



Forest Cover

Issue no.35, October 2010

About Forest Cover

Welcome to the thirty-fifth 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

[Donate to GFC](#)

Follow GFC on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).



CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

About Forest Cover

Ex Silvis: 21 September and the Failed 2010 Biodiversity Targets

Fiu Mataese Elisara, Director of O le Siosiomaga Society, Samoa, and GFC Chairperson

NGO Statement on the CBD's Mission, Strategic Goals and Targets for Post 2010

The Not so Merry-Go-Round of the FCCC
Simone Lovera, Sobrevivencia, Paraguay

Creative Accounting and Loopholes: Report from UNFCCC AWG-14 Meeting in Bonn

Deepak Rughani, Biofuelwatch, UK

Commonwealth Conference Fumbles With Forest Restoration Ball

Almuth Ernsting, Biofuelwatch, UK, and Wally Menne, Timberwatch, South Africa

UNFF Major Groups Initiative Workshop Strengthened Multi-stakeholder Approach

Hubertus Samangun, ICTI, Indonesia, and Andrey Laletin, FSF, Russia,

Reports on other meetings

Social Forum of the Americas Rejects REDD and Carbon Trade

Calendar of Forest-related meetings



Reclaimed Indigenous land, state of Espirito Santo, Brazil. Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC



Ex Silvis: 21 September and the Failed 2010 Biodiversity Targets
Fiu Mata'ese Elisara, Director of O le Siosiomaga Society, Samoa and GFC Chairperson

In 2004, 21 September was declared an 'International Day Against Monoculture Tree Plantations' by a number of organizations throughout the world. This year, 2010, is the year we were supposed to meet the 2010 Biodiversity Targets agreed as part of the first Strategic Plan for the Biodiversity Convention, signed by governments in 2002. We have so far failed to "achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth." (Strategic Plan, part B: Mission, <http://www.cbd.int/sp/>)

With forests representing an estimated 80% of the world's terrestrial biodiversity, 21 September is an opportunity to make sure no-one forgets that these Biodiversity Targets have been well and truly missed, and why they have been missed. People in every continent will carry out actions to generate and heighten awareness of the impacts that large scale tree monocultures have on local communities, Indigenous Peoples, their lands and their environments, and to show that the massive expansion of monocultures of agro-industrial crops and trees is one of the main reasons for failure.

Even more worryingly, new threats are constantly emerging, proposals and technologies that involve expanding the area occupied by these socially and environmentally damaging 'green deserts' even further. Current plans to expand industrial bio-energy, for example, will inevitably lead to yet more biodiversity destruction, to the detriment of the Indigenous Peoples and women who depend upon it for their daily livelihoods and very survival. The disaster of climate change has led the rich industrialized countries to promote false solutions that not do not solve the problem but create yet more suffering for local communities. 'Carbon sink plantations,' 'green fuels,' and genetically engineered trees are examples of profit-oriented false solutions that threaten people and the environment in many poorer countries.

There are other ways out of this dilemma, ways that have been tried and tested, and are much less damaging. As Tui Atua Efi, Samoa's head of state, said, "Fundamentally, the problem of climate change is one of arrogance and greed and our governments must ensure that our sovereign rights are not sacrificed at the altar of false solutions."

The People's Agreement that resulted from the World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth in Cochabamba concurs with this point of view, saying: "The recent financial crisis has demonstrated that the market is incapable of regulating the financial system,...it would be totally irresponsible to leave in their hands the care and protection of human existence and of our Mother Earth... we consider inadmissible that current negotiations propose the creation of new mechanisms that extend and promote the carbon market, for existing mechanisms have not resolved the problem of climate change nor led to real and direct actions to reduce greenhouse gases.....we condemn market mechanisms such as REDD and its versions + and ++ which are violating the sovereignty of peoples and their right to prior free and informed consent as well as the sovereignty of national States..."

