Introduction

There has been much discussion about the possibilities of corruption in REDD+ and similar schemes. The idea of paying people not to cut down trees is simple to explain, but it also seems simple to cheat. The international rules are still unclear and - being international - will hard to to enforce. Once in place, the complexity of REDD+ regulations will create its own opportunities for corruption. Markets in credits provide opportunities for speculation by ‘carbon cowboys’. The huge flows of money envisaged are attractive to criminals. In any case, forestry has a poor track record for illegality, including corruption. Some of the countries signing up for REDD have poor reputations for corruption in government.

This paper tries to disentangle the relationship between corruption (and anti corruption) and deforestation (and REDD+). It uses a framework summarising types of diagnoses and cures for corruption and applies it to REDD+. ¹ For the latter I have relied on a close reading of CIFOR’s REDD+ (Angelsen 2009). That has a chapter on Corruption (to which I contributed) and corruption is referred to about 30 times in other chapters. It crops up most densely in the chapter in which Vatn and Angelsen provide an evaluation of options for REDD+ funding architecture. They see corruption as an ‘opportunity’ in Project funding, rising to a ‘challenge’ in separate REDD funding, and a ‘serious challenge’ in the two ‘state’ options (Angelsen 2009: 65). Corruption is also salient in the book’s conclusions, where it is referred to five times. While the book deals with Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) of carbon stocks, Seymour and Angelsen urge MRV for the money as well.

¹ I am grateful to my Independent Commission Against Corruption counterparts (Robert Waldersee, Michael Nest and Alexandra Mills) for the development of the framework (but they are not responsible for the use to which I am putting it) and to CIFOR for inviting me along to this IACC meeting. The paper is produced as part of an Australia Research Council project with Luca Tacconi, Frank Jotzo, Emma Aisbett and two PhD students: Fiona Downs and Patrick Doupe.
First, to set the scene, there seem to several similarities between the literature on anti-corruption and the chapters on REDD+.

The Two Worlds of Anti-Corruption and REDD+

First, solutions often seem to lie outside the scope of the immediate manifestation of problems: deforestation and corruption. Thus Angelsen concludes ‘broad societal policies and non-forestry policies play a critical role’ in deforestation (2009: 137). These might include agriculture or tax policy. Similarly Daniel Kauffman (2005) has argued ‘you don’t fight corruption by fighting corruption’. Huther and Shah (2000) have argued that specialize anti-corruption agencies wont function with already weak governance. Even more broadly, just as there is a ‘forestry transition’ there may be a ‘corruption transition’ (Grundlach and Paldam 2008). As countries become richer they become less corrupt: and the causal flow is from income to corruption rather than the other way round. While we can’t afford to just let it, happen policy and institutional design should at least go with the grain of these broader social forces.

Second, both sit awkwardly between developing and developed countries. The awkwardness is because emissions created in the industrialized world are going to be compensated for by reductions in deforestation in the developing world. And much - but not all - corruption in the developing world has been funded by companies from rich countries, or countries rapidly becoming rich. The REDD literature distinguishes Annex I and Annex II countries, and traditional development agencies play a leading role. However Transparency International (TI), the leading anti-corruption NGO initially took the opposite tack from REDD+ proponents. TI’s influential Corruption Perceptions Index, for example, puts rich and poor countries ‘on the same page’. But TI’s donor funding, and local activism tends to be stronger in developing countries like Bangla Desh.

Third, both face problems of translation between levels of government: international, national and domestic. In REDD it is translation from international agreements to action at national and local levels. Corruption control, by contrast has traditionally been a national concern, albeit imperfectly carried out by the police and courts (with some international cooperation through Interpol). TI initially planned to operate only at the international level, dealing with corruption in international business (De Sousa, Larmour and Hindess 2009). It has been particularly successful in getting international financial institutions like the World Bank to take corruption seriously. But it was quickly persuaded it would lack credibility unless it created national ‘chapters’ (which in turn typically generate local projects).

