

Group 1 Are there norms that are common to forestry institutions around the world? Which of these support or obstruct women's inclusion?

“Women from the North”

/Global North

- How to understand Forestry Institutions?
- What are norms?

# Question 1 (and 3):

- History: Forestry as a para military organization (to protect the King's forest etc.)
- No facilities and not safe for women to be in the forest ("going to the forest" - having a liaison)
- Fire fighting- all women crews some times, because often men would not be in the team with women
- Sexual harassment common
- Women not seen as physical fit for the job

- Women's use of forest not seen as important economically- invisible
- CIFOR Indonesia research: Cutting down trees *became* men's work when big chain saws were introduced.

- Status Quo: 67% women students at Yale School of Forestry (?). All main forestry NGOs lead by women
- Even fewer women in the forest operations
- Positive discrimination existent some places (ex. American forestry services), but last hired first fired
- 6% foresters are women in Nepal, but still significant women group initiative

- Challenge: Gender and forestry two separate fields
- Uncomfortable for *women* to raise the question: it gives you the double head. Leads the attention to yourself
- Not taken seriously when raised; exhausting to be seen as the “gender person” or feminist
- Women in minority *stands out*, every thing they do is more visible.
- Resistance to join women forestry groups, and to be seen as a special group perception that this will widen the gap.
- “Gender mainstreaming” ... positive or negative to advance inclusion of women in the forestry sector? (not discussed in detail)

- Women's knowledge not more local than others *per se*. This is a norm that is replicating itself.
- Women from the North: seen as a men, or having no gender at all because not fitting into some traditional categories

- Discrimination: Asked if afraid for spiders or having a boyfriend –not seen as qualified for fieldwork
- But- can also be more convenient for women to focus on research, not in the field– *self select* out
- Comparable to ‘white privilege’; Men saying there is no boys’ club, not admitting the privileged position



- Women as a “marginalized/vulnerable group” (passive)- not an important contributor and *stakeholder* (active).

- New opportunities: Forest certification: women not active in setting the standards
- Forest protection- new opportunity to include women! Broadening of the forest sector- can be good for inclusion of women
- Missed opportunity of forestry not working for social change, ex. for literacy or health
- Transformative changes needed (ex: child care options in international workshops)

## Question 2: IPs

- Difficult to talk about: women not a group as IPs, with territorial rights etc.
- Local trad. IP knowlegde: gender seen as interfering with the local culture. Gender roles are dynamic, culture is always changing. Threatening to change the culture. Seen as imposing culture, HR etc. from the outside.
- IP repr. often men. Leadership “typical masculine”
- IPs, fear of post-colonisation

- Women seen as vulnerable group, not important stakeholder as a contributor (vs. IPs, acknowledged now as key stakeholders in REDD for ex.).
- Women don't *own* a lot of forest- decrease their importance
- IPs use stereotypes vs. women don't want to use the stereotypes of women to be a stakeholder group

Indigenous Peoples have enjoyed a relative high amount of attention to their interests within the forestry sector. Why have women not been able to convince these same institutions of the need to provide the same level of attention to their interests?

Global South

Q2: Indigenous people have enjoyed a relative high amount of attention to their interests within the forestry sector. Why have women not been able to convince these same institutions of the need to provide the same level of attention to their interests?

- SOFT agenda
  - Conservation vs livelihood: women is not linked to conservation
  - Forester do not want to hear about livelihood. Strong resistance
- Women leaders who do not represent women's agenda
- Need for strong women organization: Women champions
- Drawing on CEDAW vs ILO 69
- Are Women considered as stakeholder?
- Need space in national-regional-global fora

Q3: Why has research and knowledge on women's role in forest management not been effective in bringing about their inclusion in forestry sector?

- Bridging the national policy to ground level and visa versa.
- *Communication of research finding*
- **REDD is an opportunity**
  - Other sector involved along with forestry

Q1: Are there norms that are common to forestry institution around the world?

- What forester should look like?
- Forester supposed to do Hard sciences
- Loose your status when you work on social sciences
- Disciplinary boundary



# Group 3

research is important but not a driver of social change  
there has been a sufficient amount of research undertaken  
producers of research are not local people (women)  
research should make the business case  
research has not been translated into policy why?

Q2

Enforceable legal instrument in place but no institutional  
accountability

IP have distinct property ownership

Power distribution as related to IP is more manageable