

# The Fore<mark>sts</mark> Dialogue

#### TFD STEERING COMMITTEE 2014

Lennart Ackzell Federation of Swedish Family Forest Owners

Chris Buss International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Joji Cariño Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)

Peter Dewees Finland

Gary Dunning The Forests Dialogue (TFD)

James Griffiths Switzerland

Jeannette Gurung

Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)

Kalyan Hou The Center for People and Forests—Cambodia (RECOFTC)

Chris Knight PricewaterhouseCoopers

Skip Krasny Kimberly-Clark

Joe Lawson, TFD Co-Leader MWV

**Eduardo Mansur** Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Antti Marjokorpi Stora Enso

**Ivone Namikawa** Klabin

Sara Namirembe World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)

Cécile Ndjebet African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests (REFACOF)

Milagre Nuvunga Micaia Foundation—Mozambique

**Ghan Shyam Pandey** Global Alliance of Community Forestry (GACF)

Ren Peng Global Environmental Institute—China

Miriam Prochnow Apremavi—Brazil

**Päivi Salpakivi-Salomaa** UPM

Teri Shanahan International Paper

Rod Taylor, TFD Co-Leader WWF International

Dominic Walubengo Forest Action Network—Kenya

# The Forests Dialogue ENGAGE! EXPLORE! CHANGE!

# Field Dialogue on Food, Fuel, Fiber and Forests

# 02–05 September, 2014 | Punkaharju, Finland Co-Chairs' Summary Report

By Juha Hakkarainen, Anders Portin, Miriam Prochnow and Rod Taylor

## INTRODUCTION

The Forests Dialogue (TFD) convened a four-day field dialogue on Food, Fuel, Fiber and Forests (4Fs) in Finland in collaborations with Metsäteollisuus, Stora Enso, UPM, Metsä Group, MTK, WWF, Metsämiesten Säätiö, Finnish Forest Foundation, Metsähallitus, and World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). 30 participants from 19 countries and 23 key stakeholders in Finland (see page 13 for a list of participants) participated in the dialogue with the objectives to:

- Share experiences from Finland on land-use decision-making and practices in a landscape dominated by productive forests;
- Develop deeper understanding of how Finnish stakeholders balance demand for bio-energy, timber, pulp & paper products and eco-system services in this landscape;
- Synthesize lessons learnt from Finland that can inform land-use decision-making and practices internationally.

The 4Fs Finland Dialogue is the third field dialogue under TFD's initiative "Changing Outlooks on Food, Fuel, Fiber and Forests" which aims to build new cross-sectoral partnerships that foster fairer and more sustainable land use decisions. A scoping dialogue was held in Washington D.C. in June 2011, followed by a field dialogue in Capão Bonito, Brazil in November 2012 and a field dialogue in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia in March, 2014.

Participants in the Finland Dialogue spent the first two days visiting pulp and paper mills, wood-based bio-energy refineries and forest holdings owned by local families as well as companies in the southeastern part of Finland. Participants had the opportunity to discuss issues with local land owners, as well as representatives from forestry industry, government and NGOs. Based on the observations and learnings from the field and outcomes from previous dialogues under this initiative, participants



Break-out groups discuss ways forward on 4Fs globally



4Fs participants engage industry representatives



Participants observe an active timber harvest at a UPM field site



Learning about floating log transport

engaged in a day and a half of discussions in plenary and small working group settings. This summary aims to capture key dialogue discussions and reflect on key lessons learnt from Finland that can inform land use decision-making and practices internationally. More details about the field trip and presentations during the dialogue can be found at TFD's website.

## THE FINNISH CONTEXT<sup>i</sup>

**Productive and expanding forests dominate the landscape:** Finland is the fifth largest country in Western Europe with an area of 338,424 km<sup>2</sup> and a population of 5.4 million. Forests cover 76% of Finland's land area and 67% is productive forests. (See Figure 1: Finland—a land of forests) Finland has about 30 indigenous tree species. Main species in productive forests are Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), Norway spruce (*Picea abies*), downy birch (*Betula pubescens*) and silver birch (*Betula pendula*).



The available forest resources in Finland are increasing: annual cutting has been smaller than the annual growth since the 1970s. For the past few years, the annual growth of wood volume in Finnish forests exceeded one hundred million cubic meters and exceeded removals by over 30 million cubic metres. The current total volume of timber in Finnish forests is 2,189 million cubic meters.

