



Forest Cover

Issue no.34, June 2010

About Forest Cover

Welcome to the thirty-fourth issue of Forest Cover, newsletter of the Global Forest Coalition (GFC). GFC is a world-wide coalition of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and Indigenous Peoples Organizations (IPOs). GFC promotes rights-based, socially just and effective forest policies at international and national level, including through building capacity of NGOs and IPOs in all regions to influence global forest policy.

Forest Cover is published four times a year. It features reports on important intergovernmental meetings by different NGOs and IPOs and a calendar of future meetings. The views expressed in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect the views of the Global Forest Coalition, its donors or the editors.

For free subscriptions, please contact Yolanda Sikking at:
Yolanda.sikking@globalforestcoalition.org

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

About Forest Cover

Ex Silvis: EU Targets and Subsidies for Bio-energy will not Work

Fiu Mata'ese Elisara, Chair of the Board of GFC

A Short Note from Cochabamba

Pat Mooney, ETC Group, Canada

UNPFII Considers Development, Culture and Identity

Marcial Arias, International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, Panama

Appropriate Forest Definition Needed for REDD and LULUCF

Alejandro Alemán Treminio, Humboldt Center, Nicaragua

Reports on other meetings

GB03: Eating Less Meat can Save Forests

U.S. Gulf Coast Faces New Disaster: Genetically Engineered Trees

Calendar of Forest-related meetings



The demand for wood is likely to escalate as 'second generation' agro-fuels become economically attractive



Ex Silvis: EU Targets and Subsidies for Bio-energy will not Work **Fiu Mata'ese Elisara, Chair of the Board of GFC**

As the incoming chair of GFC's Board, I welcome you all to this 34th edition of the Global Forest Coalition's Forest Cover newsletter. As GFC plans its bio-energy tour of EU countries in the last week of May and the first week of June, I want to say, right at the outset, that the EU's targets and subsidies for bio-energy, which promote the expansion of industrial wood-based bio-energy production, will not mitigate climate change. They even defy the logic of the EU's own findings: the EU recently admitted that agro-fuels might be as much as four times as damaging to the climate as conventional fuels, because of their indirect impacts. Yet this conclusion is still being ignored by EU policymakers.

GFC's tour will highlight this contradiction in all its discussions - with the EU and UK public, civil society, officials, government representatives, and parliamentarians. If the EU knows that its targets and subsidies won't work, why is it still pursuing them? Who stands to benefit?

The EU must change its policies. Promoting the production of bio-energy from wood ignores the fact that a rapid increase in demand for wood will unquestionably have immense negative impacts on the world's forests and forest peoples, as well as on Indigenous communities. Many of these communities are already suffering from the direct and indirect impacts of monoculture tree plantations spreading across their lands and territories, as bio-energy companies seek to produce energy for export to the North.

The use of trees previously grown to produce pulp and paper brings further problems. The displacement of North American paper production, for example, increases the likelihood of a massive expansion of pulp mills and plantations in Latin America, South-east and East Asia and southern Africa, as well as in Russia.


The demand for wood (and other forms of biomass) is also likely to escalate as 'second generation' agro-fuels become commercially viable and economically attractive. So far, these liquid agro-fuels have remained largely in the research and development phase, but biotech firms, pulp and paper companies, and oil firms have joined forces to invest billions of dollars into researching these unsustainable wood-based agro-fuels, and that includes research into genetically engineered trees. They clearly expect a handsome return at some point.

Genetically engineered (GE) trees pose another serious threat to forests, forest-dependent communities and the climate. It is impossible to predict the impacts of GE trees because un-expected mutations are more likely to occur in GE trees than in non-GE trees (this is true with all genetically engineered plants). Tree seeds can also travel great distances, and GE trees can easily establish themselves in native forests and/or cross-fertilize with native trees. Unstable low-lignin trees are being specifically engineered for cellulosic ethanol production (because the wood can be processed more easily if there is less lignin present). Fast-growing, cold-resistant trees are also being engineered to produce wood bio-energy for heat and electricity.

Critically, deadwood, branches, leaves and twigs and even tree stumps are increasingly defined as 'residues' to be used, even though they are essential for recycling nutrients and thus keeping forest soils fertile. They are also critical for biodiversity and carbon storage. A recently released study from the Finnish Environment Institute and others highlights the importance of taking soil carbon emissions into account, and the impact that removing wood residues from forests might have on such emissions. The study, which warns that carbon dioxide emissions from soils have been seriously underestimated, concludes, "that to maintain carbon storage, the accumulation of organic material in forests should increase. However, this is not compatible with current bio-energy goals for forests and with the increased intensive harvesting of biomass in forests."