Negotiations to reverse biodiversity loss are heading down the same blind alley. Instead of abolishing subsidies and other perverse incentives for biodiversity destruction, some governments are actively trying to promote biodiversity offsets. These and other markets for environmental services promote privatization and the commodification of biodiversity, and inevitably lead to the marginalization of economically less powerful groups including women, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, peasants and fisherfolk. They facilitate increased corporate control over biodiversity, undermine public governance, and have little regard for peoples' sovereignty over their own resources. As we approach the CBD's COP 10 in Nagoya, in October, we must reject the creation of new markets in environmental services with every fiber in our being.

Biodiversity cannot be the price we pay for protecting our climate. The millions of hectares of land already occupied by pulpwood, timber and oil palm plantations must not be dwarfed by yet more millions of hectares to make way for 'fast wood' plantations of genetically modified 'franken trees' designed to absorb the carbon emitted by the use of fossil fuels. Neither can we allow them to be buried beneath endless carpets of oil palm and other crops, simply to feed cars.

None of this is science fiction: it is already happening. We must stop it. The way to achieve this is to support our local communities and Indigenous Peoples who are in the frontline of the struggle against plantations, people who are intent on forcing culprit governments to change course. On 21 September this year, the International Day Against Monoculture Tree Plantations, we call on the peoples of the world, and particularly on northern citizens, to join together to bring about real and lasting change.



NGO Statement on the CBD's Mission, Strategic Goals and Targets for Post 2010

On 17 May, a joint NGO statement was presented to Working Group 2 at the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) SBSTTA 14 in Nairobi (1). The statement draws attention to ongoing biodiversity loss, diminishing ecosystem functions and services, and the skewed distribution of the costs and benefits of natural resources. It highlights the poor response of Parties to the 2010 biodiversity loss reduction targets, and the failure to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, particularly “economic and governance systems and policies that promote the over consumption of natural resources by some countries and segments of society.”

To summarize: the planet cannot support an increasing human population at high levels of production and consumption. “Fundamental change is urgently required. Society needs a new vision that links socio-economic and environmental policy.” Biodiversity and functioning ecosystems provide a range of services that support the economies of Parties to the CBD and they must recognize the value and benefits of biodiversity, as well as the cost they will bear from its loss. Political leadership is required to ensure that governments act at the highest level. Heads of state must commit to mobilize resources and action by all relevant sectors.

“The current draft of the CBD Strategic Plan does not fully address this challenge.” The statement proposes that targets need to be reformulated significantly to address the scale of the challenge. By 2020, biodiversity loss must be halted, ecosystems restored and the values and benefits of biodiversity and ecosystems shared equitably. The 2020 targets need to ensure the engagement of governments at the highest level to integrate biodiversity into relevant portfolios. It requires concrete steps, mechanisms and timelines to integrate biodiversity processes, benefits and values into economic policy design and national accounting, for the health and benefit of society as a whole.



Peat bog restoration by plantation clearance, Forsinard, Scotland. Photo: Ernsting, Biofuelwatch

This requires the urgent prevention of habitat loss across all ecosystem types, with full respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. CBD objectives need to be integrated into multilateral agreements, especially on climate change mitigation and adaptation under the UNFCCC. “We urge CBD Parties to announce national commitments to advance these four issues before CBD COP 10 in Nagoya.”

Reading between the Lines.

Although the NGO statement calls for ambitious targets, it falls short in providing specific direction to the Parties to the CBD. It appears there is still a deep-seated reluctance to adopt progressive reforms in both national and global governance of the natural environment. Business as Usual, ‘BAU’ appears to dominate the CBD, with the large industrialized countries and big NGOs exerting undue influence over the agenda of the CBD’s Secretariat to that end.

While the NGO statement does offer a relatively progressive position, what it means for forests is that full protection might only be assigned to ‘high biodiversity value’ areas. In the ECO of 27 May (2), WWF proposes ‘zero net deforestation by 2020’, but this must be contextualized in terms of plans to compensate for reduced logging in real forests by allowing greater increases in tree plantations – using what WWF optimistically calls ‘new generation plantations’! (3, 4)

By all indications it seems there may be little improvement in the next strategy period. We seem doomed to repeat the mistakes that led to our failure to meet the 2010 Biodiversity Targets, so long as commercial overexploitation of natural resources by the global North remains a sacred cow.

