Breakout Session 2

TFD 4Fs Scoping Dialogue

Morning of Day 2

Breakout Group Questions

- What are the **top four** fracture lines for food, fuel, fiber and forestry that your group want to further explore?

- What are the current spectrum of views on each fracture line? By which stakeholder groups?

- What are the underling reasons that are creating each fracture line?

Group 1

Facture line identification

Facture lines discussion (1/4)

- BIG Challenge = competition for scare land resources for economic development
  - Food, fuel and fiber “win” which drives forest loss
- BIG Opportunity = efficient and equitable use of scare resources based around sustainable management
- BIG Question = Intensification model suggested by LFC and V2050 – does it work/how to make it work better?
  - Right incentives
  - Governance/rights/tenure for sustainable management
  - Capacity building/skills development
  - Small scale v industrial scale
  - Consumption levels/consumption impacts
  - Carbon & ecological impacts or footprint
  - Development and deployment of appropriate technology

Facture lines discussion (2/4)

- Globalization – supply and demand
  - Drives intensification
  - Global retailer supply chains = new gate keepers
  - Political economy = concentrations of power/how and who decides
  - Capacity building/technology
  - Local models to leverage global markets
  - Policy incentives at local level to support forests protection (Costa Rica)
  - Shift in economic power and n/s trade flows

Facture lines (3/4)

- Governance - illegality & s enforcement – how/who makes resource allocation decisions, involving and influenced by whom?
  - Role of Government
    - Building accountability
    - Addressing corruption
    - New policy developments like Lacey Act & REDD+/ FLEGT/VPA based on phased approach
  - Role of Corporations
    - Internal governance
    - Supply chain management
    - Advocacy on improved governance by governments
    - Capacity building/social services by companies

Facture lines (4/4)

- No meaningful discourse on population growth, levels & controls
- Scale up strategies for “practical” and “game changing” solutions
  - Global/local governance
  - Global/local capacity building
  - Global/local movements
  - Transformation/incremental
  - Speed and scale
- Scale up options – CSR, sectors, standards, soft and hard regulation
- Connected v non-connected consumers
- Involved v non-involved engaged/non engaged companies

Spectrum of views

- Changing social values & economic incentives for effective resource use and consumption
- Technical v social
- Top down v bottom up
- Hard policy v soft policy
- Value based decision-making v vested interest decision making

Who/how to influence

- Media
- Supply chain focus/public policy
- Don’t forget the rest or other approaches
- Agenda setting, rule making, implementation and enforcement/accountability
- Small land holders engagement
- All wanting to accelerate positive action
- **5 F** forces landscape level perspective, interdependence and connected of these issues, new type of decision making……integrated systems solutions

Who/how to influence

- Resource owners
- Politicians
- Companies/industry/B2B value chain analysis/ choice editing
- Critical geographies & value chains 80/20 China, Indonesia, Brazil, India
- Think beyond pilots to scale up
- Policy leverage points – Lacey Act, UNFCCC
- New data/new analysis

Facture lines for future dialogue

1. Intensification to meet future needs in a carbon and resource constrained world
   - Means of Intensification and supporting strategies as well as the other development options
   - Technologies – low to high technology
2. Governance
   - Addressing illegality
   - Capacity building around enforcement
   - Policy case studies that have worked – integrated and effective land use planning

Facture lines for future dialogues

3. Values that underpin norms, decisions and actions
   - Population policy
   - Climate justice
   - Exclusion/inclusive
   - Empowered/unempowered
4. Tactics for scale up
   - Incremental v transformation
   - Incentivize the leaders and regulate the laggards

Fracture Lines - Group 2

1.1 Getting people's attention – how?

- how to characterise/ communicate issues? (impact, consistency …)
- tectonic shift or incremental response?
- persuading people to engage in dialogue

- alternative models of development

1.2. People's rights

- the REDD+ debate writ large
- global/ national good
  vs local/ individual rights
- smallholders as well as
  Indigenous & forest-dependent peoples
- C21 land (inc. for water) grabs

1.3. Informed, responsible, sustainable/ reduced consumption

- Prioritisation of consumption?
  F_1 vs F_2 vs F_3 vs … F_n
- Proactive or imposed change?
- Markets for ecosystem services (terminology; barriers to implementation)
- Level playing fields – all sector accountable (eg through certification systems)
- Role of regulation (eg tax) vs markets

2. Landscape-level land use planning

- meeting demand for the 5Fs (in CC world) will require that land be used 'well' (iLUC)
- market forces alone don't make this choice (partly because of inefficiencies, externalities …)
- land use allocation is a fundamental point of engagement between sectors & actors
- spatial planning tools available (offsets?)
- national & sub-national dialogue as catalyst