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/print.asp?contentid=351875&lan=en&clan=en>

So far the European debate on biomass has focused largely on sustainability standards for biomass (although even these have been ruled out by the European Commission for the time being, at least as far as EU-wide standards are concerned). The question of whether a further massive increase in Europe's demand for wood can possibly be met sustainably, particularly through global markets, has been largely ignored in the policy debate. Yet no standard can prevent escalating wood prices driving plantation expansion and increased logging elsewhere in the world.





'Residues' are essential for recycling nutrients, for biodiversity and for carbon storage.

By driving up European demand and global prices for wood, industrial bio-energy is set to increase land grabbing and speculation, expand destructive logging, and speed up the conversion of biodiversity-rich native forests to monoculture tree plantations. Furthermore, replacing energy-dense fossil fuels with plant materials requires more land per unit of energy than almost any other type of energy. This will also ramp up the pressure on forests and other ecosystems, and on soils and freshwater.

As an Indigenous person from the South myself, I am concerned that the main victims are inevitably going to be Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent peoples in the South, especially women, who depend on access to forests for fuelwood and other small-scale bio-energy extraction for their families. This is not a solution that can work. Bio-energy based on wood cannot be the answer.

~~~~~

**A Short Note from Cochabamba**  
**Pat Mooney, ETC Group, Canada**

Last week the World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth drew to a raucous conclusion in the Cochabamba football stadium, as more than 35,000 people from over 140 countries cheered the adoption of their own strategic plan to address climate change around the world. Bolivia's Cochabamba gathering was neither Social Forum nor an inter-governmental meeting but a marvelous mix of the two - bringing together official government delegations from 42 countries with social movements and civil society organizations from many more. Most of the 35,000 registered participants made it to Cochabamba - despite the shutdown of most of the airline routes that would have connected European, African and Asian delegations to the Andean city in the heart of the Altiplana.

The Bolivian government announced its plan to hold the Peoples Summit in Cochabamba last December, following the Copenhagen debacle and the failure of governments to achieve any kind of meaningful consensus or plan of action. It is hard to believe that a mere four months later such an impressive and diverse gathering could take place. The decision to hold the meeting in Cochabamba was undoubtedly complicated by organizational problems -- but it was a wonderful decision. Ten years ago the citizens of Cochabamba took to the streets and peasants blockaded roads to prevent the privatization of Cochabamba's water supply. The long battle and final victory brought international recognition to the global issue of water privatization and contributed to strengthening the social movements that, arguably, began with the WTO protests in Seattle in 1999 and led to the creation of the World Social Forum in 2001.

The final ten-page summary of the conference's deliberations read out in the stadium could hardly be described as great prose and still needed some editing before being submitted as negotiating text to the UNFCCC. But there is no doubt that it was the consensus of three days of intense negotiations that brought together Indigenous Peoples, peasant organizations, trade unions, teachers, engineers, environmentalists and a vast array of civil society organizations, interested individuals and government delegates. People sat on the floor and crammed in the doorways of the 17 different working groups in a rarely seen democratic and international exchange on what needed to be done about climate change. Many UN agencies, including a representative of the Secretary-General, also attended.

In a closing dialogue session between governments and civil society representatives, President Evo Morales and his Venezuelan counterpart, Hugo Chavez, were enthusiastically joined by Ecuador's Foreign Minister and Cuba's Vice-President in calling for the report to be submitted to the UN. The conclusion of this historic meeting has now been submitted to the faltering climate change negotiations, providing a voice for those who felt silenced in Copenhagen - look for this document on the UNFCCC's website, and go to 'Bolivia':  
*FCCC/AWGLCA/2010/MISC.2.*



The four people representing the 17 working groups denounced the Copenhagen Accord as inadequate and illegitimate, condemning false solutions such as carbon trading, REDD, and geo-engineering, and called for the recognition of ancestral knowledge, loosening of patent regimes, sustainable agriculture, and the protection of human rights. There were calls for an environmental court of justice, a Charter on the Rights of Mother Earth, and a world-wide referendum on climate change. Stony-faced junior representatives from the United States, Canada, Australia, Mexico, France and the UK (and many others) remained silent at this precedent-setting dialogue of governments and civil society.

If the Cochabamba declaration lacks poetry, it doesn't lack rhetoric or substance. In comparison to the US-imposed "Copenhagen Accord", the Cochabamba document is elegant, erudite and explicit and has a real plan of action. Greenhouse gases, for example, must be cut back to no more than 300 parts per million and the industrialized countries climate debt must be paid in full. Carbon trading was flatly rejected. The assembly refused to accept Trojan horse technologies that -- while pretending to address climate change - are little more than untested experiments that use the global South as guinea pigs. The full text provides more details and examples, both of what should not be done and what could be done.