(1) <http://undercovercop.org/2010/05/17/joint-cso-statement-on-the-cbd%E2%80%99s-proposed-mission-strategic-goals-and-targets-for-the-post-2010-framework/>

(2) ECO 32 - <http://undercovercop.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/ECO3221.pdf>

(3) WWF zero net deforestation - www.panda.org/sustainableplantations

(4) New Generation Plantations - www.wrm.org.uy/bulletin/153/FAO.html



The Not so Merry-Go-Round of the FCCC ***Simone Lovera, Sobrevivencia, Paraguay***

One of the risks of stepping on to a merry-go-round is that one might end up pretty dizzy. A slight feeling of dizziness and nausea was definitely sensed by those who attended the 32nd session of the subsidiary bodies to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that took place from 31 May to 11 June 2010, and the sessions of the FCCC Ad Hoc Working Groups on the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) that took place in June and August.

Both meetings took place in good old Bonn, home of the Wasted Negotiation Time. Documents and discussions that looked finalized were suddenly narrowed down to a chair's draft that mainly included the kind of nonsensical statements that were reflected in last December's Copenhagen Accord (the vague agreement that was adopted by a number of countries in Copenhagen regardless of disagreement from others).

Subsequently, Parties were invited to comment on the chair's draft and, rightfully, they began to add all the elements that had just been cut out back in, in order to try and return to something approaching a more 'balanced' text. Bolivia and other countries also attempted to include some of the proposals from the Cochabamba's People's Summit on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth in the text – this was one of the few climate change summits where those whose livelihoods will be destroyed by climate change actually had a say. Sadly, those additions were put into brackets by those Parties that stand to benefit from a nonsensical and unjust climate agreement along the lines of the Copenhagen Accord. As a result, the entire negotiation text contracted and expanded like an accordion throughout the meeting.

Even more sickening is the fact that those discussions that would make sense, like the crucial discussion on what options still remain that could actually prevent dangerous climate change (a discussion mandated by the FCCC itself), were ruthlessly wiped from the table in June. A handful of oil-producing States would prefer us to keep our eyes wide shut on this issue, even though it is clear that their economies will have to adapt just as much as other countries in the end.

In general, some participants' comment to the Earth Negotiations Bulletin¹ team that the outcomes of the AWG meetings in Bonn were successful as they provided a good "basis for delegates to engage in 'full negotiation mood' at the next AWG sessions in Tianjin, China in October" makes one wonder what on earth more than 4,500 people - who had spent a lot of crucial funding and CO₂ to attend these two Bonn meetings - had been doing for three weeks?

For the discussions on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation and enhancing carbon stocks (REDD+) this crazy fair implied that some of the important social and environmental safeguards that had been agreed upon in December 2009 are suddenly in brackets again. This is extremely worrying, especially as the main REDD+ donors have formed a 'partnership' with the main (potential) REDD+ recipients to speed up and presumably coordinate 'action' on REDD+.

Clearly, despite the highly chaotic process so far, the financial cotton candy at stake is still attractive enough to keep the process rolling – in whatever direction that may be. There is still an ambition to conclude a fast and dirty REDD+ deal at the next Conference of the Parties, which will take place from 29 November to 10 December in Cancun, Mexico. With the main safeguards in brackets and definitions and baselines being potentially defined by a highly fraudulent negotiation process on Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF), closing a REDD+ deal in Cancun is likely to have much in common with stepping on to a rollercoaster – one without brakes that is.

For more information about LULUCF negotiations, please see the companion article in this edition by Deepak Rughani.

¹ http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/workshops/other_meetings/application/pdf/enb12220e.pdf



Creative Accounting and Loopholes: Report from UNFCCC AWG-14 Meeting in Bonn ***Deepak Rughani, Co-director of Biofuelwatch, UK***

During the UNFCCC meetings in Bonn in June and August, some intense negotiations took place on the new Land-Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) proposals. Very confusingly, REDD and agriculture are being debated in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) but LULUCF is being discussed separately, by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Countries under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP).

