

on program positive outcomes, conflicts of interests and unclear responsibilities amongst government agencies, elite capture in natural resources and information, and the lack of political space given to local communities and non-state actors to take part in monitoring and evaluation process. Our paper suggests that enhancing transparency and accountability in monitoring and implementing PFES requires not only application of advanced technology but also to address underlying politics of numbers.

**Lessons from land management platforms: model forests in Latin America / Lecciones aprendidas de las plataformas de gestión territorial: caso de los bosques modelo de Latinoamérica**

Fernando Carrera<sup>1</sup>, Roger Villalobos<sup>1</sup>, Leonardo Duran<sup>2</sup>, Claudia Rojas<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CATIE, Turrialba, Costa Rica; <sup>2</sup>Universidad Mayor, Santiago de Chile, Chile (fcarrera@catie.ac.cr; rvillalo@catie.ac.cr; leonardo.duran@umayor.cl; claudia.rojas@catie.ac.cr)

Los Bosques Modelo son plataformas de gobernanza para la gestión territorial que vienen operando en Latinoamérica desde hace dos décadas. Estas plataformas están enlazadas a través de la Red Latinoamericana de Bosques Modelo (RLABM) que reúne a 33 territorios de incidencia en 14 países y el apoyo de organizaciones internacionales como FAO, CUSO, CIFOR, CIAT y CATIE. La RLABM es parte de la Red Internacional de Bosques Modelo (RIBM) que aglutina a más de 70 plataformas en 30 países a nivel global. La investigación sintetiza las principales lecciones aprendidas de estos procesos de gestión territorial en Latinoamérica, mismos que son reconocidos como un espacio que favorece la articulación de actores del ámbito público, privado y de la sociedad civil para responder a las oportunidades y desafíos del desarrollo sostenible en un territorio de interés común. Estas lecciones fueron obtenidas con base en entrevistas, revisión de documentación y visitas de campo. Entre los aprendizajes se destacan la necesidad de involucrar a los gobiernos locales e instituciones académicas en la gestión de estas plataformas; la conveniencia de que organizaciones locales asuman con mayor peso el liderazgo; la importancia de contar con personal y un mínimo de recursos físicos y financieros; el peligro que representan los cambios en la políticas gubernamentales en la continuidad del proceso; la conveniencia de contar con planes estratégicos participativos; lo determinante del liderazgo social, el compromiso de los socios y la identidad territorial. Se resalta que el establecimiento de alianzas estratégicas desde la acción favorece la sostenibilidad de la gobernanza.

**Interests and conflicts in forest management: Who possess power in Slovakian forest governance?**

Yvonne Brodrechtova<sup>1</sup>, Róbert Sedmák<sup>1</sup>, Ján Bahýľ<sup>1</sup>, Michal Bošela<sup>1</sup>, Ján Ján Tuček<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Technical University in Zvolen, Zvolen, Slovakia (yvonne.brodrechtova@tuzvo.sk; robert.sedmak@tuzvo.sk; jan.bahyl@tuzvo.sk; michal.bosela@tuzvo.sk; jan.tucek@tuzvo.sk)

The actor landscape in Slovakian forestry has become more diverse since the early 1990s due to the transition from planned to market economy. This has led to various conflicts among actors concerning forest management and its output: ecosystem services (ES). Who are the relevant actors and what power resources they possess to act in forest management today? Based on the actor-centered power approach the actors' interests in ES and power to drive forest management were assessed based on the ability of actors to apply the mechanisms of coercion, incentives, and dominant information. The results of 38 in-person interviews and participatory observations revealed that both actors both inside and outside of the forestry arena drive forest management in Slovakia. However, governmental actors in forestry, environment (with various interests in ESs) and agriculture are still the most powerful and have the highest impact on forest management. Moreover, the governmental actors are often influenced by businesses rather than politics. The power is increasingly being taken by businesses, which either formally (e.g., associations, (environmental) non-governmental organizations) or informally (e.g., media, lobbying) influence forest politics. In contrast to actors representing the environment via various non-governmental organizations that exercise medium power in the forest arena, the actors in forestry represented via various associations have a rather low impact. As a result, forest management research should focus more to power resources and relations of actors acting on forest management. If not, powerful actors driving forest management may use conflicts for their benefit and avert balanced ES trade-off.

**Puzzle pieces or poker chips? How citizens use multistakeholder forums to hold government and NGOs accountable**

Amé Larson<sup>1</sup>, Juan Pablo Sarmiento Barletti<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CIFOR, Lima, Peru (a.larson@cgiar.org; j.sarmiento@cgiar.org)

Greater coordination and collaboration among actors – particularly across governance levels and sectors – is one of the main strategies proposed to support the achievement of climate goals regarding land and forest use. Such strategies have recently been referred to as landscape approaches, multistakeholder initiatives or jurisdictional approaches, but they emerge from a history of similar efforts at participatory processes, integrated conservation and development initiatives or co-management arrangements. To what extent have these past experiences informed current efforts at collaboration? How are new initiatives addressing power relations and inequity in order to assure legitimacy and accountability in processes and outcomes? This paper is based on the comparative analysis of 14 multistakeholder forums (MSFs) established to conserve forests and/or improve land use, primarily in subnational jurisdictions. We focus on four countries - Brazil, Peru, Indonesia and Ethiopia – and specifically on forums that bring together subnational (and sometimes national) government, NGOs, grassroots organizations and private sector stakeholders in a specific geographical location. Data were collected through 30 to 40 structured, in-depth interviews for each MSF, with organizers, participants and non-participants, as well as with key informants who have knowledge and firsthand experience on the context of forest management in each region. In four cases, focus groups were conducted with rural communities. This article analyzes approaches to addressing power differences and inequities across the MSFs and, specifically, the obstacles and opportunities for actors from marginalized groups (indigenous people, peasants, women) to voice their concerns and to influence the forums' agenda and outcomes.