The summary report rejects "false solutions" to climate change such as nuclear power, agrofuels, transgenic crops and GM tree plantations, and geoengineering. Although most of the 35,000 delegates came to Cochabamba with little or no understanding of geoengineering, the launch of the H.O.M.E campaign -- "Hands off Mother Earth - Our Home is not a Laboratory" (see [www.handsoffmotherearth.org](http://www.handsoffmotherearth.org)) in the midst of the conference attracted a lot of interest in the many side events and debates that took place, in addition to being discussed by several of the working groups. The campaign's message was considerably aided and abetted by the presence of a handful of scientists and companies advocating geoengineering who had traveled to Cochabamba from Europe to host seminars. Their presence and participation solidified opposition to the idea of any techno-fix that would massively modify planetary systems on land, on oceans, or in the stratosphere.

Although participation in the conference was impassioned and debates intense, the hurriedly convened international meeting did have its problems. The government of Bolivia had only expected 10-13,000 delegates -- not 35,000. Cochabamba and the nearby town of Tiquipaya, were bursting at the seams, and there was considerable confusion about the time and place of side events and working groups. Many organizations were also concerned that government delegations -- including the Bolivian delegation -- would try to manipulate the outcomes.

The Bolivian government itself came under fire for preventing an alliance of national CSO's from incorporating their "working group 18" into the formal proceedings. In the end, working group 18 met just outside the gates of the University conference to discuss the Bolivian government's plans to encourage the mining of silver and lithium, and other industrial development related to fossil fuels. Despite differences, working group 18 attracted large audiences who crossed back and forth between formal and informal negotiations. All of this took place in an atmosphere of peace without any excessive security presence. The Bolivian army was there - but as often inside the workshops as at the gates of the conference checking ID badges!

There were also mixed feelings about a government proposal to create a new "Global Alliance" of governments and society to work together on climate change. At a banquet on Wednesday night, a Brazilian guest proposed that the Cochabamba Summit be reconvened every two years. Although there is genuine support for a global forum that can bring together government and civil society on an equal footing to discuss critical issues, social movements are firm that the nature and structure of these meetings requires careful consideration and can't be assumed automatically. Cochabamba was a remarkably successful first experience but the format could have failed - lessons need to be learned and studied before next steps are taken.

Perhaps more than anything else, the Cochabamba Summit succeeded in bringing together progressive government negotiators and activist social movements, all of whom are now committed to dialogue and cooperation during the months leading up to the Cancun UNFCCC Summit at the end of November. Society has become more militant and coherent and more governments are getting the message that the Copenhagen debacle must not be repeated.

For more information, please visit: <http://www.cmpcc.org.bo/>

~~~~~



UNPFII Considers Development, Culture and Identity ***Marcial Arias International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, Panama***

The ninth session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) took place at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, 19-30 April. Its central theme was Indigenous Peoples: development, culture and identity in relation to articles 3 and 32 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

These articles address Indigenous Peoples' right to self-determination with respect to political status, economic, social and cultural development, and the use of their lands and resources. When development is related to the free self-determination of Indigenous Peoples, there is no need for interpretations, definitions or doctrines. The concept is clear: we are talking about development based on a cosmivision, on sustainability, conservation, protection and harmony.

Article 32 is very specific. It says:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources.
2. States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources.
3. States shall provide effective mechanisms for just and fair redress for any such activities, and appropriate measures shall be taken to mitigate adverse environmental, economic, social, cultural or spiritual impacts."

Are governments and multinational companies really complying with this article? This is different from country to country and we can only base our opinions on our own experiences, the realities we face in our countries. But wherever Indigenous Peoples are being marginalized, exploited, or impoverished, then it is certainly the case that the United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Peoples Issues is *not* being fulfilled. There is something wrong, and that wrong must be righted. Moreover, this principle is related to other principles and articles in the Declaration, such as the principle of free, prior and informed consent, the principle of just and fair reparations and the principle of fair and equitable benefit sharing.

