



## A Global Forest Coalition Newsletter on International Forest Policy

### CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

#### About Forest Cover

##### **Ex Silvis: the Road to Copenhagen is Blocked by Boulders**

*Miguel Lovera, chairperson, Global Forest Coalition*

##### **To Reach a Climate Agreement in the Near Future, Countries Must Look Into the Past**

*Janet Redman, Co-Director of the Sustainable Energy and Economy Network, at the Institute for Policy Studies*

##### **Climate Change Negotiations: Indigenous Rights Remain in Limbo**

*Onel Masardule, Executive Director, Fundaci3n para la Promoci3n del Conocimiento Indigena (FPCI), Panama*

##### **Forest Investment Program Meets for Second Design Meeting**

*Sena Alouka, Executive Director, Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement, Togo*

##### **UNFF: a Never-Ending Marathon?**

*Swati Shresth, Focal point South and East Asia, India*

##### **International Campaign Against GE Trees Heats Up**

*Anne Petermann, Global Justice Ecology Project Co-Director and North American Global Forest Coalition Focal Point, USA*

##### **The Forests Dialogue: on Investing in Locally Controlled Forests**

*Hubertus Samangun, GFC IPO Focal Point, ICTI Tanimbar, Indonesia*

#### Reports on other meetings:

##### **CSD: If You Do What You Did, You Get What You Got**

##### **Eighth session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues**

#### Calendar of Forest-Related Meetings



# Forest Cover

Issue no. 30, July 2009



## About Forest Cover

Welcome to the thirtieth issue of Forest Cover, the newsletter of the Global Forest Coalition (GFC), 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 the international and national level, including through building the capacity of NGOs and IPOs 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](mailto:Yolanda.sikking@globalforestcoalition.org)

## Ex Silvis: the Road to Copenhagen is Blocked by Boulders

**Miguel Lovera, chairperson, Global Forest Coalition**

On the road to intergovernmental agreement on climate change, one encounters many obstacles but few levers. And these obstacles, which are as big as boulders, are spread right across the road, making it impassable. The biggest boulder, the one that puts paid to any possibility of moving ahead in a straight line, is developed countries' apparent inability to address their historical responsibility for creating the problem in the first place.

They protest that they were ignorant of the eventual consequences of their industrial development. This may be true with respect to precise scientific understanding of the physical impacts of fossil fuel combustion. But it cannot have been that difficult to appreciate the eventual outcome of the inequitable and acquisitive greed underlying colonialism. The only honest response to such an imbalance between strong and weak, and rich and poor, would have been to stop the colonization process in its tracks, to cease exploiting other peoples' lands, and to stop attacking vulnerable nations, populations and individuals for the sake of profit and prestige. Yet it seems that no-one in those countries, then

or now, sought to deter the abusive land, resource and human exploitation that gave fuel, matter and blood to the new industrial states. And these industrial states have been burning the world's coal and oil ever since.

The other seemingly immovable boulder barring the way is these same countries' resistance to sensible proposals about how to mitigate climate change, as well as adapt to the inevitable! It seems that money is more important than the planet's climate: any argument that might 'cost too much' is met with a stony resistance that would put a solid rock wall to shame. Negotiators from developed countries typically argue that their economies will be ruined if they agree to these proposals. They do so without the slightest hint of guilt or discomfort, ignoring the cries of those whose homes and lands are disappearing beneath the waves, of those dying because of climate-induced thirst, hunger and natural disasters. Lamentably, the commendable traits that we saw in early environmental negotiations, of compassionate and collegial understanding, seem to have faded away completely. Negotiators will only entertain profit-generating false solutions.



*Panel members at UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, New York, May 2009. Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC*



On 26 June, for example, the US Congress passed an Energy Bill. Of course, it is heartening that the US is back at the UNFCCC's negotiating table, after so many years of political isolation, and that is taking a constructive approach to the importance of maintaining the environmental integrity and functionality of ecosystems as part of that effort. But those values are obliterated by other parts of the Bill, which bluntly proposes that the USA could offset all its emissions until 2040. Coming from a country that has the highest per capita emissions in the world, this is a disappointing and dismal message.