This translation matters because these three levels are different moral and legal orders, as well as political ones. It’s familiar that international action is frustrated by national claims to sovereignty. We aren’t surprised if nation states follow their own perceived interests, and bend international rules to their own interests (eg in securing offsets). And international law has limited capacity to bring, say, REDD+ defaulters to court. Enforcement is more available at the national level, though its extension to forest
frontiers may be weaker or more arbitrary (or farmed out to timber companies with their own private security guards)

The prevailing ethics of each level seem different too – and the difference matters for moral judgments, like ‘corruption’, rather than the more technical judgments involved in REDD. Focus group research in PNG, for example, finds local people forgiving of corruption by their peers (seen as ‘doing it tough’ in difficult conditions), while at the same time deeply suspicious of elite misbehaviour (TI PNG). National governments tend to value equal treatment of citizens, but traditional landowners involved in tenure ‘clarification’ may be unsympathetic to the interests of internal migrants. The REDD+ book talks in terms of the 3 Es (Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Equity), and it may be (as an empirical matter) that there is a difference in the relative weight given to these values between different REDD+ actors, and at different levels of government.

Fourth, both literatures have a practical intent. They are not just interested in the phenomena (deforestation and corruption), but they want to do something about it (REDD+ and Anti-Corruption). In the Corruption world Robert Klitgaard’s 1988 book and TI’s activism stood against the fatalism of earlier arguments that nothing much could be done about the problem. Similarly the editors of the REDD+ volume nudge their contributors towards practical implications and non-pessimistic conclusions. Neither literature sees a tension between theory and practice. ‘Corruption’ is also paired with ‘Anti-corruption’ in the Masters course we teach, often using the metaphor of disease and cure. If the cure is to succeed it must be based on a good diagnosis, empirically tested. But (we argue) there is no simple flow from theory to practice. Some existing cures may also work against the new disease (eg for REDD+, it might be Conservation Trusts). Cures may be embraced without much evidence they do any good. And the history of medicine suggests some popular cures may do more harm than good

Definitions and Types

Whereas the authors of the REDD+ book are inventing new concepts (and acronyms) the writers on ‘corruption’ are dealing with a long standing phenomenon about which there are many different academic and popular views. The cost, of course, is that the REDD debate is hard for outsiders to follow, and its principles hard to communicate to those who supposed to implement it. ‘Corruption’ – in English at least – is an ancient word, often bandied about and saturated with moralism. The cost of its familiarity is loss of

Appeals to these ethical principles may also become highly politicised and opportunistic. For example, ‘compensation’ is an important equity principle in REDD (owners being compensated for lost opportunities) and (for example) in PNG it is highly valued principle of conflict resolution. However there is also a history of inflated compensation claims and more recent examples of corrupt government layers getting a slice of claims they settle out of court.
precision, and more moralism than may be warranted. For example it is relatively easier to mobilize the population of a developing country against ‘corruption’ than it is to mobilize them against ‘deforestation’. Everyone is against corruption, though when you look more closely they may have different things in mind. Fewer see the point of avoiding deforestation.

Activists often get impatient with arguments about definition (preferring to get on with fighting the problem). Government officials typically have to run with the definitions available in the national law. The definition of corruption as ‘use of public office for private gain’ has become the international standard. It reflects long standing suspicions of government (for example as expressed in Angelsen’s evaluation of the risk in various REDD+ architectures, above). But it only takes us so far. Its focus on public office misses corruption within the private sector or NGOs (both important actors in REDD+). It also misses corruption that doesn’t involve personal enrichment – for example corruption on behalf of family, clan, region or political party (or, perhaps, nation in the international arena where global standards are set). Some of this is called ‘noble cause’ corruption.