FL: how to harness both rational planning (regulation) & markets synergistically

3. New/ appropriate technologies

- Facilitating learnings across sectors
- Management regimes:
  productivity & sustainability
- Resource use efficiencies
- GMOs
- MRV
- Socially-enabling change
  (6^{th} F – Facebook)

4. Sectoral divisions diminishing/ new business structures forming

- Opportunities for learnings & innovation across sectors, & within organisations
- Information inefficiencies/ sharing

The Forests Dialogue 4Fs Scoping Discussion

Breakout Group 3

June 2, 2011

1) Bioenergy
Land competition of using land to grow energy
Is it a threat or a solution?

2) Technology (for farming/forestry)
Does it create efficiencies? Includes genetics, big agriculture versus smallholders (large farms/agribusiness versus family farms, fertilizers, pesticides; farming technologies to reduce emissions.

3) Stakeholder Participation in Decision-making
Public participation in decision-making; who/how decisions are made and what are the drivers

4)Consumption
How should we address, buy better vs buy less; how to shape consumption patterns in face of peoples' sovereign right to make consumer choices

==========

1) Bioenergy/Land Competition
What are the current spectrum of views on each fracture line?

- Those who believe this is a vital source of rural income
- Is a renewable energy solution, creates energy security, low emissions, makes good use of a waste product

- **Who's for it?** Big Agriculture, government policymaker looking for acceptable climate change, energy solutions, industries that need liquid fuel, countries that want energy independence
- Some rural communities and businesses who can benefit
- Feedstock countries
- Some NGOs -
- Some forest companies who see it as creating a new supply opportunities
- Some energy companies

- **Who are against it?** Forest companies who see it as a threat to the forest basket,

direct land use and indirect land use change (iLUC) camp (diversion from food to fuel creates demand for more land for food elsewhere in the world, which can result in forest loss), those against ag subsidies, those concerned about food security and impacts on prices

Some NGOs, some forest companies, farmers, pulp and paper milling industry, food companies, oil-rich countries

What are the underlying reasons that are creating each fracture line?

- Poor examples (e.g. Jatropha in India)
- Strong political influence (e.g. corn ethanol subsidies), EU mandate are promoting biofuels
- Difficult figures/science
- Opportunity or threat to business (e.g. food companies, oil companies, forestry)
- Forward vision versus current threats/costs/direct and indirect impacts
- Some businesses are looking for future opportunities
- Some energy companies are coming in and cutting corners, suspicious of biofuels moving into forest areas.

2) Technology for farming/forestry

What are the current spectrum of views on each fracture line?

Anti technology

- Anti-genetics, franken
- Tied into the Agri-tech companies
- Small farmers being out-competed and displaced by high-tech farming
- Globalization/powerful multinationals
- Biosafety
- Seed bankers
- Organic/local vs global specialization and trade
- Divided science
- Agricultural pollution
- Precautionary principle
- Undermines traditional knowledge
- Traditional/cultural practices threatened
- Higher emissions due to inputs and transport
- Lower employment opportunities

Pro- technology

- Big business can increase productivity
- Can't produce enough food without large companies
- Poor soils can't be used without technology
- How else can we feed the world?
- Intensification on existing land can protect forest- land sparing
- Big companies and governments can provide extension services/ nucleus model
- Solution to food waste

- Resistance to pests
- How we deliver the volume needed to meet global demand
- Input reducing technologies
- Customizing /optimizing feed stocks (reducing waste, increasing efficiencies)
- More profitable for companies and small farmers/higher eco-efficiency

Who is for it?
For:
Big ag
Retail
Biotech
Government
Traditional and niche agricultural producers
Indigenous groups
NGOs- suspicious rather than against, depending upon safeguards

Against:
Consumers- although they may have strong opinions against but their choices suggest for

There are people who are ideologically opposed to these and others who would be ok if safeguards put in place

What are the underlying reasons that are creating each fracture line?

Divided science
Land-sparing: intensification debate- does land-sparing spare land or just increase profitability and hence more production?
History of poor examples, bad track record
Anti-globalization, suspicion of multinationals, it is an emotional issue
Viewpoints according to wealth- the starving/hungry versus those who are rich
Inequalities- access to money and resources to the technologies

3) Stakeholder Participation in Decision-making

Who are the stakeholders? Communities: farm and forest dependent, indigenous, traditional, local, migrant, family forest owners, family agriculture, women

Government, business, consumers, NGOs (social, environmental, campaigning), Labor, academics, urban and rural poor

What are the current spectrum of views on each fracture line?

