	136
Table 7.3 Average annual forest product collection and income from NTFP in CFUGs by vegetation types (3 years before and during 3 years of REDD+) in the study sites	137

Table 7.4 Average annual cost (US\$/ha) of the CFUGs due to changing forest product use behaviour for the REDD+ by vegetation types of the study sites	138
Table 7.5 Sacrificed benefits of communities for the REDD+ in CFs by vegetation types in the study area	140
Table 8.1 Comparison between our estimates and other estimates for closely related forests for carbon stock (MgC/ha).....	150
Table 8.2 Theoretical maximum carbon stocks by years in CF and undisturbed <i>S. robusta</i> forests	153
Table 8.3 Age category of CFs by dominant vegetation types	153
Table 8.4 Scale of REDD+ project for CFs and possible issues	170

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Greenhouse gas emissions (CO ₂ -equivalent) measured in 1970, 1990 and 2010 by five sectors in four economic regions (Source: Victor <i>et al.</i> 2014)	13
Figure 2.2 Development of the REDD+ mechanism in UNFCCC	16
Figure 2.3 Theoretical aspects for REDD+ in community forestry	39
Figure 3.1 Map showing the study area with three watersheds: Kayerkhola watershed (271 –1,618m asl) in Chitwan district; Ludikhola watershed (418–1,401m asl) in Gorkha district; and Charnawati watershed (652–3,238m asl) in Dolakha district.	46
Figure 3.2 Distribution of sample plots in <i>S. robusta</i> , mixed broadleaf, <i>Schima Castanopsis</i> , <i>Pine</i> and <i>Rhododendron-Quercus</i> dominated forests in Charnawati watershed Dolakha (A), Kayerkhola watershed Chitwan (B) and Ludikhola Watershed Gorkha (C) of the study areas	51
Figure 3.3 Model of a composite sample plot used to measure carbon pools during forest inventory.....	52
Figure 5.1 Cumulative biomass carbon in undisturbed <i>S. robusta</i> forests (<i>adopted from Rautiinen 1995</i>).....	89
Figure 5.2 Mean Annual Increment (MAI) and Current Annual Increment (CAI) in undisturbed <i>S. robusta</i> forests (<i>adopted from Rautiinen 1995</i>).....	89
Figure 5.3 Cumulative biomass carbon in dense <i>S. robusta</i> dominated CFs	93
Figure 5.4 Cumulative biomass carbon in sparse <i>S. robusta</i> dominated CFs	93

Figure 5.5 Mean Annual Increment (MAI) and Current Annual Increment (CAI) in dense <i>S. robusta</i> dominated CF.....	94
Figure 5.6 Mean Annual Increment (MAI) and Current Annual Increment (CAI) in sparse <i>S. robusta</i> dominated CF.....	94
Figure 5.7 Cumulative biomass carbon in undisturbed natural forests with uniform age; dense and sparse canopy CFs with average age of dominant trees in <i>S. robusta</i> forests	95
Figure 5.8 Area under curves showing cumulative biomass carbon growth in undisturbed natural forests(34,708.07); (A) dense CFs (10,651.03); (B) sparse CFs (8,304.57) in <i>S. robusta</i> forests.....	96
Figure 6.1 Observed forest fire incidence by proportion of total plots in different vegetation and canopy cover types.....	101
Figure 6.2 Observed livestock grazing incidence by proportion of total plots in different vegetation and canopy cover types.....	102
Figure 6.3 Observed fodder collection incidence by proportion of total plots in different vegetation and canopy cover types.....	103
Figure 6.4 Observed firewood collection incidence by proportion of total plots in different vegetation and canopy cover types.....	104
Figure 6.5 Observed timber collection incidences by proportion of total plots in different vegetation and canopy cover types.....	105
Figure 6.6 Scatter plots showing relationship between carbon stock (average in year 2010 and change between 2010- 2013) in <i>S. robusta</i> dominant forests by canopy types.....	110
Figure 6.7 Scatter plots showing relationship between carbon stock (in year 2010 and change between 2010 - 2013) in Mixed broadleaf forests by canopy (A-F)	111
Figure 6.8 Scatter plots showing relationship between carbon stock (in year 2010 and change between 2010-2013) in <i>Schima-Castanopsis</i> forests by canopy types (A-F)	112
Figure 6.9 Scatter plots showing relationship between carbon stock (average in year 2010 and change between 2010- 2013) in <i>Pine</i> forests by canopy types (A-F).....	113
Figure 6.10 Scatter plots showing relationship between carbon stock (average in year 2010 and change in carbon stock between 2010 and 2013) in <i>Rhododendron-Quercus</i> forests by canopy types (A-F).....	114
Figure 6.11 Proximity of sample plots from closely located road	116