**Ongoing challenge to halt biodiversity decline:** Nevertheless, the positive annual increment in the wood stock does not automatically translate to greater biodiversity. According to an IUCN evaluation conducted in 2010,<sup>ii</sup> biodiversity has been declining in Finland's forested landscapes and the number of threatened species is increasing. The increasing demand for wood-based energy in Finland may decrease the amount of residues left in the forests and negatively impact biodiversity.



#### FIGURE 2 FOREST GROWTH AND REMOVAL BETWEEN 1920-2012

**Forests offer multiple uses (food, fuel, fiber, forests, fresh water and more):** The forests provide fuel, food, fiber, natural forests for recreation, fresh water, and many other ecosystem services.

- Fiber: The forest industry accounts for 18% of Finland's total industrial output value, 20% of the export revenue and around 4% of the GNP. The forest sector as a whole accounts for 3.5% of employment in Finland. Competition among different companies in the forest industry helps to continuously drive innovation and improvements in the sector.
- Fuel: 20% energy used in Finland is generated through wood. The pulp and paper industry has been generating energy for its own use from residues to reduce waste and costs. Additionally, there is increasing demand for wood-based bioenergy created by EU regulations encouraging a shift to renewable energy as well as the need for energy security.
- Food: The most important non-wood products are game, berries, mushrooms and lichen. The greatest value in economic terms is game, particularly moose. In Northern Finland, reindeer management is also regionally significant.
- Forests: Most Finns have summer cottages in the forests and enjoy outdoor recreational activities in the forests. The Finnish Statistical Yearbook 2013 estimated that nature-based tourism contributed around €1,100 million to the Finnish economy.<sup>iii</sup> Conservation of biodiversity is supported by national policies: e.g., the METSO program (see box 1), tax and financial incentives etc.
- Fresh water and other ecosystem services: Forests help maintain the quality and quantity of water in Finland. Forests also provide other ecosystem services (e.g., good air quality, carbon storage, etc.).

**Conservation is carried out by a combination of voluntary and mandatory approaches:** In northern Finland, large forest conservation areas have been established in state-owned forests (See Figure 3 for area strictly protected in Finland). In the southern and middle boreal forests where most of the land is privately owned, conservation is carried out through a combination of regulatory and voluntary approaches:



4Fs participants get the bird's eye view of Stora Enso's Imatra mill and first-generation biorefinery



Participants from Finland and Ethiopia during a field visit to Metsä Fibre's facility in Joutseno, Finland



Crane claws moving and organizing stockpiles of timber at UPM's mill in southeastern Finland



Participants discuss the international context of 4Fs

#### BOX 1 METSO-THE FORESTS BIODIVERSITY PROGRAM FOR SOUTHERN FINLAND

#### (Source of information: METSO Fact Sheet http://www.metsonpolku.fi/fi/julkaisut/esitteet/METSO\_Forest\_Biodiversity\_Programme.pdf)

METSO (2008–2016) aims to "halt the ongoing decline in the biodiversity of forest habitats and species, and establish stable favorable trends especially in Southern Finland's forest ecosystems." It includes both privately and state-owned lands. Through this program, the Finnish government aims to increase nature reserves to about 96,000 ha and increase the preserved area in commercially managed privately owned forests to 82,000 ha. Funding for the METSO program is around 40 million euro per year.

Key features of METSO program include:

**Voluntary:** Conservation agreements are signed between forest owners and authorities on a voluntary basis. Forests owners can choose between two types of agreements based on their preferences: temporary conservation contracts (set for 10 years) and permanent protection contracts;

**Payment for ecosystem services:** There is a set of criteria developed for the selection of qualified sites for the program based on the ecological structure of forests and forest habitat types important for biodiversity and ecosystem services. The program offers landowners of qualified sites tax-free compensation for lost revenue for converting production forests into conservation areas;

**Research:** Research is vital in assessing the program's long-term ecological, economic and social impacts. Under the program, 2 million euros per year are allocated to support both basic and applied research on forest biodiversity.