- Top-down decision-making doesn't involve stakeholders (bad)
- National priorities and efficient governance can't take decisions only based on local opinions

- National/state/international priorities and policies do not allow for local participation
- Multinational investment ignores stakeholders
- Business certainty versus customary flexibilities creates government and business uncertainty
- Governments' interpretation of sovereignty versus self-determination

What are the underlying reasons that are creating each fracture line?

- Top-down decision-making without free, prior, informed consent.
- National/state/international priorities and policies do not allow for local participations
- More efficient for multinational to only deal with government guidelines
- There is inequitable access to decision-making
- Lack of recognition of values and rights
- Governments' preservation of sovereignty
- Social justice- how is it defined, how is it respected, the role of governments in delivering
- Lack of appropriate models to recognize local circumstances
- Inequitable access to decision-making

4)Consumption

Personal rights/freedoms versus need to move towards sustainable consumption choices
Buy better versus buy less
Should we price the environmental/social costs or stay within the status quo?

What are the current spectrum of views on each fracture line?

- Consumers want to be able to buy/eat/use whatever they want/can afford
- Cost of goods don't recognize the full environmental cost of producing it
- People should consider global sustainability versus their own personal preferences
- We should be responsible as consumers for supporting a sustainable future
- Regulations- can ban bad chemicals etc.
- Consumers should pay more for certified/more sustainable goods
- The full cost of goods should be included in price via government policies (full cost pricing)

What are the underlying reasons that are creating each fracture line?

- How should these costs be internalized? Uncertainties over how to achieve this.
- Shifting of aspirations- people want to be able to buy what they want versus people should be responsible for a long-term
- Governments can't influence personal decisions
- Government incentives/taxes/subsidies can influence big business decisions that have trickle-down impacts

- Consumers don't want to pay more for better products, despite saying they prefer them
- Even if you want to, it's more expensive and difficult to "buy better" even if you want to
- Waste is 'free' in most countries
- Subsidies based on lobbies/history rather than what is best for forests/agricultural sustainability
- Confusing information on footprint choices

Group 4

What is the vision we have for our planet?

- What are the scenarios and consequences?
  - More open to look at different scenarios and more understanding for different consequences
- Adaptation v.s. Mitigation for climate change
  - Too much focus on mitigation to 2 degrees?
- Trade-off v.s. do-it-all?
  - Do-it-all is too difficult:
    - Danger in set the goal first and work back (e.g. ZNDD Scenario)
    - Visionary v.s. Practical Short-Term Solutions
    - Do we need to sacrifice biodiversity?
  - Do-it-all is a must
- Diet Shift (Reduce Animal-based Protein Intake)
  - Possible or not for implementation?
- Industrialized production v.s. local small-scale production:
  - Market is driving us towards industrialized production.
  - Can industrialized production co-exist with local production without government intervention?

Food Security v.s. sovereignty:

- Population increase/urbanization/climate change v.s. IP's rights and livelihood
- Western Value/Practice v.s. Others' Value/Practice
- Top-down approach v.s. bottom up:
  - Land tenure is fundamental for IP's self-determination in development. How we achieve that?
  - How much the price-rise does the small farmer capture? Fair-pricing as a solution
  - Given important role of small farmers, should there be a farmer-centric approach?

Globalization v.s. localization:

- Subsidization: solution or problem?

How to approach the 4F issue?

- Should there be a priority for the Fs? Food as a priority? Forest as a priority?
  - Do we prioritize based on global natural capital values? Should we consider the priority base on which “F” has more options? What is the timing?
- How do we balance among different priorities?
- What’s a viable option?

What are the solutions?

- What is the right combination of **voluntary** and **mandatory** approaches?
  - Market is not the only solution, governance structure among others are needed
  - Will market approaches designed in western drive changes in the emerging economy? Can the pressure points be along the supply chain that managed by multi-nationals? But how you address the demand side in emerging economy?
  - What is the government role?
- Can **technology** be the solution?
  - Technology address the supply-side problem; but we need to look whole value chain and improvements can be made through the whole chain
- **Passive v.s. Proactive**?
  - Chronic disasters or Crisis that go beyond our adaptation capacity are needed for big changes to happen?
  - Proactive change: e.g.Brazilian with regard to deforestation rate (Look at models outside of forestry sector; what are the leverage points?)
- To what extend and how we can provide **subsidies/incentives** for landscape approach?
  - How can IP's efforts in conservation be rewarded? Cautions against the perverse incentives
- **Reduce Waste**: How do you reduce waste in production & in consumption?
- How do we bring out the **consumption pattern and governance structure change**?