Does the US really want to contribute to reaching a fair and balanced agreement in Copenhagen, or do they want to derail the negotiation altogether, simply to protect the short-term welfare of the US economy?

The road to Copenhagen needs to be cleared of these boulders if we are to succeed in moderating climate change - and this needs to happen in the next few months. Governments must realize the inevitability of reducing emissions to

survive, in the order of 90% as many assert. Let's just hope governments don't bury their heads in the sand. They need to face up to the climate change challenge, and get moving down that road.



Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC



Press conference "Survival: Stop Deforestation, Industrial Logging and Plantations" organized by Global Forest Coalition. Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC

Dr Miguel Lovera is temporarily stepping down as chairperson of GFC, to help the government of his country, Paraguay, develop their climate change mitigation and adaptation strategy. In June 2009, the GFC coordination group asked me, as vice chair, to take over as acting chairperson of GFC until the end of 2009. I would like to thank Miguel for all his work over the last eight years, and I hope that he will return to GFC in January 2010. I wish him the best of luck and much tolerance during the ongoing intergovernmental climate change negotiations, both before and during UNFCCC COP-15, and I am sure that his participation will contribute to achieving a fair and equitable climate regime in Copenhagen in December 2009.

Andrey Laletin



## To Reach a Climate Agreement in the Near Future, Countries Must Look Into the Past

**Janet Redman, Co-Director of the Sustainable Energy and Economy Network, at the Institute for Policy Studies – Washington DC**

The second round of this year's climate negotiations have ended, and negotiators are digging in to their positions, making the chances of a global climate deal in Copenhagen this December - let alone a fair one - increasingly slim.

Midway down the road to Copenhagen, much has stayed the same since last time the Parties met in Bonn, in March. Two major hurdles block movement in reaching an agreement: industrialized countries' lack of will to commit to deep cuts in their own greenhouse gas emissions, and their resistance to delivering comprehensive financing to help poorer countries deal with locked-in climate change and a shift to ecologically sustainable development.

What has begun to change is how developing countries and climate justice movements frame these issues. Increasingly governments and civil society organizations are claiming the developed world owes the developing world a twofold climate debt. The greenhouse gases released by rich nations to date equate with physical and financial losses in poor countries. At a briefing on historical responsibility for climate change arranged by UN officials, Bolivian ambassador Angelica Navarro noted an annual loss of 4-17% of GDP due to changing weather patterns. These impacts constitute an "adaptation debt." And to pay it off, those who caused it must compensate developing countries.

The second - an "emissions debt" - is more complicated, but no less real. It's based on the fact that the atmosphere has limited capacity to absorb greenhouse gases before reaching irreversible climate chaos - and on the principle that every person, no matter where he or she lives, has an equal right to the remaining atmospheric space. The South Centre, a Geneva-based intergovernmental organization, estimates that the space left can hold up to 600 gigatons of carbon dioxide - and industrialized countries have already used more than their share. With below 20% of the world's population, they have emitted almost 75% of all

climate change gases. Martin Khor, South Centre director, says if rich countries don't radically change course they will use up 240 gigatons of the atmospheric space by 2050, although based on population their share should be 125 gt.

In other words, developed countries have borrowed 115 gigatons of carbon dioxide, and developing countries want it back. As people in poorer nations strive to improve their quality of life, fight for access to electricity, and grow their domestic economy they will need this space. The idea that poorer countries shouldn't use the atmospheric commons to develop is not only unjust, it's unrealistic. Failing to take this reality into account at the negotiations will doom the people and economies of all nations.

The implications for developed countries are profound. To repay their climate debt they must make deep cuts in ghg emissions. Developing countries are calling for cuts from 45 to 80 percent below 1990 levels in the next decade. Some researchers say to avoid catastrophe, emissions from rich countries will have to drop by 100 percent - then going into negative figures by 2050.

Even with clean energy and improved land use, it will be close to impossible for countries like the US to meet such ambitious targets. The balance of their climate debt will then have to be repaid with a transfer of money and clean technology to developing countries so that they can create new low-carbon economies. The cost will be in the region of hundreds of billions of dollars a year.