Much of the literature on REDD draws on ideas from institutional economics, and the pioneer of modern anti-corruption thinking, Robert Klitgaard (1988), is an economist who drew on theories of principals and agents to conceptualise corruption, and in support of his influential formula:

\[
\text{Corruption} = \text{Monopoly} + \text{Discretion} - \text{Accountability}
\]

The World Bank for example has used Klitgaard formula to identify sector by sector risks of corruption, including in forestry. The idea of a monopoly can apply to the state – with Webers’s monopoly of the legitimate use of violence – as well as to the natural monopolies who could traditionally gouge customers who had nowhere else to go.  

A principal-agent definition of corruption – ‘the unauthorized receipt of benefits’- is used by Hong Kong’s Independent Commission Against Corruption (whose structure has become a model for other countries). That ‘receipt’ could as easily take place in a private company, or between private companies – where a private supplier bribes the person responsible for purchasing decisions. With this definition Hong Kong’s jurisdiction extends over public and private sectors, and most of its recent business comes from the latter. The UK also recently attempted, but failed, to reform its anti corruption legislation in principal-agent terms

A third type of definition, proposed by Mark Warren (2004) a political scientist, looks particularly relevant to the processes of national and local policy making advocated by proponents of REDD+. Warren argues that the public/private preoccupation is out of date. It fitted eighteenth century concerns to protect individual liberties against absolute

---

3 think for example of the bribes that you had to pay to get the national phone company to install a new line. You don’t have to bribe anyone to buy a mobile phone (though you may have to do so to get a license)
states. But it has nothing particular to say about democracy, and the fact that there are other sources of power in complex modern societies: big corporations and the media, for example.

He argues that an overarching meta-norm of democracy is inclusion of those affected by decisions, and he proposes a new definition of corruption as ‘duplicitous exclusion’. For example a job that is supposed to be open to everyone is in fact given to the person that bribes the selectors; or a tender open to all is settled among friends. Warren’s definition points to the moral quality of hypocrisy that we find offensive in corruption: officials espouse one (inclusive) value, but practice the other (exclusive). This definition would cover weak or incomplete local consultation processes over REDD+ schemes, as well as such high level exclusions as the choice of companies to carrying out verification under a CDM mechanism.

Types of Corruption

The standard distinction made is between petty and grand corruption. The former is small payments made in exchange for services that should have been provided for free. It is often visible and socially accepted (because of low salaries) even if formally illegal. The second is the more secretive, illegal, grand corruption of minister and senior officials, accepting bribes for bending the rules towards the giver. The World Bank and its work on oil revenues have popularized a third term ‘policy corruption’ whereby leaders change the law to suit their own business interests. It is, by definition, not illegal.

Each type is likely to be present in the world of REDD+, and each requires a different kind of treatment. Small, socially accepted payments may be rife on the forestry frontier, where poorly paid inspectors may rely on the cooperation of people they are supposed to regulate. Grand corruption is more likely over the award of timber concessions (or agriculture concessions which have an indirect effect on the profitability of deforestation). Policy corruption comes in the design of REDD+ schemes, or broader land use schemes so that they can be tailored to ministers’ personal or political interests (Tacconi, Downs and Larmour in Angelsen ed 2009). In his study of institutional breakdown in timber booms Ross (2001) makes a similar distinction between rent seeking (grand corruption, breaking the law) and rent seizing (policy corruption, changing the law; for example the law protecting forests). The personal interest there may be financial (ministers own timber companies, especially in PNG) or political. There have been votes in making more land available to farmers.

While government agencies, private firms and the links between them, are the traditional focus of anti corruption, the institutional world of REDD is more ethically complicated. It includes NGOs, professional law and accounting firms, universities and think tanks. They may be complacent about corruption risks among themselves, in for example recruitment, consultancy and publication. Conflicts of interest are rife (Shapiro 2010). Loosely defined professional norms may be inadequate to the risks posed by REDD+.
Frameworks

The dominant international framework for thinking about both corruption and deforestation has been broadly institutionalist. It emphasises the choices individuals make within long established ‘rules of the game’. The recommendations tend to be structural. TI deliberately took a structural approach out of prudence: pursuing corruption individuals might put its members at risk from retribution. There is nothing wrong with this approach, but in a course we teach we have tried to broaden it with greater emphasis (on the one hand) with individual psychology, and with broader political and political-economic concerns (on the other). The structural solutions derived from institutional economics sit between these, along with others from management studies.