- Regulations: Around 13–14% of forests are strictly protected under law and the Forests Act gives recommendations and guidelines for conserving biodiversity in commercial forests.
- Voluntary measures: Some examples include forest certification, training on biodiversity conservation and conservation agreements. Some of the conservation agreements offer cash payments as incentives for land owners: For example, the METSO program (See Box 1).
  - Land owners make strategic land use decisions guided by national policies and supported by associations and NGOs: In Finland, 62% of the forest is owned by private families; more than 1 million people own forests with an average size of 30 ha. Forest owners enjoy autonomy in making their own decisions on how they want to manage their land guided by national policies. Their land use management objectives are changing towards more multi-uses. Associations and NGOs lend support and provide information to land owners to enable more strategic and informed decisions. The long history of family forestry has contributed to strong emotional and spiritual ties between land owners and the forests which in turn impact their decisions on how to manage their forests. But through inheritance, properties are becoming smaller and smaller. Importantly, more land owners have moved into the city away from the forests. This poses a challenge for how to maintain strong ties between land owners and forests.

Field Dialogue on Food, Fuel, Fiber and Forests | 02–05 September 2014 | Punkaharju, Finland



#### FIGURE 3 LEVEL OF STRICT FOREST PROTECTION BY VEGETATION ZONE

#### **KEY ISSUES AND LESSONS LEARNT**

Participants identified the following key issues and lessons from Finland's experience and explored their international relevance and translatability.

#### How to balance conservation and other increasing demands on forest resources?

Given the IUCN findings on loss of biodiversity (see above), some stakeholders question if Finland's forest management practices strike an adequate balance between wood production and biodiversity conservation objectives.

#### How to conduct conservation?

Finland presents a conservation model that combines large protected areas (in the north) with the cumulative efforts of conservation efforts across numerous small-scale productive forests (mostly in the south). This model motivates conservation at scale through sustainable forest management and motives of numerous family forest owners. But it has limited ability to do large-scale conversation planning across a large number of autonomous land holdings. Some participants cautioned that biodiversity could take a second seat to timber production imperatives in Finland. While others argued that 95% of productive forests in Finland are certified. And certification has been used as a tool to ensure that biodiversity is one of the priorities in productive forests.

Sustainable forest management is a tool to ensure biodiversity and ecosystem services while meeting other demands on forest resources: Productive forests, if managed sustainably, can provide land



4Fs participants engage industry representatives with questions regarding market opportunities



A representative from Gasum presents on the possibilities of bio-SNG



One of UPM's active timber management sites in southeastern Finland



4Fs participants discussing the concept of "every man's right" with local land owners

owners income while contributing to conservation. The key is to equip land owners with information and tools to manage their forests for both productive purposes and conservation. Leading forest certification schemes offer performance standards and guidance for conservation in productive forests.

#### How much conservation is enough?

Currently 13.7% of the total land area is strictly protected in Finland. Finland ratified the Aichi Biodiversity Targets set by Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and has a national target to increase the cover of protected areas and the measures applied to conserve biodiversity in the use of other areas to at least 17% of the terrestrial environments and inland waters of the country, and 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020.

Participants had different views on the level of conservation needed in Finland: some argued the target of 17% is not sufficient; some suggested that it may not be practical to increase conservation area given increasing demands on food, fuel and fiber; others highlighted that it is not the percentage of area that matters but the quality of conservation. Further research is needed to understand the current status of conservation efforts in Finland. It was also noted that, in Finland, private land owners have strong emotional and cultural attachments to forests and it is better to incentivize and strengthen those ties to motivate voluntary conservation efforts than to set mandatory targets or restrictions on forest use.

#### How to incentivize conservation?

Secure land tenure provides incentives for Finland's private land owners to manage their land sustainably for future generations. Transparent and participatory policymaking processes help ensure the social acceptability of conservation policies and measures. Some participants suggested that disincentives in policies for conservation should be removed.

Participants also suggested a variety of tools to encourage conservation on voluntary basis:

- Cash payments to private land owners for conservation efforts: For example, urban dwellers can pay additional fees on the water they use to finance forest owners who maintain forests around watersheds; the current METSO program in Finland (Box 1) is financed through government funds which come from tax revenues. The feasibility and scale of these types of programs are constrained by the economic status of a country or region.
  - Income generating activities based on conservation: For example eco-tourism and non-timber forests products.