Industrialized countries have balked at this estimate, but their obligation to deliver this support is already enshrined in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, a global agreement that even the US has signed. And if the recent bank bailouts have taught us anything, it's that where there's political will, there's a way to mobilize trillions of dollars.

Meena Raman, researcher and legal advisor to the Third World Network and former Chair of Friends of the Earth International, called the technical briefing and the introduction of the climate debt concept "one of the most important moments in the history of the Convention." But if climate talks in Copenhagen are to yield a just and effective result, the conversation must move beyond concepts to commitments from nations with the greatest historical responsibility.



## Climate Change Negotiations: Indigenous Rights Remain in Limbo

**Onel Masardule, Executive Director, Fundaci3n para la Promoci3n del Conocimiento Indigena (FPCI), Panama**

The thirtieth sessions of the UNFCCC Convention subsidiary bodies - SBSTA and SBI - took place from Monday 1 June till Friday 12 June 2009.

Negotiations in the Ad Hoc Working Groups on Long-Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) and on the Kyoto Protocol AWG-KP (held in parallel, 1-12 June, in Bonn) stalled due to the lack of political will amongst the parties. The participation of Indigenous Peoples' representatives was extremely difficult and our proposal failed to receive support from a single government, meaning that it could not be considered part of the negotiation text for the next meeting of the working groups.



*A portable sawmill training, Papua New Guinea, Photo: Patrick Durst*



*Morning protest to negotiators as they go into UN Climate Talks in Bonn, Germany.*

*Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC*

In our opinion, no government really wants to contribute or assume any commitment that truly helps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The positions of both the developed and developing countries seem to be entirely based on their own interests; they are not concerned about mitigating climate change impacts.

Historical debt is a complex issue: southern countries claim that northern ones should account for their past actions and take responsibility for reducing global emissions. But nobody mentions that all countries, without exception, are responsible for a historical climate change debt owed to Indigenous Peoples.

There is no political will among the parties to support Indigenous Peoples' claims. Our only achievement in Bonn was that indigenous participation was included in the negotiating text. It is critical that we continue to participate in the negotiations, to reverse this situation. We must consolidate the International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change and ensure that it is acknowledged as an Indigenous Peoples' body within the Convention. We also need to develop a strategy that allows Indigenous Peoples effective participation in the working group meetings and all other relevant activities prior to Copenhagen meeting, as well as CoP-15 itself.

And finally, it is essential that all agreements must recognize and respect Indigenous Peoples' rights, especially to avoid facing situations like the recent violent oppression of Indigenous communities in Peru.



## Forest Investment Program Meets for Second Design Meeting

***Sena Alouka, Executive Director, Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement, Togo***

The Bali Action Plan calls on parties to “consider policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation [REDD] in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.” This call prompted the World Bank to set up several mechanisms through which it could provide the necessary funding for REDD plans being developed by several countries and multilateral institutions.

During the final design meeting of Bank’s Climate Investment Funds (CIF), held in Potsdam, in May 2008, it was agreed that “a forest investment program should be established by the end of 2008 to mobilize significantly increased funds to reduce deforestation and forest degradation and to promote sustainable forest management, leading to emission reductions and the protection of carbon reservoirs. The FIP should be developed based on a broad and transparent consultative process. That process should take into account country led priority strategies for the containment of deforestation and degradation and build upon complementarities between existing forest initiatives.”

According to the World Bank, the main goal of the FIP is ‘to support developing countries’ REDD-efforts, providing up-front bridge financing for readiness reforms and investments identified through national REDD readiness strategy building efforts, while taking into account opportunities to help them adapt to the impacts of climate change on forests and to contribute to multiple benefits such as biodiversity conservation and rural livelihoods enhancements. The FIP will finance efforts to address the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation and to overcome barriers that have hindered past efforts to do so.’ The FIP is supposed to achieve all this by serving as a vehicle to finance large scale investments, promoting transformational change, generating understanding and learning of the links between investments and outcomes, and piloting

replicable models to leverage additional and sustained financial resources for REDD.

