



TFD's Initiative on Intensively Managed Planted Forests

Background, Evolution and Progress To Date

TFD IMPF Dialogue
16 April 2008
Novotel Vitoria
Vitoria, Brasil





Overview

- Origins
- IMPF dialogues
- Objective of IMPF dialogue series
- Dialogue conclusions to date
- Next steps





Origins: **IMPF in the international arena**

- 1992 – *UN Conference on Environment & Development* recognizes significance of IMPF to SFM
- 1999 – *International Experts Meeting on the Role of Planted Forests in Sustainable Forest Management*. Santiago, Chile. Considered role of IMPF as complement to natural forests in SFM
- 2003 – *Expert Meeting on Role of Planted Forests: Maximizing Planted Forests' Contribution to SFM*. Wellington, New Zealand. 10-year review.



TFD IMPF Meetings

- Scoping meeting: Gland, Switzerland – 2005
- Field tours and dialogues
 - Beihai, China – 2006
 - Pekanbaru, Indonesia – 2007
 - Vitoria, Brazil – 2008
- Final wrap-up: Switzerland - June 2008



Objectives of IMPF dialogue series

- Development of strategies to promote continued innovation in IMPF technology to
 1. optimize social and environmental benefits
 2. maintain competitive advantage and profitability
- Ongoing development of best management practice systems and a sustainable development framework for IMPF
- Field visits to test and refine the understanding gained



Dialogue conclusions to date: Gland

- Under the right conditions, IMPF can provide a range of important benefits
- External drivers have the greatest influence in shaping design and determining impacts
- Large-scale land use change has significant impact: maintaining a landscape perspective is important
- There is a need for clear definition of IMPF to minimize misunderstanding and address research gaps



Conclusions to date: Beihai & Pekanbaru

- Land tenure and use rights are the key issue in regions visited so far
- Companies are working in contexts where the political and legal framework cannot adequately ensure:
 - secure land tenure
 - rights
 - sustainable environmental stewardship
- Both companies and communities share common cause in terms of regulation, land tenure, productivity, ecosystem integrity, and timber security



More conclusions to date: Beihai & Pekanbaru

- Role of scale:
 - Scale determines choice
 - One size does not fit all: one template cannot satisfy all stakeholders' concerns
- Potential for community-corporate coalitions to lead government and promote transparency
- Potential for private sector to serve as vehicle for development
 - Use of corporate social responsibility (CSR) to address gaps in governance



Some site-specific issues affecting IMPF mgmt

China

Conversion of already-deforested land

Taxes favor agriculture over forestry

Govt unclear on needs of businesses operating in region

Mechanized harvesting

Mobile, migratory workforce

Lack of modern IMPF mgmt expertise

Indonesia

Conversion of natural forest

Mill expansion accelerating conversion

Human-wildlife conflict

Strong reliance on subcontracted and outsourced labor (80%)

Land competition: indigenous vs. migrant

HCVF as tool to manage conversion

Considerations of climate change



Ways forward

- Continued partnership-building between industry, banking & finance, civil society, communities and governments
- Strengthening of smallholder and community capacity
- Search for ways to provide choice in land-use planning
- Consider potential for technology to resolve environmental challenges and protect community interests
- Consider avoided deforestation as strategy to mitigate climate risk
- Private sector as vehicle for sustainable development



Private sector as vehicle for sustainable development

- Corporate best practice acquisition of land use rights
- Best management practices related to tenure and recognition of land/community rights issues
- Consider employment models that better protect labor rights, eliminate abuse, increase security, and resolve conflicts more directly
- Extend transparency to accountability at operations sites?
- Incorporate immediate as well as global risks in environmental risk assessments (climate, biodiversity, etc.)
- Adopt and maintain common standards for reporting



Unresolved questions

- Can IMPF be considered a neutral technology?
- Does IMPF development reduce pressure on natural forests?
- CSR: to what degree can and should it be extended? How effective can it be when operating within a weak governance framework?
- Companies and communities working together:
 - How to define the terms of partnership? (outgrowers)
 - How to define distribution of partnership benefits? How to achieve more equitable distribution of benefits?



Next steps

- Brazil dialogue – April 2008
- Switzerland workshop– June 2008
 - review of 3-year series
 - publication of TFD Review to report findings and conclusions





Thank you!

For more information:

TFD Secretariat at Yale University

Email: info@theforestsdialogue.org

Web: www.theforestsdialogue.org

Phone: + 1 203 432 5966

