

Breakout Session 2

4F Scoping Dialogue

Afternoon of Day 2

Breakout Questions

Stakeholder Groups :

Business/ Environment/ Social

From your stakeholder group perspective and based on the discussions and list of issues:

- What's your vision of how to reconcile the competitions between food, fuel, fiber and forest?
- What are the big barriers to achieve your vision?

List of Issues / Fracture Lines

1. Getting people's attention – how?
2. Landscape-level land use planning
3. New/appropriate technologies
4. Intensification to meet future needs
5. Governance
6. Values that underpin norms
7. Tactics to scale up
8. Stakeholder participation in decision making
9. Consumption (freedom of choice)
10. What vision we have for our planet?
11. Food security vs. sovereignty
12. Globalization vs. localization
13. How to approach the 4F issue – prioritization?

Business Group

Vision: Sustainable Forest Management of existing forests with development of protected area network and intensification of planted forest can help meet future wood and fiber needs; and help reduce the land conflict among the other Fs.

Barriers:

- Existing landuse planning generally does not favor forestry development
- NGOs and society generally does not favor intensively managed forest and technology required to increase productivity
- Full market value for fiber, biofuel and other ecosystem services are not realized
- Market distortions due to inequality of subsidies, taxes, certification and sustainable production standards among all sectors
- NGO's vision to use less wood not more wood

The Forests Dialogue 4Fs Scoping Discussion

Environmental Group

June 2, 2011

What's your vision of how to reconcile the competition between food, fuel, fiber and forest?

Depends upon the scale, if you look at a landscape scale, do good land-use planning, the market will kick in depending upon how the local land-use planning works, which will alter in time, based on markets

But this would require most of Africa's cropping area to be protected because it's mostly subsistence.

But you could look at a landscape scale and identifying the best options for what should be grown where and where yield enhancements are possible.

But this requires a lot of capacity-building, good governance- a lot of barriers.

Do you put food first? What happens when a farmer switches from subsistence to commodity production?

Biodiversity safeguards/local needs have to be part of the landscape-level planning.

-Acre process in Brazil, where the state governments were mandated to do land-use planning. They mapped land, set parameters for forest protection, cultivation areas and spent years reaching out to communities to understand what would be required to implement the planning effectively.

Those in cleared areas could be zoned to reforest, others to harvest in forests (NTFPs) and the planning impacted infrastructure planning.

Some cut areas were regrown while other areas were cut (where most suitable for agriculture.)

But does this work at a global level? If you allow the market to impact crop choices, this could ensure that food demand was met.

This would allow you to value ecosystem services too.

We know the market will cause a shift- e.g. with Acacia in Indo moving over to palm oil but as environmentalists, we should be concerned with the impacts of moving over to other things- e.g. loss of Acacia can stimulate deforestation to make up for lack of fiber.

So how do we make decisions about which areas to conserve since this shifts in time and depending upon the region.

Barriers division- we shouldn't think about current technologies but for the future- ag waste, algae, so there may not be this conflict between food and fuel.

It is also a management issue and a time question.

What about solid biomass.

How do we prioritization- how do we speak with local people. They did involve local people but it was about how to make it fair.

Barrier is little or access to water and mechanisms for distributing money equitably.

Can we build on a bottom-up vision from Acre?

Do these need a top-down boundary determination, like with the Living Forests reports.

If we zone out areas for subsistence farming and look at the 'balance' we need to fulfill for each region. Overall we still have to reach the same result in terms of feed, conservation and food production.

Acre- it is an ideal experiment and most of us look at it as a perfect scenario but it's not a solution that would work in Sao Paulo to determine protection over the Mata Atlantica.

What is the next step- how to scale up?

Biodiversity services and food- how do we mix the two?

Do we mean to separate forests and food or could we be talking about agroforestry? There are other synergies.

There is a huge amount of biodiversity in managed lands- similar to looking at SFM.

Acre- also with extractive reserves, that function well but can't support a growing population.

Depends upon the scale.

This is a very different conversation if you're discussing with or without investors.

What is the best way to practically manage land,

We need to have priorities- first look at underutilizes land.

Is it worth having a global vision? But as you get down to RCAs

But we're being asked to look at how to feed 9 billion people within the global constraints at the same time.

How do you link the global with local/landscape-level vision.

What do we do about landscape-level planning??

How do you decide whether to put food or forests first? In Brazil, 30% of deforested land is not used. Is this land that can regrow? Is this where we use a top-down approach.

Land-use planning in the alps entails a broad, top-down vision in conjunction with ground bottom-up planning and reconciling the two.

But is there a way to use the studies that IIASA produces. Does there not have to be a government decision to put in place rules, how much lobbying can be done in order for global mapping to get into the UN?

WWF envisioned how global maps could be used at the UN, but then you have the governance issue. Land-use planning is only as good as the people who will influence it.

There is a global vision that this needs to be done locally, following best practice guidelines, looking at areas of risk and social/environmental factors, done by local people, the market can designate the rest of the land.

The technical part is not a problem, it's the political and governance issues.

Feeding people in a constrained world could be done.

Should we look at consumption? What is the role of the environmental community.

We should be able to talk about it- incentives, tax incentives to have children, education for girls. The Cairo conference was about empowering women.

What went wrong?

Lobbyng for money

What are the incentives for lower consumption? We can look at the synergies.

- 1) We don't care what you produce but we just want to protect forests.s
- 2) Governance is a major barrier.

Countries believe that the way to get rich is to remove forests.

Social perspective: reconciling competitions

- Need of setting local groups, indigenous peoples, smallholders as **main part of the solution**, not co-benefit, because they are **owners of resources, not just people linked to forest**
- Need of recognizing **rights** of indigenous peoples and local communities over **resources**,
- Need of **ethical**, transparent ways of doing **business** for companies
- Local communities and Indigenous peoples **right** to decide engagement with businesses (**FPIC**)

- 
- IP's and Local groups rights to **excercise** traditional **stewardship** systems
 - Need of **recognition by political institutions** of local groups to be part of decision making and capacity building related to that

Barriers for achieving the vision

- Vision of different sectors regarding the un-importance of social issues
- Poor implementation of Free, Prior, Informed and Consent
- Problems with lack of implementation of regulations
- Problems with distribution mechanisms and sustainability with indigenous communities and local peoples (no equitable distribution) (REDD example).