### **Design meetings**

The first design meeting for the development of the FIP was held in Washington DC, 16-17 October 2008. A working group experts’ meeting was then convened 8-9 January 2009, and a second design meeting organized on 5-6 March 2009. A third design meeting took place in Washington DC, 4-5 May, but no consensus could be reached, and the current version of the proposal stems from an online consultation organized by the FIP secretariat.

Arrangements made for civil society participation in these meetings has been haphazard at best. Some NGOs and Indigenous People were invited to the initial presentation meeting of the CIF in October 2008, thanks to the Development and Environment Group of BOND (British Overseas NGOs for Development) in the UK. Since then, IUCN has been asked to conduct a self-selection process to identify six civil society delegates from the various regions of the world. Another process was arranged for the selection of the Indigenous peoples’ delegate.

Participation in the second design meeting was particularly poorly organized. Because of the extremely late notice and failure to facilitate participants’ visa and travel arrangements in a timely fashion, civil society representatives who were duly elected to attend the FIP meeting, through a formalized selection process, were unable to take part in the end: the delegate from Togo, for example, got his ticket one hour before departure. Even for the lucky few who managed to attend, background materials and the agenda had not been circulated to all in advance, meaning that participants had had little time to review and prepare their inputs to the meeting, let alone consult their constituencies and solicit input in a meaningful manner. In the end, the civil society group wrote a joint letter to express its deep disappointment in the ongoing organization – or rather lack of organization - of the Forest Investment Programme (FIP) design meetings, which is making meaningful and broad civil society participation impossible.

This is of particular concern given that the majority of those unable to attend were from tropical forest countries – the very people whose voices, opinions, and



knowledge are essential to ensure the success of measures to stop deforestation and forest degradation in those countries, and to guarantee respect for the rights and interests of forest-dependent communities. The joint letter queries the “sincerity of the World Bank Group’s stated commitment to ensure that the FIP is based on “a broad and transparent” and “fully” consultative process.”

**Business-as-usual** - Key issues that have been important for civil society participants have included the principles of the FIP, the Special Initiative for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, the level of transformational change the Bank and its acolytes are willing to reach, and the broad participation of civil society organizations and local communities. But it is ever clearer that the FIP could be business-as-usual. Several countries insisted on their need for development – the right to keep on logging – and their national sovereignty; but this approach risks reducing compliance, transparency and windows for broad participation from civil society organisations and Indigenous People.

Concerning the Special Initiative for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, civil society participants stressed that activities eligible for support should include capacity building; securing and strengthening customary land tenure, resource rights and traditional forest management systems of Indigenous Peoples and local communities; support for the development of pilot project proposals from Indigenous Peoples and local communities; and support for their involvement in monitoring and evaluating forest activities. Additionally, there is also a need to ensure that support for Indigenous Peoples and local communities is fully integrated into national forest-climate policy, REDD/FIP processes and investment plans. This means that activities supported through a dedicated mechanism should not be isolated or marginalized from the design and implementation of national REDD/FIP plans, nor should the existence of such a mechanism stop Indigenous Peoples’ and local communities’ accessing funds through other mechanisms or for other activities.

One point that has drawn a lot of attention is the “Illustrative Examples of Potential Investments under the FIP.” While this could be useful, civil society participants indicated their preference for an exclusion list, detailing activities that will not, under any circumstances, be supported by the FIP. As the FIP is

designed to “support countries’ REDD-efforts” and maximize benefits of sustainable development, particularly in relation to biodiversity conservation, rural livelihoods, and ecosystem services, it should never be used to finance deforestation or forest degradation.

Concerns were also raised around Sustainable Forest Management, which may hide an intention to promote industrial-scale logging or ‘certification’ systems, plantations (monocultures, potentially including genetically modified trees), and destructive mining and infrastructure projects, with the pretention of making them more sustainable.