Yet the LULUCF proposals are of great relevance to what is being discussed under REDD, and agriculture as well. Very briefly, the LULUCF proposals have two major strands:

Firstly, new 'accounting rules' for Annex I countries are being proposed. These would allow them to hide significant increases in emissions, particularly from logging, and thus claim non-existing 'emissions reductions.' One of the main 'loopholes' would be based on Annex I countries comparing their emissions not to a proven 'historical baseline' of emissions from logging, deforestation, etc, but to their own 'individual baseline' which they would be allowed to decide for themselves.

This all sounds very technical and indeed the negotiating text about 'LULUCF emissions accounting' is virtually incomprehensible (no doubt to many delegates as well). But what it means in practice, amongst other things, is that a country like Canada could log even more of their forests than before, in order to supply fuel to power stations in North America and Europe, and then claim that they had emitted no more than they would have done under some fictitious 'alternative scenario.' So new emissions would not be compared to previous ones but to an assumption about 'what might have happened.' It's a bizarre logic, but one that is all too familiar from carbon trading.

Secondly, the LULUCF proposals would perpetuate the false definition of tree plantations as 'forests' and the allocation of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) carbon credits for 'afforestation and reforestation' as a result. Even worse, they include suggestions that could result in increases in CDM funding for these practices, as well as for tree plantations and 'forest management' (a term commonly applied to industrial logging). This could also apply to 'soil carbon sequestration,' 'cropland management,' 're-vegetation' and 'wetland management' – all of which were specifically excluded from the CDM before the Kyoto Protocol came into force.

To sum up, these LULUCF proposals amount to a major new program to get plantations of all kinds, and logging, included in the CDM (and thus, indirectly, in other carbon markets) – and on a scale well beyond anything seen so far with tree plantations.

It soon became clear that delegates were considerably more aware of these 'accounting loopholes' than they were of the LULUCF offsetting proposals and their implications (despite attempts by different CJN! members to raise such awareness). As far as 'loopholes' are concerned, both the new draft negotiating text (with a LULUCF section which is not actually new but virtually identical to that first proposed in Copenhagen) and a Report by the Chair of the AWG-KP session, confirm that major differences persist.

Condemnation of Annex I countries' desire to use LULUCF rules to evade their already meager emission reduction commitments is widespread and shared by the G77, China, India, the LDC group, the Africa Group and the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS). The AWG-KP Chair and Vice-Chair, however, insist that the 'loophole' discussion is not relevant and that different accounting methods would make little difference – contrary to published figures and analysis.

As far as the LULUCF offsetting proposals were concerned though, I am not aware of a single government delegation having formally objected to the text. This may well be because the proposals are still seen as 'obscure': they do not appear in the working groups where one would 'expect' any proposals for carbon trading in forests, soils, etc to be discussed. In addition, media reporting on LULUCF has been virtually confined to the 'loophole' issue, perhaps partly due to the fact that the Climate Action Network, which has been particularly vocal on LULUCF loopholes, has remained silent on the offsetting proposals. However, many delegates I spoke to were very concerned to see the text proposals, which they had not realized existed.

This is clearly not the only reason for this overall silence on offsets however. Many delegates from non-Annex I (developing plus least developed) countries clearly consider the CDM to be the most realistic form of future climate finance even if not the most



ideal. It is clear that some African governments have been 'advised,' including by FAO and other UN organizations, that inclusion of the land-use sector in the CDM would make it more likely for their countries to access some of this money.

When the new 'draft negotiating text' was issued on the last day of the Bonn meetings, LULUCF 'emissions accounting' proposals remained in brackets, but key ones about possible CDM inclusion did not. This means that should any text be agreed in Cancun, even about the 2011 work programme, it is very likely that the 2011 SBSTA will be instructed to carry out a work program that includes looking at how best to include more crop and tree plantations and more logging (or to use UNFCCC speak, more afforestation, reforestation, revegetation, crop management, soil carbon management and forest management) in the CDM.