Figure 6.12 Proximity of sample plots from settlement.....	118
Figure 8.1 REDD+ project performance cycle can be used during REDD+ evaluation (<i>adopted from Liu and Walker (1998)</i>).....	165
Figure 8.2 Theoretical growth pattern of carbon stock in forests [<i>Adopted from growth pattern of trees mentioned in literatures (Birch 1999; Clark & Clark 1999) which was found similar in this study</i>].....	175

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Checklist for key informant survey	233
Appendix B: Checklist used to collect forest related information from documents available with CFUGs	234
Appendix C: Checklist used to collect costs and benefits data from documents available with CFUGs	235
Appendix D: Checklist of the questions asked in group discussion.....	236
Appendix E: A format used to collect forest resource inventory data in each sample plot	237
Appendix F: Comparison of biomass (both above ground and below ground) using four year measurement data by vegetation types and canopy strata of CFs in the study areas	240
Appendix G: Average carbon stock (MgC/ha) in individual CF in the study areas	243
Appendix H: Summary of local practices, changes in CFs and local perceptions about REDD+ in the study areas	248
Appendix I: Definition of some terms used in this thesis	251

ABBREVIATIONS

3PG	Physiological Principle Predicting Growth Model
AGTB	Above Ground Tree Biomass
AGSB	Above Ground Sapling Biomass
AFOLU	Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use
ANSAB	Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources
BEF	Biomass Expansion Factor
BGTB	Below Ground Tree Biomass
BGSB	Below Ground Sapling Biomass
DoF	Department of Forests
C	Carbon
CAI	Current Annual Increment
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emissions Reduction
CF	Community Forest
CFUG	Community Forest User Group
cm	Centimetre
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
COP	Conferences of the Parties
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
DHM	Department of Hydrology and Meteorology
EU-ETS	European Union Emissions Trading System
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FECOFUN	Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FullCAM	Full Carbon Accounting Model

g	Gram
GA	General Assembly
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoN	Government of Nepal
GPS	Global Positioning System
H	Height
ha	Hectare
HB	Herb Biomass
HH	Household
ICIMOD	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development
ICS	Improved Cooking Stove
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
kg	Kilogram
LB	Litter Biomass
LPG	Liquefied Petroleum Gas
LSU	Livestock Standard Unit
LULUCF	Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry
MAI	Mean Annual Increment
MFSC	Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
Mg	Mega gram
mm	millimeter
MMF	Morgen-Mercer- Flodin
MPFS	Master Plan for Forestry Sector Nepal
MRV	Measurement, Reporting and Verification
MSY	Maximum Sustained Yield
NARC	National Agriculture Research Council
NARMSAP	Natural Resource Management Sector Assistance Programme
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NSCFP	Nepal Swiss Community Forestry Project
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products
ppm	Part Per Million

REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, Sustainable Management, Conservation and Enhancement of Forest Carbon Stock
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
R ²	Coefficient of Determination
REL	Reference Emission Level
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SD	Standard Deviation
SOC	Soil Organic Carbon
UN	United Nations
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UN-REDD	United Nations REDD+
US\$	United States Dollar
VDC	Village Development Committee