In the end, for the FIP to be truly transformative, it should support efforts to reduce demand for wood and agricultural products altogether, and halt the production and purchase of products derived from degraded or converted forests, as well as conserving intact or primary natural forests – not just ‘high conservation value or pristine forests.’ CSOs decided to participate in the FIP sub-committee as active observers, rather than full members, to avoid the possibility of legitimizing harmful projects. In general, however, they were relatively satisfied with the openness of the FIP secretariat and the positive attitude displayed by several participants (apart from some developing country governments that seem to regard the FIP as a means of financing and legitimizing industrial logging).

Finally, taking into consideration the sunset clause in the CIF, which obliges it to come to an end by 2012 (unless otherwise requested by the UNFCCC), there is reason to ask about the relevance of the FIP as well, since most institutions, finally conscious of the lack of transparency in the drafting process, are already calling for a redrafting of the REDD or REDD+. Fingers are crossed that future meetings address these profound concerns, before the FIP’s Design Document is finally validated by the Strategic Climate Fund Trust Committee.

*Forests and Climate Change: An Introduction to the role of Forests in UN Climate Change Negotiations can be downloaded at:*  
[www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/publications/Forests-and-Climate-Change.pdf](http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/publications/Forests-and-Climate-Change.pdf)



## **UNFF: a Never-Ending Marathon?**

### ***Swati Shresth, Focal point South and East Asia***

A major 'success' of the 7th meeting of the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF) in 2008 was to set up the 'NLBI' (non-legally binding instrument) or 'Forest Instrument'. The 8th session of UNFF, met in the UN's New York HQ from 20 April -1 May, to discuss funding of the NLBI and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM).

Inter-sessional meetings were devoted to 'forest' financing, and the possibility of financing via 'environmental services.' The Country Led Initiative on Financing for SFM, the achievement of global objectives on forests and the implementation of the Forest Instrument, (the "Paramaribo Dialogue") was held 8-12 September 2008 in Paramaribo, Suriname. Delegates discussed sources of finance and the potential for financing SFM with payment for ecosystem services. The Ad Hoc Expert Group on Finance met in Vienna, Austria, from November 10-14 2008. This meeting aimed to develop a "voluntary global financial mechanism /portfolio approach /forest financing framework" to support SFM implementation. While there was some interest within the UNFF in the outcomes of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), this meeting saw a clearer desire to find funding through reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and to link SFM to climate change.

The second Forest Day, held during COP14 of the UNFCCC in Poznan, Poland in December 2008, also highlighted the importance of forests and SFM in terms of climate change. UNFF 8 thus convened with a background of SFM being an increasingly important aspect of forest-related discussions on climate change, bringing with it a need for additional funding for SFM and the Forest Instrument (NLBI). The Chair, Boen Purnama, highlighted the significance of the Forest Instrument in the opening plenary, noting that it was the first global agreement on SFM, which addresses all types of forests. He also emphasized that finance is the central pillar of SFM, and described UNFF 8 as the "last mile of a marathon." Given the urgency around securing funding, many developing country delegates supported the establishment of a global forest fund. Donor countries said there was no mandate to negotiate the establishment of such a fund, and argued for a "facilitative mechanism" to leverage funding through existing sources and to

create enabling conditions for private and other investments. No consensus was found, as it was expected the UNFCCC talks would resolve this when it created a financial mechanism for REDD in December. Delegates, such as World Bank's Warren Evans, and Russ Mittermeier of Conservation International, appear to view the climate change regime as an opportunity for SFM financing and seem convinced that highly controversial REDD proposals could provide the funding to sustain UNFF's efforts to deliver SFM and implement the forest instrument.

But civil society has had great concern about the potential impacts of REDD on Indigenous Peoples, the rights and livelihoods of local communities and on forests (especially as REDD proposals recognize plantations as forests). Given the global economic crisis, it is feared that governments will increasingly look to industry and private capital to finance REDD, meaning climate change and funding for SFM through REDD will only facilitate increasing the influence of industry in negotiations on environmental issues. The popularity of market-based solutions underscores the ease with which those in political and economic power can reduce ecological services, and the relationships of communities with their natural environments, to monetary terms. (See GFC brochure 'Forests and Climate Change: An Introduction to the role of Forests in UN Climate Change Negotiations' for a more detailed discussion on issues related to REDD).

