

Field Dialogue on Tree Plantations in the Landscape in New Zealand

#TPL*New Zealand*

29 October – 2 November 2018
Rotorua, New Zealand



Te Uru Rākau
Forestry New Zealand

Group questions from yesterday

1. What are the challenges for realising more widely the values that underpin the Māori approach to forestry?
2. What are the challenges for the 1BT Program to deliver tangible outcomes?
3. How are the challenges for realising sustainable 'sustainable intensification'?
4. What are the challenges of NZ realising the full ecosystem services contribution of planted forests (including to its Paris commitments)?

Group 1 – Challenges to the adoption of a Māori forestry model

- **Relationship building:**

- Organisations initiate good faith engagement with indigenous or community entities
- Parties develop and agree on a collaborative process to create shared value outcomes
- Organisation to identify and understand key values underlying the Maori model:
 - sense of attachment and belonging to their whenua and treasures (taonga) – Ahi kaa, turangawaewae
 - Decision-making, control, and autonomy of ancestral lands and natural resources – Mana, rangatiratanga, mana motuhake
 - Guardianship and wise use of the land, waters, natural ecosystem, atmosphere - Kaitiakitanga
 - Sustainable and perpetual management of the land, water and air is a priority that supersedes profits
 - Creating and growing benefits for future generations

- **Organisation and indigenous entity develop shared-value projects and enterprises**


- Organisation provides for indigenous entity to carry out independent, due diligence on all partnership ventures. DD to include scoping of political, cultural, and legislative frameworks (including land tenure) that may constrain the adoption of a partnership initiative.
- Dual, coordinated and agreed approach to seek reform of state regulatory and policy framework

- **Promoting international adoption of successful models**

Group 2 (informed by gp 1) – What are the challenges for 1 billion tree program to deliver tangible outcomes?






- the need for communication with communities/iwi/society in a transparent way to:
 - Build social license with different stakeholders
 - Address perception of the society
- how to undertake monitoring, assessment and reporting to demonstrate progress and benefits of the Program ... not only a number
- how to get land, seed, labor availability including participation of iwi, landowners, smallholders
- how to develop market demand, economic models and necessary infrastructure for native species, regarding its timber and non timber products
- how to fit a Strategic Plan (including mapping), developed with multi stakeholder consultation/participation, to answer questions of:
 - What to plant, where (location and mosaic), and for what outcomes

Group 3 (informed by gp 2) - Sustainable intensification

- Like sustainability, SI both is “a harbour & voyage”  (Lakeland Queen)
- trust in actors’ values & commitment to sustainability are the foundation for their credibility (then maybe the semantics matter less?*)
- trust can only be built through dialogue and relationships, which form the basis for effective & credible communication*
- 25+ years of collaborative work towards characterising and governing sustainability of forestry, so build from that ...
- “good” forest governance frameworks (participatory + regulatory + voluntary) are a good basis for oversight of SI
- original focus of sustainability governance was on production; more recently, shifting along the value chain (eg ZND)
- a whole of chain/ lifecycle assessment should smile on forest(ry)/ products*

Group 4 – What are the solutions required for New Zealand to realize the full ecosystem services contribution of planted forests (including its Paris commitments)?

Priorities in order of need to solve

- (2) Developing a cost framework for ecosystem services to weigh the positive and negative outcomes, and trade-offs 
- (3) Who is going to pay? 
- (4) Measuring and monitoring (data) 
- (1) Awareness and education (of the public, landowners, and managers) 
- (5) Cultural views – historic bias favors farming 

In your working groups, focus on

- What is doable
- What is no doable
- Order of priorities

Group Numbers and Rooms

Group 1 – George Asher – Battan 1

Group 2 – Ivone Namikawa – Rutherford

Group 3 – Peter Kanowski – Seddon Room

Group 4 – Peter Clinton – Hillary Room