Here I want to use that framework heuristically. Table 1 outlines the framework, in terms of diagnoses and cures in general. Table 2 speculates about the risks that might be involved in REDD+ (the diagnoses) and suggests some possible remedies (the cures). These risks may lie in the agencies administering REDD+, including international organisations, the private sector and NGOS. They may also involve the promoters of projects, private loggers, or the owners of land brought under REDD+. I have tried to focus on risks that are REDD specific, and susceptible to treatment. However, as we have seen, effective cures may be much broader in scope: for example (in PES) involving corruption in government payment systems, or (in REDD+) corruption in agricultural land use.

Each table identifies three types of theory about corruption: behavioral (or individual); structural (or organisational); and political (including political economy). The oldest argument about corruption, going back to ancient China, is whether it is caused by ‘bad systems’ or ‘bad people’ (Alatas 1960). There is also a long standing sense that politics is - perhaps necessarily - corrupt, and relationships between government and business are particularly risky in a mixed economy.

There are subtypes of each general theory. For example, economic theories tend to assume that individual choices are rational. So does a strand of criminology. But individuals are also concerned with equity and fairness, and some research (Uslaner 2008) suggests that perceptions of corruption may increase with inequality.

The most influential structural theories of corruption target monopolies, private as well as public. We have described Klitgaard’s 1988 formula above. Hirschmann (1970) also distinguished between voice and exit as consumer responses to poor service from state monopolies.

A confused internal structure, with unclear or overlapping lines of accountability provides opportunities for corruption, particularly among so-called ‘resident experts’ who know their way around. And viewing work as a process rather than hierarchy identifies points at which conflicts of interest may occur. These points differ between sectors. The
US Sarbanes Oxley accounting standards require firms to conduct their own distinctive internal fraud risk assessments.

Political theories tend to identify power as the villain, and the classic constitutional answer - embodied in the US constitution - is the idea of checks and balances so that ‘the system is better than the individuals in it’ (Euben). Of course as Warren (2004) pointed out there are more sources of power than the government. Constitutional checks and balances may be particularly weak in NGOs and international organisations, where a sense of mission, or of powerlessness or of professionalism may make members complacent about (for example) conflicts of interest, recruitment or payment practices.