Some delegates noted that discussions on finance, climate funding and carbon markets left little room for issues such as biodiversity and desertification. The current economic crisis should have alerted delegates to the risks of linking forests and forest communities to markets. At the UNFF it strengthened the claims of those who thought financing to be the key concern. Despite politically correct talk on the importance of SFM and the Forest Instrument, funding concerns ultimately bogged down UNFF 8. The Earth Negotiations Bulletin reported: "It could be that the lack of agreement at UNFF 8 could result in forest financing being skewed towards the climate regime, despite the widely held view within the forest community that this risks ignoring the role that SFM can play in both adaptation and mitigation, and marginalizing the many other values delivered by forests." (Volume 13, Number 174, Monday, 4 May 2009). In their desire to put SFM at the heart of talks on forest-related climate policies; the UNFF has fallen for the financial lures of the climate change regime.



## International Campaign Against GE Trees Heats Up

**Anne Petermann, Global Justice Ecology Project Co-Director and North American Global Forest Coalition Focal Point, USA**

The threat of climate change has, ironically, helped to advance the development of genetically engineered or 'GE' trees (also called genetically modified trees).

Since 2007, GE trees have been promoted as a potential feedstock for large-scale production of alternative liquid fuels (agrofuels), supposedly as part of the solution to climate change. A quick look at the facts, however, reveals that the volume of wood that would be required to manufacture enough liquid fuels to replace petroleum could lead to massive global deforestation.

Because manufacturing agrofuels from normal trees is difficult, eucalyptus and poplars are being genetically engineered to facilitate the process, including by reducing their lignin content. The escape of pollen bearing the low-lignin trait into the environment could however, significantly increase forest mortality, since low-lignin trees would be far more susceptible to disease and insects. They also likely to rot quickly, releasing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere more rapidly. Ultimately, GE trees could contribute to rather than mitigate climate change.



Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC

On 6 May of this year, Belgium allowed the Flanders Institute of Biotechnology to plant a GE poplar field trial, despite the controversy it had generated. The trees have been engineered specifically for the production of cellulosic ethanol. Poplars grow throughout Europe and the Americas and the escape of GE poplar seeds and pollen is a great concern.

In the United States, the government recently issued preliminary approval for the release of 260,000 GE cold tolerant eucalyptus trees in the southeast of the country. These trees have been designed with agrofuels in mind. That they have

been engineered to tolerate freezing temperatures poses a major threat in that it could allow eucalyptus plantations, with their typically devastating social and ecological impacts, to grow in regions previously considered too cold.

GE eucalyptus plantations will threaten groundwater resources, as eucalyptus trees are notoriously heavy water users. They will increase wildfire risk as they are highly flammable. Eucalyptus wildfires in Australia earlier this year moved at 100 km per hour and killed 173 people. ArborGen, the company that is behind GE eucalyptus, hopes for approval to grow them commercially in both the US and Brazil and once approved, could be exported worldwide. But agrofuels aren't the only climate change-related scheme driving GE tree research and development. Various 'REDD' (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) schemes, including REDD pilot projects being set up by the World Bank and the UN, could likely to include GE trees. This is because a decision made by the UNFCCC in 2003, allows the planting of GE trees in carbon sink plantations. This means that some financial benefits of REDD schemes – intended to compensate for reducing deforestation - could go to those planting GE tree plantations. This alarming possibility largely arises because of the UN's general definition of forests, which includes tree plantations (despite the fact that monocultures do not provide habitat for biodiversity or livelihoods for forest-dependent peoples). Groups including the Global Forest Coalition have been challenged this definition of forests, insisting that it should include social and ecological considerations.

An important step to reject GE trees occurred at the Indigenous Peoples' Global Summit on Climate Change, in April in Anchorage, Alaska. Indigenous Peoples from around Earth gathered there to discuss the impacts of climate change. The Anchorage Declaration that came out of the summit states, "Mother Earth is no longer in a period of climate change, but in climate crisis. We therefore insist on an immediate end to the destruction and desecration of the elements of life." The declaration rejected the use of all Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) on Indigenous lands and will be presented at the UNFCCC COP in December.