Not everything was bad however. Representatives of governments, Indigenous Peoples and civil society happily received New Zealand's announcement that the country would finally sign the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Moreover, New Zealand went beyond that by committing itself to implementing and putting into practice what has been agreed at the UN.

The ninth session of the PFII also addressed various public denouncements including the killings in Bagua, Peru, and discrimination and racism against Bolivian Guaranyes.

These situations have implications for the human rights of Indigenous Peoples. Above all it should be emphasized that even in this millennium, slavery still exists in some countries, not only in Bolivia but across the whole continent of Abya Yala.



Tapping or extracting of almaciga resin by indigenous tribesmen of the Sierra Madre mountains, Luzon Island, Philippines. Photo: Arsenio Ella.



On 24 April, also in New York, the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of Tropical Forests and the Global Forest Coalition organized a seminar called "Next Stop Cancun!" Its purpose was to strengthen Indigenous delegates' capacity to participate in the UNFCCC process. 30 Indigenous representatives participated, taking advantage of the opportunity to present their draft ideas about REDD++ and Indigenous Peoples and to make comments and questions (to find out what REDD++ is read this article: <http://chrislang.org/2009/12/14/redd-redd-redd-redd-and-bacon-sausage-and-spam/>). They agreed to send their comments via e-mail by the end of May at the latest.

The debate was chaired by Estebancio Castro, Executive Secretary of the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of Tropical Forests, with Marcial Arias moderating. Presentations were also made by Johnson Cerda from Conservation International, Hugo Lazaro from the Latin-American Indigenous Forum on Climate Change, and Florina Lopez from the Indigenous Women's Network on Biodiversity. All of them explained what their organizations were doing in the months preceding Cancun.

The panelists stressed that there is no participation of Indigenous Peoples in governmental development plans and programs and that ecosystem services will end up in the hands of private companies and governments.

They emphasized the need to:

- Maximize participation whilst ensuring equitable gender and geographical representation.
- Organize preparatory meetings in all regions where there are Indigenous Peoples.
- Collect Indigenous Peoples' experiences of and perspectives on Monitoring, Reporting and Verifying (MRV) forest-related processes, and traditional knowledge.
- Define a consensus proposal on REDD+.
- Ensure that all those involved fully understand the concepts of access to, control of and benefits from resources.
- Develop their own collaborative strategy up to and beyond Cancun, rather than following in a path dictated by governments.

It is important to also note the following: the next session from 2011 to 2013 will be in the hands of the new members of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. However, it is important that there is an in-depth evaluation of the participation of Indigenous delegations, to ensure that Indigenous peoples' representatives are able to engage on an equal footing with governments, UN specialized bodies and NGOs.