Table 2 tries to apply these general principles to REDD+. REDD+ policies should be subject to the at least same audit and appeal processes as other government policies, for example). REDD + policies may be particularly risky, for example, because they take place in remote areas, or involving particularly corrupt agencies (eg forestry) , or because - in the case of PES - they will involve cash payment.
Table 1 Corruption Diagnoses and Cures In General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory about Corruption</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Cure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>corruption is a calculated choice</td>
<td>Raise perceived chances of detection; reduce perceived costs of compliance; appeal to altruistic motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>corruption is justified by perceived unfairness in work or society</td>
<td>reduce - or better justify - perceived inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>corruption is the way we do things here: everyone does it</td>
<td>improve induction, role modeling, staff turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm structure</td>
<td>corruption = monopoly + discretion - accountability</td>
<td>increase competition; reduce discretion; overlapping jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal organization</td>
<td>confusion and overlap create opportunities for corruption by long serving ‘resident experts’</td>
<td>simplify; reduce conflicts of interest; separate monitoring from approval and payment; rotate staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Process</td>
<td>opportunities for corruption occur at different points in process;</td>
<td>sector-by-sector analysis; identify choke points; Sarbanes-Oxley accounting standards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional</td>
<td>corruption is abuse of power</td>
<td>checks and balances, independent offices, inspect the inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>corruption is duplicitous exclusion</td>
<td>open processes, opportunities for appeal, transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Business relations</td>
<td>governments must anticipate and respond to business needs in mixed economies</td>
<td>regulate but dont ban lobbying, post separation employment; formalise interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Corruption Diagnoses and Cures Applied to REDD+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory about Corruption</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Cure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>Actors will calculate chances of shirking or gaming or cheating REDD regulations</td>
<td>Raise perceived chances of detection and prosecution; highly visible inspection; reduce costs of compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Perceived unfairness (e.g. between rich and poor) will create excuses for corruption</td>
<td>Take on ‘big fish’; focus initial efforts on relatively equal societies/regions; reduce wage differentials between international and national organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Organisations involved in REDD have long established systems of corruption enforced on new recruits. Payoffs to regulators are endemic in forestry</td>
<td>Use new rather than historically corrupt agencies (e.g. forestry depts?); improve HR practices like induction; community sanctions in local projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm structure</td>
<td>government monopolies over approval of schemes, and PES</td>
<td>Prefer market to fund based approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal organization</td>
<td>complex rules create opportunities for REDD insiders, remote locations make supervision difficult</td>
<td>Rotate staff, insist leave taken, boost morale/espíritu de corps among field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Process</td>
<td>risks in translation between levels of government Cash payments in PES</td>
<td>MRV for money; non-cash payments? Use of existing welfare fraud controls?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Constitutional | REDD and donor structures escape national and local checks | Link REDD to existing system
More checks and balances on international actors, and locally powerful NGOs
REDD Inspectorate - and whistle-blowing protection. Inspect Inspectors |
| Democratic | Favoritism and bribery in spite of open advertisement for jobs and contracts in REDD | Formalise and supervise
Provide for appeals |
| Government/Business relations | governments tend to favour logging companies who provide jobs and tax revenue | design REDD to include loggers, provide REDD related local employment; show revenue benefits to governments |

Table 2 suggests particular behavioural, structural and political cures. Inspection and verification regimes, for money as well as carbon, need to be highly visible if they are going to deter rational choices to act corruptly. Schemes may do better in countries or regions that are relatively more equal. Low salaries are often cited as an excuse for petty corruption, but salary differentials may matter too (including, in a donor driven world, differentials between international and local pay scales). To the extent that behaviour is driven by a desire for social acceptance, REDD’s proponents should try to avoid agencies which have a reputation for corruption (perhaps forestry departments) and try to implement REDD + through new agencies, or those (perhaps Ministries of Finance) with cleaner reputations. In any case they should pay attention to how new recruits are inducted into REDD+ agencies, and their informal organisational cultures.

In structural terms, the arguments about the risk of monopolies support market - rather than fun -based approaches to PES. It may also be possible to break down spatial monopolies created during decentralisation (which may concentrate PES project approval, verification and payments in a few hands) by overlapping jurisdictions: if one local agency is corrupt, citizens would have the right to approach a competitor. The risk of long established staff capitalising on their inside knowledge of confused administrative systems can be reduced by rotating staff, and insisting that they take leave due to them (so that their replacements can see what they have been up to). Part of the US Forest service’s response to nineteenth century corruption scandals was to create a sense of *esprit de corps* among filed officers (Kaufman 1960). Otherwise they were vulnerable to pressure from local interests, compounded by field officers’ endemic feelings of estrangement from head office.
The political theories suggest integration with existing systems of checks and balances (where they exist, for example in the judiciary, or ombudsman system), and the creation of systems of checks and balances in international organisations and NGOs dealing with REDD+. The guards need guarding too (as in the Inspector position recently created to oversee the New South Wales ICAC).