For more background information, see: <http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/news/view/209>

You can also read this presentation from a pre-session workshop on LULUCF and Forest Accounting, from Lim Li Lin of the Third World Network on behalf of Climate Justice Now! This presentation is now listed on the UNFCCC as a formal Climate Justice Now! submission on LULUCF (http://unfccc.int/meetings/ad_hoc_working_groups/kp/items/4907.php).



*Clearcut with plantation by the Strathnaver road, Scotland.
All photos: Ernsting, Biofuelwatch*



View with bog beans, Dubh Lochan, Scotland



Douglas fir plantation, Never Forest, Scotland,

Commonwealth Conference Fumbles With Forest Restoration Ball Almuth Ernsting, Biofuelwatch, UK, and Wally Menne, Timberwatch, South Africa

During the week of 28 June to 2 July 2010, over 400 people from forty different countries attended the Commonwealth Forestry Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland. The theme of the conference was forest restoration, using the inspiring slogan 'Restoring the Commonwealth's Forests: Tackling Climate Change.' However many of the presentations included industrial tree plantations under the guise of 'forestry'.

When it comes to restoring forests with a view to re-establishing natural habitat, the rule is to use the correct mix of native plant species, replicating those found in real forests that still exist or may have existed in that area. However, planting a single tree species in uniform rows for industrial production purposes can hardly be described as forest restoration. Some of the conference presentations described excellent examples of real restoration projects that were more compatible with the conference theme. Others, however, were clearly more suited to a meeting of the timber, pulp and paper industry, and did not fit in well.

This anomaly can be witnessed in many parts of Scotland: up to one million hectares have been planted with monocultures, mainly of Sitka Spruce, a North American species with invasive tendencies. At the conference it was announced that national tree cover could be significantly increased in order to reach a target of having 25% of Scotland planted with trees. It must be acknowledged that there are some important projects underway to restore native woodlands in some regions, albeit only in small areas, but there are also indications that plantation expansion could soon be resumed on a large scale. Restored 'real' woodlands would provide permanent habitat for wildlife as well as helping to store a limited amount of carbon, which will benefit the climate to a small degree.

On the other hand, the influential recent report on "Carbon and Forestry" by Sir David Reid, commissioned by the UK's Forestry Commission, worryingly claims that plantations, particularly those intended to provide timber for bioenergy, are better for climate



change mitigation than native forests – a claim which flies in the face of what is known about forests and their significance for the climate.

The report legitimizes a new push for large-scale tree plantations in the UK and elsewhere. These plantations, however, will be cut down, and converted into heavily processed products, including paper and fuel, which require large inputs of energy and chemicals. This means that these trees' contribution to storing carbon will be short-lived at best. In addition their cultivation, extraction and transportation will require the use of additional fossil-fuel energy to drive equipment and vehicles, adding to carbon emissions.

Another problem is that many UK plantations have been established on peat bogs. This results in major losses of soil-carbon through oxidation when they are deliberately drained, as is common, or when they simply dehydrate because of high water demand from fast-growing planted trees. In parts of Scotland, aerial spraying with nitrogen fertilizers is also common, resulting in substantial greenhouse gas emissions in the form of nitrous oxide.

Planting trees on hills and on the lower slopes of mountains creates yet another set of problems. Tree plantations shade out the natural grass or heath groundcover, leaving the soil beneath the trees bare and exceedingly prone to erosion. This is worsened when heavy logging equipment breaks up or compacts the soil surface, resulting in sheet erosion that strips large areas of precious topsoil when the runoff from rain scours the area.

Biodiversity is also devastated when the crowns of evergreen plantation trees meet and block out the sunlight needed to sustain the naturally occurring indigenous herbs and grasses. This eradicates the birds and other wildlife that depend on them for food, nesting material, and protection from cold and wet conditions. In the UK, peat bogs and heath lands are particularly vulnerable to tree plantation expansion and both constitute scarce and diminishing habitats of great importance to plants, birds and invertebrates in particular. Apart from destroying the natural vegetation when plantations are established, biological soil processes are also halted, and the natural accumulation of soil carbon from the activities of soil microorganisms ceases, meaning that soils are also deprived of the nutrients that would support shallow-rooting herbs and grasses.