For more information please check: http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/session_ninth.html

~~~~~

### **Appropriate Forest Definition Needed for REDD and LULUCF** **Alejandro Alemán Treminio, Alexander von Humboldt Center, Nicaragua**

The first session of the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2010 was held 9-11 April in Bonn. The meetings' shared objective was to address organizational aspects of the negotiations, including the number of meetings, their dates, and a methodology conducive to building consensus.

The session was also useful for gauging current relationships between parties after the chaotic negotiations in Copenhagen. The decisions adopted by the *ad hoc* working groups (AWG-LCA on Long Term Cooperative Action, and AWG-KP on the Kyoto Protocol) were discussed paragraph by paragraph during the closing plenary sessions. On the basis of these results, one could say that the negotiating 'climate' seems to be considerably better than the one that prevailed at the end of COP15.

In Bonn the main topic on the table was the legal status of the US-driven 'Copenhagen Accord,' in relation to negotiations taking place between now and COP16. However, there were also discussions and decisions about a new roadmap, to cover that same period of time. This adds in two extra meetings of the *ad hoc* subsidiary bodies, which will have to take place between the inter-sessional meeting in May/June (which was already included in the negotiating agenda), and COP16, which is scheduled for November/December 2010, in Mexico.



These extra meetings will supposedly provide enough time for negotiations to be completed. Additionally, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) is due to be in session during the May/June meeting in Bonn, and during COP16 in November/December.

For those who have been following the negotiations on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD), both the May/June and November/December sessions should be especially relevant. One of the most important subjects on SBSTA's current agenda regarding REDD and Land Use, Land Use Change and Forests (LULUCF), is that the latter must provide the *ad hoc* subsidiary bodies with the technical elements they



Chunga tree, Panama.  
Photo: Marcial Arias

require to establish an adequate forest definition for developed and developing countries. The current definition, used under the Kyoto Protocol, does not differentiate between monoculture tree plantations and highly biodiverse natural forests. The continued use of such a definition generates unwanted results when it comes to conserving the carbon sequestered in natural forests, which is much greater than that stored in tree plantations. It also affects the conservation of biodiversity, which provides ecosystem services and underpins the livelihoods of forest-dependant local communities and Indigenous Peoples.

During the June-December period, negotiations to achieve an agreement on REDD can be expected to recover their normal dynamism. This momentum should be used to promote the adoption of a forest definition appropriate for both LULUCF and REDD. An appropriate definition should allow for the identification of degradation processes in natural forests. It should also guide the implementation of REDD safeguard clauses, especially those aimed at avoiding the conversion of forests into plantations.

For more information, please visit:

[http://unfccc.int/meetings/intersessional/bonn\\_10/items/5533.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/intersessional/bonn_10/items/5533.php)

## Reports on other meetings:

### GBO3: Eating Less Meat can Save Forests

The third Global Biodiversity Outlook 3 (GBO3), which was launched on 10 May 2010, includes sad news, although we already knew and were prepared for much of it: governments have failed to meet the 2010 target they set themselves for significantly reducing biodiversity loss, and this is likely to have dramatic consequences for humankind. Even more dispiriting is the fact that the report confirms that pressures on biodiversity are currently intensifying.

Looking at the detail, some meaningful trends can be detected. For example, protected areas have been expanded, the amount of Forest Stewardship Council certified forest has increased, and official development assistance for biodiversity has gone up, but this has not led to progress on biodiversity conservation in general: all other indicators relating to the status of biodiversity score negatively, with biomes still declining and the number of threatened species rising. The population of wild vertebrate species in the tropics, for example, declined by a shocking 59% between 1970 and 2006.

Deforestation, which continued at an average rate of 130,000 km<sup>2</sup> per year between 2000 and 2010, is a major factor in biodiversity loss. Other direct causes include the loss of other ecosystems, forest degradation, climate change, pollution, and the spread of invasive alien species like Eucalypt, a plant which is being manipulated genetically so that it can be grown in areas it is even more alien to (see next article).

Of these, land-use change and climate change are the main threats to terrestrial ecosystems such as forests. Perverse incentives driving land-use change are identified as a major factor in biodiversity destruction: subsidies and other measures to promote bio-energy, for example, provide perverse incentives to replace biodiverse ecosystems with oilpalm and other monoculture tree plantations. As GBO3 notes, tree plantations "often have low biodiversity value and may only include a single tree species." As the report observes this also means that, "a slowing of net forest loss does not necessarily imply a slowing in the loss of global forest biodiversity."



A further underlying cause contributing to this global disaster is decision-makers' refusal to acknowledge the tremendous socio-economic value that biodiversity has, especially when it comes to supporting the livelihoods of local communities and Indigenous Peoples. As a result, financial investments are seldom beneficial for biodiversity. As GB03 observes: "International and national rules and frameworks for markets and economic activities can and must be adjusted and developed in such a way that they contribute to safeguarding and sustainably using biodiversity, instead of threatening it as they have often done in the past.