The theories from political economy are more controversial and counterintuitive, but derive from the insight that - in a mixed economy - the private sector carries out what in some ways are ‘public’ functions: providing jobs, and producing taxable revenue. In a socialist economy these tasks were carried out by public enterprises. A capitalist economy cedes initiative to the private sector and politicians who want to get elected on the strength of jobs and public services must anticipate private sector needs. They need to know what these needs are. Hence the political-economic value of lobbying, revolving doors and even campaign contributions, even though they have overtones of corruption.

Conclusions

These three approaches are predictive: they point to where corruption might take place, not whether it will in fact take place. Many are derived from rational choice principles. They don’t say much about why people don’t take advantage of opportunities to be corrupt. Others are a kind of management common sense (or ‘bureaucratic hygiene’ as Klitgaard, in another context (1997), put it).

They need to be tested, and supplemented with empirical studies of where corruption has in fact taken place. This is difficult, as corruption often takes place in secret, and research must be indirect. Scandals that have led to investigations provide one window.

There is no comprehensive systematic study of ‘what works’ in dealing with corruption - and it is likely to depend on context. Alan Doig’s research on anti-corruption agencies has cast doubt on their relevance in Africa (1995). Spector, Johnson and Dinino (2005) have made a start with evaluating donor sponsored schemes, finding surprisingly high rates of success. And REDD+ hasn’t happened yet, though there are numerous pilot projects, and long standing related schemes, like CDM or Conservation trusts. As the impact of corruption may be indirect, its also important to investigate corruption (and its absence) in non-conservation policy areas that will impact on REDD+, or provide channels for PES. For example there may be welfare or veterans payments systems that provide models for fraud control in PES payments.

Empirically, there is much to be learned from earlier similar schemes: corruption in Protected Areas, or conservation funds. There is evidence of corruption risks in the
Clean Development Mechanism where, for example, firms involved in verification have been suspended (Shapiro 2010). Ross (2001) analysed the political processes underlying the swathe of deforestation in SE Asia, running from Philippines through Malaysia and Indonesia to PNG and Solomon Islands. Longer ago, Kaufman’s classic of the study administration - *The Forest Ranger* (1962) - described how the US Forest Service centralized itself, and created all sorts of internal controls in reaction to corruption scandals in the late nineteenth century.

Following the money - the title of this panel - the biggest risks look to be in the area of the funds envisaged to handle the transfers, and in PES - only a form of REDD - which envisages a myriad cash payments.

Among the funds, surpluses may be siphoned off in legal but extravagant salaries allowances car loans, cheap mortgages and so for employees, board members and their cronies: something like this has crippled Provident Funds in the Pacific Islands.

In PES itself there may be conflicts of interest if a single official is involved in approval, verification and payment for the environmental services provided. It is easy to imagine corrupt complicity between the promoters of a scheme and the officials approving, verifying and paying for it: ghost schemes, for example. The intangibility of the service compounds the difficulty, as does the remoteness of the locations in which projects may take place, making them hard to inspect. Remedies rehearsed in the REDD+ book include community monitoring (Chapter 8) including paying people for the act of measurement itself rather than hard-to-measure reductions in emissions. More generally, it may be possible to pay families or communities in kind, rather than cash (ensuring such payments are additional to, rather than substitutes for, government services they should be entitled to anyway, but probably don’t actually get).

At this stage, with rules still emerging the greatest opportunities for corruption may be in the design of REDD+ schemes, which may be tilted towards leaders’ personal, business or political interests. We aren’t surprised where negotiating parties ensure their own country’s peculiar interests are taken account in drawing up the rules. It has a hypocritical or ‘duplicitous’ character when these exemptions, offsets, interpretations and so on are buried in the small print. At this stage, however, there are opportunities for the proponents of REDD to clean up their own acts, and act as examples. The standard definition of corruption as ‘the use of public office for private gain’ points attention to corruption in government. However the world of international organisations, think tanks and NGOs is also vulnerable to the other kinds of corruption, whether defined in terms of ‘unauthorised receipt of benefits’ or ‘duplicitous exclusion’
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