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Introduction

Plantation forests - even-aged stands of a single tree species established primarily for wood production - are one of the defining features and, against many criteria, one of the successes of forestry in the past century. Plantation forests are currently an important source of wood, contributing to 3% of total world industrial wood supply, and are expected to continue playing an important role in the global wood supply in the future.

An increasing proportion of the planted forests are “intensively managed”, and these forests contribute disproportionately to industrial wood supply. Intensively managed planted forests (IMPFs) are defined here as plantation forests of relatively high productivity, in which the owner makes a sustained investment, over the life of the forest, to optimise returns from industrial wood supply.

As WWF notes, “well managed and appropriately located plantations can play an important role in healthy, diverse and multi-functional landscapes”, and can generate substantial economic benefits. WWF also notes that plantations can impose significant environmental and social costs: the potential disbenefits of IFM have been articulated strongly in terms of environmental degradation and social costs. Critics of IFM argue that the consequences of large-scale land use change and wood fibre-based industrialisation, especially for the rural poor and the environment, and argue that these costs often outweigh the associated benefits.

Intensively managed planted forests - concepts, locations, trends

Definitions of planted forests have been evolving to accommodate the new forms of forestry and to clarify the blurred distinction with some forms of managed natural forests. Both proponents and many critics of IFM prefer not to use the term “forest” in describing them. favouring terms like “tree farms” which they believe to better reflect the characteristics of these land use systems. Contemporary forms of IFM are distinguished from other forests by composition, scale, management, and productivity. IFM are typified by reliance on one or a few species or interspecific hybrids, established and managed as even-aged plantation stands. The
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Various other IMPF2 contexts: eg, TFD FPIC, GMT processes
IMPF2: other learning processes

http://newgenerationplantations.org/en/what/
Expansion focused on “fastwood forests”

Figure 1 Growth in planted forest area (million ha)

McDermott 2012 for FSC, Figure 1

CIFOR 2003
Changing balance of global wood supply

Fig. 6  Estimates of global natural forest roundwood production 1945–2030

The expansion of other plantation crops...
IMPF: a history of contest

Photo credits: Philip Adlard; stopgetrees.org/; EJOLT - Vanessa Vilarinho
... + haze, land grabs, food security ...
The first shoots of a green economy …
IMPF2 survey

- Online survey of IMPF1 dialogue participants, other TFD processes, NGP, IMPF authors ...
- 55 respondents from 200 invitations
  - 25% corporate forestry
  - 25% NGO or civil society
  - 50% research, government, international orgs, SME
- 50% IMPF or other TFD processes
- 50% NGPP or similar
- 67% ‘engaged’ with forest certification
IMPF2: starting points

Critically-important factors

- Good governance
- High levels of CSR
- Respect for rights
- Empowerment of workers & smallholders
- Integrated land use
- Dialogue & conflict resolution processes
- Implementation models
IMPF2 survey
– progress against critical factors
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Recommendations
1. Governments
   - implement principles
   - land use planning
2. Financing institutions
   - due diligence, governance
3. Businesses
   - proactive CSR
4. All actors
   - equitable sharing of benefits & costs
## IMPF2 survey
– performance against recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>1. Performance of national and sub-national governments</th>
<th>2. Performance of institutions financing or underwriting IMPF investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents: 47</td>
<td>Number of respondents: 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>3. Performance of businesses engaged in IMPF activities</th>
<th>4. Models of IMPF-based development that share benefits and costs equitably</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents: 49</td>
<td>Number of respondents: 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPF2 survey:
Overall performance, against ‘own’ criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of respondents: 50**
IMPF2 survey: overall performance against own criteria

Generally …

- evolution rather than transformation
- leaders & laggards
- more progress against environmental than social criteria
- variation within & between regions
- progress on the ground often slower than boardroom commitments
IMPF2 survey: enabling & constraining factors

+ effective engagement between s’holders
+ good governance
+ principles (need translation to practice)
+ certification (smallholders disadvantaged)
- workforce & smallholder participation models
- sustainability challenges
+ ‘how we think’ about IMPF & forests
IMPF2 survey: what’s new & good ...

- landscape approaches (eg HCV protection)
- mechanisms for early constructive engagement
- collaborative monitoring & information sharing
- benefit-sharing mechanisms
- wider community dialogue
- co-learning processes
- new technologies, & holistic implementation: planning, precision forestry, genetics, processing ...
Planted forests: ideotypes ...

State of the World’s Forests

Enhancing the socioeconomic benefits from forests

fao.org/forestry

PNG landowners, Markham Valley (Peter Kanowski)
Planted forests: ideotypes …
IMPF: various realities

Photos: Stora Enso/ Stephen Midgley; Peter Kanowski
IMPF: various realities
IMPF: possible foci for dialogue

1. How should IMPF actors respond to drivers?
IMPF: possible foci for dialogue

2. Definitions & the scope of dialogue

Figure 1. — Scope and concept of planted forests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuum of Forest Characteristics</th>
<th>Non-forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trees outside forests</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of native species, where there are no clearly visible indications of human activities and the ecological processes are not significantly disturbed</td>
<td>Stands smaller than 0.5 ha; trees in agricultural land (agroforestry systems, home gardens, orchards); trees in urban environments; and scattered along roads and in landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of naturally regenerated native species where there are clearly visible indications of human activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified natural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Productive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siivicultural practices for intensive management (weeding, fertilizing, thinning, selective logging)</td>
<td>Forest of introduced species and in some cases native species, established through planting or seeding mainly for production of wood or non-wood goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-natural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted natural regeneration</td>
<td>Forest of native species, established through planting, seeding or coppice of planted trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plantation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-forest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carle & Holmgren. 2008. *Forest Products J* 58(12): 6-18, Figure 1
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3. Enabling governance

The Palangka Raya Declaration on Deforestation and the Rights of Forest Peoples

Arts. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2014.05.008
www.forestpeoples.org
IMPF: possible foci for dialogue

4. Giving effect to a landscape approach
IMPF: possible foci for dialogue

5. Equitable & meaningful benefit sharing

Riau, Indonesia: Photo – CIFOR
Lao PDR & PNG: Photos – Peter Kanowski
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6. Technologies & Sustainability

FuturaGene’s eucalyptus is approved for commercial use in Brazil

São Paulo, April 9, 2015 – The Brazilian National Technical Commission on Biosafety (CTNBio) today approved the commercial use of the yield enhanced eucalyptus developed by FuturaGene, a wholly owned subsidiary of Suzano Pulp and Paper. Field experiments conducted since 2006 at various locations in Brazil have demonstrated an approximate 20% increase in yield compared to its equivalent conventional variety.
IMPF: possible foci for dialogue

- IMPF in context – responding to drivers
- Scope & definitions
- Governance systems
- Implementing a landscape approach
- Sharing benefits & costs equitably
- Technologies & sustainability