Without drastic change of some kind, the future is certainly looking bleak for biodiversity, but there is at least some good news. Some governments have also shown that, with the right amount of political will and resources, successful measures can be taken to curb deforestation and other causes of biodiversity loss. Suggestions for further action include "moderating excessive and wasteful meat consumption" and re-wilding landscapes using abandoned farmland (which would require a significant reduction in the use of farmland for bio-energy production).

Moreover, the GBO3 concludes that, "Indigenous and local communities play a significant role in conserving very substantial areas of high biodiversity and cultural value." It points out that there are thousands of Community Conserved Areas in the world, which cover an estimated four to eight million square kilometers, including 22% of all of the world's forests. Appropriate measures to support communities in their efforts to conserve and restore these forests and other ecosystems can play a very positive role in sustaining both biodiversity and human livelihoods. GBO3 therefore recommends "empowering indigenous peoples and local communities to take responsibility for biodiversity management and decision-making."

*Global Biodiversity Outlook 3 is here: <http://gbo3.cbd.int/>  
GBO3's proposals for a way forward are here: <http://gbo3.cbd.int/the-outlook/gbo3/towards-a-strategy-for-reducing-biodiversity-loss.aspx>*

### **U.S. Gulf Coast Faces New Disaster: Genetically Engineered Trees**

On 12 May, the United States Department of Agriculture approved a request by ArborGen, a multinational transgenic trees company, to plant 260,000 cold-tolerant genetically engineered eucalyptus trees across seven states along the US Gulf Coast. These 260,000 trees are to be planted in 28 so-called 'field trials,' and their purpose is to test the GE eucalyptus trees in a variety of environments. This will include allowing them to flower, in order to test their 'altered fertility' trait. The next step will be commercial plantations of GE eucalyptus over millions of acres of land in the South.

ArborGen is a joint initiative of International Paper, MeadWestvaco and Rubicon (and originally Monsanto). Their CEO, Barbara Wells, previously worked for 18 years for Monsanto, where she co-managed Monsanto Brazil and led the Roundup Ready soybean team. The introduction of GE soya in Brazil has led to the destruction of vast swathes of the Amazon forest and the poisoning of numerous peasant communities.

The danger of GE cold-tolerant eucalyptus is not limited to the US, however. ArborGen also has offices in Brazil, New Zealand and Australia. The GE eucalyptus being planted in the US originated in Brazil, was genetically modified in New Zealand and is being mass-produced and tested in the US. If perfected in their US field trials, ArborGen intends to export their GE eucalyptus 'product' for use in plantations around the world. The cold tolerance trait will enable the eucalyptus to survive temperatures down to -6oC. This will greatly expand the range where eucalyptus plantations can be developed and spread the disaster of eucalyptus plantations to new ecosystems and communities.

Eucalyptus plantations are notoriously destructive - causing deadly wildfires, depleting fresh water, and escaping into



*GE trees grow in Greenhouse in Mexico. Photo: Langelle/GJEP*





native ecosystems, where they displace biodiversity and wildlife. Around the world, GE eucalyptus plantations would replace thousands of acres of precious native forests, due to the increased financial incentive to replace slow-growing native forest stands with monoculture plantations of GE eucalyptus which can mature in as few as three to five years.

GE Eucalyptus trees are just the beginning. If allowed to mass-plant GE eucalyptus, industry will soon be ready to deploy GE versions of native trees like poplar and pine which would inevitably and irreversibly contaminate native forests.

*Please join the campaign to stop this unprecedented threat to native forests, biodiversity and forests dependent communities. Go to: <http://www.nogetrees.org>*

## Calendar of Forest-Related Meetings

*More information on these and other intergovernmental meetings can be found at: [www.iisd.ca/linkages](http://www.iisd.ca/linkages)*

The 32nd session of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies will be held 31 May to 11 June 2010. The venue is likely to be Bonn, Germany.

*For more information visit: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010)*

At least two negotiation sessions of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Kyoto Protocol and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action of the Framework Convention on Climate Change will be organized between June and December 2010. Time and venue will be announced shortly.

*For more information visit: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010)*

The 23rd IUFRO World Congress 'Forests for the Future: Sustaining Society and the Environment' will take place in Seoul, Republic of Korea, 23 to 28 August 2010.

*For more information visit: <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Events/CIFOR/iufro-congress.htm>*

The 20th session of the FAO Committee on Forestry is expected to be convened at FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy in October 2010.

*For more information visit: <http://www.fao.org/forestry>*

The 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity will take place 18 to 29 October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan.

*For more information visit: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/>*

The 46th meeting of the International Tropical Timber Council (ITTC-46) is scheduled to take place in Yokohama, Japan, from 13 to 18 December 2010.

*For more information visit: <http://www.itto.or.jp>*

The 16<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and Sixth Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol will take place from 29 November to 10 December 2010 in Cancun, México.

*For more information visit: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2010)*

The 9<sup>th</sup> session of the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF 9) will be held 24 January to 4 February 2011 in New York, US. *For more information visit: <http://www.un.org/esa/forests>*

### Editorial Team:

- Yolanda Sikking, the Netherlands
- Simone Lovera, Paraguay
- Ronnie Hall, UK
- Sandy Gauntlett, Aotearoa/New Zealand
- Swati Shresth, India
- Wally Menne, South Africa

***This publication was made possible through a financial contribution from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.***