*To help stop the establishment of GE eucalyptus plantations, go to the STOP GE Trees Campaign website at <http://www.nogetrees.org>. Global Forest Coalition is a member of the STOP GE Trees Campaign.*



## The Forests Dialogue: on Investing in Locally Controlled Forests

**Hubertus Samangun, GFC IPO Focal Point, ICTI Tanimbar, Indonesia**

The Forests Dialogue (TFD), initiated in 1999, has since 2002 developed and convened more than 25 international Dialogues (the TFD also plans to conduct Dialogues at regional and national levels). Each Dialogue focuses on different aspects of conservation and sustainable use of forests. The Dialogue, in April in New York focused on financial mechanisms related to Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD). The last one, held in Brussels in June, was on a related issue: Investing in Locally Controlled Forests (ILCF): Improving Quality and Quantity.

This meeting was co-organized by The Forest Dialogue, and Growing Forest Partnerships (GFP). It was co-chaired by Minnie Degawan (IAITPTF), Peter Gardiner (MONDI) and Steward Maginnis (IUCN). Markku Simula facilitated. Around 35 participants representing Indigenous Peoples, local communities and forest communities, small forest owners, forest companies and the private sector, researchers and conservation NGOs, and local government, took part.

After the first plenary, the participants divided into five working groups according to their affiliation. Those participating in the Indigenous Peoples' group included Hubertus Samangun (Indonesia), Marcial Arias (Panama), Minnie Degawan (the Philippines), Charles Uriwagiye (Rwanda), and Edna Kaptoyo (Kenya).

Problems can arise in terms of decision-making, because the TFD/GFP views the Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Forest Communities, and the Small Forest Owners groups collectively, as the 'rightsholders' in the process. But these groups often have different priorities and concerns and are not homogenous.

For more information about TFD go to: <http://research.yale.edu/gisf/tfd/>



The Dialogue considered two questions. Firstly, the constraints and opportunities that Indigenous Peoples, forest communities and small holders faced in accessing investment? Secondly, what kind of conditions, support, structure and partners should be in place to improve investment in locally controlled forests?

In answering the first question, the Indigenous Peoples' group listed several constraints including lack of recognition of the rights of Indigenous Peoples; lack of financial resources; the role of intermediaries; lack of recognition and the implementation of the UNDRIP and ILO 169 conventions; and the need to have at least one Northern organization or NGO as a partner in order to submit proposals to northern NGOs or donor agencies. Opportunities that could arise from increased funding to locally controlled forests include strengthening Indigenous Peoples' movements at national, regional and international level, and the implementation of UNDRIP and UNPFII. In response to the second question the Indigenous Peoples' group observed that initiatives to overcome the constraints listed in their answer to the first question were essential.

The next TFD will focus on Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC), and will take place in Bali, Indonesia, in September. This dialogue on FPIC is important to Indigenous Peoples and the TFD and GFP have secured funds to bring nine Indigenous Peoples participants to Bali. Six will be from the IAITPTF Alliance (two from Asia, two from Africa and two from America), one from North America, one from the Nordic Countries and one from Oceania. Minnie Degawan, member of the steering committee, also informed the Indigenous Peoples' group that:

- The TFD/GFP also has funds to bring several Indigenous People to attend the 13th World Forestry Congress in Buenos Aires, in October 2009, so the Alliance should prepare activities.
- There is interest in having the next Dialogue in Panama, with the involvement of the Alliance.
- Stewart Maginnis, on behalf of IUCN, has asked if the Alliance wants to be a member of the IUCN.

The Alliance has decided to take its time and discuss these concerns internally: the TFD and GFP initiatives that are new to the Alliance and more time is needed to learn about them before deciding on next steps.



## Reports on other meetings:

### CSD: If you do what you did, you get what you got

From 4 to 15 May 2009, the 17th Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development was held in New York, USA. After two years of negotiations, the meeting was supposed to come up with sustainable solutions for some of the most important environmental and social challenges of our time: the profound lack of sustainability of the world's agricultural system and the food crisis and ecological crisis that has resulted from it, land degradation and desertification, and the devastating wide-spread land grabbing for agrofuel production that is currently taking place in Africa. Regretfully, the session reconfirmed agri-business as usual. Below is the closing statement by the NGO community attending the CSD session, which was presented by Nnimmo Bassey of Eraction/Friends of the Earth Nigeria.