The overall impacts of tree plantations and associated management activities must lead to considerable loss or 'leakage' of carbon into the atmosphere, a failing that is compounded if the trees are destined to be combusted as fuel for electrical energy generation. It is a misperception that burning wood is carbon neutral. The problem is that all large-scale energy production derived from combustion produces pollution and carbon emissions and the only meaningful solution is for people to reduce their own consumption - of both energy and energy intensive products.

Few people realize that there are plans to build many more bioenergy power stations in the UK, which will vastly increase demand for wood as a fuel, which when burned would release all the carbon stored in that wood back into the atmosphere. If current plans to increase wood bioenergy are realized it would require over 3.5 times the UK's total wood production for fuel, meaning that more timber imports would be needed.

In water-scarce countries like South Africa, such plantations have many undesirable social and environmental impacts. This reduces water availability for downstream communities, which also affects industrial and agricultural activities that would previously have had access to a steady supply of water. Consequently this necessitates the construction of dams and water pipelines – all at the taxpayer's expense!

The next Commonwealth Forestry Conference is due to take place in 2015 at a venue not yet determined. It is hoped that by then the Commonwealth Forestry Association will have made even greater strides in promoting genuine forest restoration projects, that trap and store carbon in a more permanent way than large-scale tree plantations. Plantations are a false solution to climate change, and are likely to cause even more environmental degradation through greater emissions when they are either burned as fuel or simply go up in smoke, as we have seen happening recently with wildfires in Portugal and Russia!

The proceedings of the Commonwealth Forestry Conference will be made available at www.cfc2010.org



Plantation in Scotland. Photo: Menne, Timberwatch



UNFF Major Groups Initiative Workshop Strengthened Multi-stakeholder Approach Hubertus Samangun, ICTI, Indonesia, and Andrey Laletin, FSF, Russia,

Major groups participating in the UNFF process organized an international forest workshop on the theme “applying sustainable forest management to poverty reduction: strengthening the multi-stakeholder approach within the UNFF.” The workshop took place from 26-30 July in Accra, Ghana, and was hosted in collaboration with the Government of Ghana, with support from the UNFF Secretariat and a number of other governments. It brought together some 120 key representatives from major groups, governments and intergovernmental organizations from more than 25 countries.

The workshop had four key objectives: to develop concrete recommendations for UNFF 9 (24 January-4 February 2011, New York) which will have the theme of “Forests for people, livelihoods and poverty eradication” ; to identify strengths and weaknesses of the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue process associated with the UNFF, and to create specific recommendations for increasing its effectiveness; to identify specific activities for Major Groups’ contribution to the UN International Year of Forests (2011) and to foster alliances, partnerships and networking within Major Groups and between Major Groups and other key players in the UNFF process.

Four working groups met during the workshop. The first focused on tenure and benefit sharing. It included substantive discussions about defining tenure and access, and about equitable benefit sharing and how to implement and improve the system. The second working group focused on Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge (TFRK), an issue that Indigenous participants are following closely. The discussion focused on the nature of TFRK and its use. On the question of its nature, the workshop concluded that TFRK refers to ancient Indigenous knowledge passed from generation to generation, in a form that evolves rather than remaining static. TFRK can be used in many different ways, including for classifying flora and fauna, determining and recognizing seasonal events and harvesting times and for forecasting weather. It can also be used for protecting watersheds, indicating soil fertility, understanding the different uses of plants and animals, mitigating and adapting to climate change, conserving biodiversity and managing forests and (timber and non-timber) forest products.

Working Group 3 focused on ways in which communities can improve livelihoods with Community Based Forest Enterprises (CBFEs) relating to timber forest products, non-timber forest products, and ecosystem services, while working group 4 considered capacity building, and discussed the International Year of the Forest (IYF), with each Major Group (that is Farmers and Small Forest Land Owners; Forest Workers and Trade Unions; Indigenous Peoples; NGOs; Scientific and Technological Communities; Women; and Youth) presenting their programs of activities for IYF 2011.