"We can say that in a sense this has been a chaotic session. However, NGOs are conscious of the fact that all order comes out of chaos. We see this session as being riddled with short-term visions signifying a deepening crisis of global leadership and governance.

We want a CSD that is firmly and clearly rooted in the spirit of Rio. We have searched for that spirit with little success. For one, we cannot accept a CSD policy direction subjugated to WTO rules, especially when the WTO is outside the UN system. (p.4). As the minister from Namibia said: 'If you do what you did, you get what you got.'"

The outcome of this session is a sort of harvest. And we hope you are happy with what you have got. Delegates appear to have accepted the text with deep reservations and regrets. It is quite a show and we thank you all for inviting us to the show.

### Eighth session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

More than 2,000 representatives of Indigenous Peoples, governments, civil society, academia and international organizations gathered at the Eighth Session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (New York, 18-29 May), where they addressed the implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, climate change, the Arctic region, land tenure and the relationship between Indigenous Peoples and extractive corporations.

The Preamble of the Recommendations of the Permanent Forum states, "The principles of respect for and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples to self-determination (articles 3 and 32) and development (article 23), including to free, prior and informed consent (article 32), are set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples must be obtained before investments are made on projects affecting their lands, territories and resources and before such projects are brought into indigenous lands and territories."

This event closely followed the Indigenous Peoples' Global Summit on Climate Change, which took place in April and addressed many of the same major themes, including the implementation of UNDRIPs. The Anchorage Declaration which emerged from the summit specifically states, "We uphold that the inherent and fundamental human rights and status of Indigenous Peoples, affirmed in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), must be fully recognized and respected in all decision-making processes and activities related to climate change. This includes our rights to our lands, territories, environment and natural resources as contained in Articles 25-30 of the UNDRIPs. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreements and principles must reflect spirit and the minimum standards contained in UNDRIP."

*For more information about the first global gathering of Indigenous Peoples on climate change, Anchorage, Alaska, 20-24 April 2009, go to:*

<http://globaljusticeecology.org/connections.php?ID=278>



## 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 second World Congress on Agroforestry will take place 23 to 29 August 2009 in Nairobi, Kenya. For more information, please visit: <http://www.worldagroforestry.org/wca2009/>

The ninth session of the AWG-KP and seventh session of the AWG-LCA will take place 28 September to 9 October 2009 in Bangkok, Thailand. For more information, please visit: <http://unfccc.int/meetings/items/2654.php>

The thirtieth World Forestry Congress will take place 18 to 25 October 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. For more information, please visit: <http://www.wfc2009.com/en/index.asp>

The forty-fifth meeting of the International Tropical Timber Council (ITTC-45) and associated sessions of the four committees will be held 9 to 14 November 2009, in Yokohama, Japan. For more information, please visit: <http://www.itto.or.jp>

The eighth meeting of the CBD Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing will be held 9 to 15 November 2009 in Montréal, Canada. For more information, please visit: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/>

UNFCCC COP 15 and Kyoto Protocol COP/MOP 5 will take place 7 to 18 December 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark. These meetings will coincide with the 31st meetings of the UNFCCC's subsidiary bodies. For more information, please visit: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2009](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2009)

The ninth Conference of the Parties to the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD COP 9) will convene in Buenos Aires, Argentina, from 21 September to 2 October 2009. For more information, please visit: <http://www.unccd.int>



Capacity building workshop during UNPFFI. Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC

### Editorial Team:

- Simone Lovera, Global Forest Coalition, Paraguay
- Ronnie Hall, Global Forest Coalition, UK
- Sandy Gauntlett, Pacific Indigenous Peoples Environment Coalition, Aotearoa/New Zealand
- Swati Shresth, Global Forest Coalition, India
- Wally Menne, Timberwatch Coalition, South Africa
- Yolanda Sikking, Global Forest Coalition, the Netherlands

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