The Indigenous Peoples Major Group agreed on a number of specific programs and activities. They agreed that the key message for 2011 will be in accord with that of the UNFF Secretariat’s: that a healthy forest means healthy peoples. The focus for this Major Group, however, is the importance of forests for ‘Peoples’ rather than people. The Indigenous Peoples are organized into five regions and their work in the IYF- 2011 will concentrate on three of these regions: Asia, Africa and Latin America. IYF 2011 activities will generally take place at the national level, although there will be a small committee formed to steer the overall process, which will involve the organization of events and activities, the building of alliances, and fundraising. The Indigenous Major Group also proposed a traditional ceremony by Indigenous Elders to launch IYF 2011. Moreover, they proposed participatory film festivals and a contest involving poems and traditional songs and tree planting events involving schools and community members.

At the end of the workshop, participants of all Major Groups agreed to prepare joint papers on the main issues that will be discussed in UNFF-9 instead of separate position papers from every MG that were made for the previous UNFF sessions.

For more information about the UNFF Major Groups Initiative please visit: <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/>



Reports on other meetings:

Social Forum of the Americas Rejects REDD and Carbon Trade

“The defense of natural resources in the face of devouring capitalism has become a central part of the agenda of resistance of more and more popular organizations and social movements. A common front is being reinforced against the destruction of nature and against the false solutions of ‘market environmentalism’ and ‘green capitalism,’ such as carbon markets, agrofuels, GMOs and geo-engineering, which are promoted by the main centers of power as solutions to climate change. We denounce the governments of the global North, which, rather than confronting the serious impacts of climate change, are seeking to evade responsibility and develop new carbon market mechanisms to make more profit, such as ‘Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation’ (REDD), which promotes the commercialization and privatization of forests and the loss of sovereignty over territories. We reject such arrangements.”

These were some of the main conclusions of the Social Forum of the Americas, which was held 11-15 August in Asunción, Paraguay. More than 10,000 representatives of social movements, Indigenous Peoples’ Organizations, NGOs and other institutions, from all over the continent, although primarily from Latin America, took part in the forum. Government representatives were also more present than ever during this fourth forum of the Americas. They contributed actively to many events, including the workshops and dialogues organized by Sobrevivencia and the Global Forest Coalition, in cooperation with organizations like Friends of the Earth Latin America and the Caribbean, and La Via Campesina, on themes including the need for sustainable land reform, REDD, and the impact of false solutions to climate change.

The fact that three presidents, President Fernando Lugo of Paraguay, President Pepe Mujica of Uruguay and President Evo Morales of Bolivia, took part in the final plenary session was symbolic of the fact that the social forum is no longer a forum of non-governmental movements only. It has become a gathering of people from all streams of society who are united in their belief in the need for profound social change as a pre-condition for a truly good life for all.

Or as stated in the final declaration: “As social movements we are facing a historic opportunity to develop initiatives to empower ourselves at international level. Only our peoples’ struggles will allow us to move towards the ybymarane’y (land without evil) and realize the tekoporá (good living).”

Calendar of Forest-Related Meetings

More information on these and other intergovernmental meetings can be found at: www.iisd.ca/linkages

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 UNCCD Secretariat is organizing Land Day 3 to meet in parallel with the 10th session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP 10), 23 October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan.

For more information visit: <http://www.unccd.int/secretariat/docs/workplan>

The UNECE Forum on the Potential of Forests in Europe for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation will take place 22 to 24 November 2010, Geneva, Switzerland.

For more information visit: [www: http://www.unece.org/meetings/meetgen.htm](http://www.unece.org/meetings/meetgen.htm)

The 16th 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



Forest Day 4 will be held alongside the 16th session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC on 5 December 2010 in Cancun, México.

For more information visit: <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Events/ForestDay4/>

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 9th 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.



Ayoreo mother and child from the community Campo Loro (Parrot Field), Chaco region, Paraguay. Photo: Langelle/GJEP-GFC