Education about the value of ecosystem services and forest management options for increasing values other than timber: For example, WWF Finland has been educating public about the health benefits provided by the forests.

### Does "Everyman's right" contribute to or inhibit conservation?

In Finland, "Everyman's right" (Freedom to Roam) ensures that access to and recreational use of forests are free to all in Finland. This includes the right to pick wild berries and mushrooms. On one hand, "everyman's right" sets a foundation for strong emotional and cultural ties between the public and the forests; on the other hand, it makes it hard for private landowners to earn commercial incomes from non-timber forests products (i.e., mushrooms and berries) or from providing access to their land. There were also concerns that forest owners won't be able to stop others from taking advantage of "everyman's rights" and commercializing non-timber forests projects (i.e., mushrooms and berries) on their land.

Sites	Metsä Fiber Joutseno Pulp Mill	Metsä Fiber Joutseno Gasfication Plant added on to Existing Pulp Mill (Under construction)	UPM Lappeenranta Biorefinery	Stora Enso First-generation Biorefinery
Technology	Bark burnt to produce bio- gas; wood dust refined into bio-ethanol	Residues from forests > Fuel Screening and Oversize Crusher > Gasification into biogas	Tall Oil to produce Biodiesel (liquefaction/hydrotreat- ment) But it has ambition to develop thermal conversion technology (gasification (btL)/pyrolysis)	Cooking liquor with dis- solved lignin is combusted in chemical recovery boiler.
Volume	Tall oil: 19,000 t/a Electricity Sales: 290 GWh; Bark-based bio-gas sale: 150 GWh	48MWh	Biofuel: 100,000 t/a	Biofuels total 5759 GWh (black liquor 4568 GWh, bark 1191 GWh) in 2013.
End Use	Integrated Pulp Mill: Support 100% energy demand of the mill ;	Support energy demand of the mill; Produce bio-ener- gy for sale	Bio-ethanol that is fully compatible with current vehicle engines	Integrated Pulp Mill support energy demand of the packing mill
Economics	Economically viable for in- ternal use :eliminate energy costs for the pulp mill by re- using side-streams of pulp production; production cost is higher than traditional fossil fuel	Production cost is twice as high as natural gas at present; Not economically viable without government subsidies	Price of bio-ethanol is high- er than gasoline and diesel; but EU's renewable energy regulation has created a niche market for the pro- duction to be profitable.	Economically viable for internal use: reduce energy costs for the mill.
Motivation	Reduce energy costs ; Re- duce Waste; Meet Finland's target on renewable energy	Prediction of higher de- mand on bio-energy based on EU regulations, Finland national target for renew- able energy and concerns for energy security; To lead technology innovation in the emerging bio-fuel market.	Niche market created by Finland's target and regulation on bio-energy; Outlooks for increasing demand for bio-energy in Finland	Energy from lignin is used as steam and electricity for process energy in pulp and board production.

#### TABLE 1: BIO-FUEL TECHNOLOGIES EXPLORED IN THE FIELD TRIP



Paula Horne of Pellervo Economic Research Institute (PTT) discusses the value of ecosystem services



Participants discuss the international context of 4Fs



A claw crane loads timber onto a trailer to be transported by truck



Break-out groups discuss ways forward on global 4Fs issues

# HOW TO ENSURE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF WOOD-BASED BIOENERGY?

In 2008, the EU set a target to increase the share of renewable energy to 20% by 2020. Similarly, Finland's national target is to raise the share of renewable energy to 38%. More than half of this target is intended to be met by forest-based energy. These policies coupled with the rising importance of energy security have created increasing demand for wood-based fuel and encouraged the forest industry to invest and expand their biofuel business.

Globally, wood-based energy is the single most important source of renewable energy providing over 9% of the global total primary energy supply. More than two billion people depend on wood energy for cooking and/or heating, particularly in households in developing countries.<sup>iv</sup> There are a variety of technologies available to produce second-generation wood-based energy (e.g., gasification of wood) but most of the technologies are not yet economically viable at scale without government subsidies. Table 1 illustrates the variety of first and second generation wood-based technologies participants observed in the field visit. As technologies for bio-energy evolve, wood-based bioenergy will play an even more important role in meet the increasing demand for renewable energy.

The sustainability of the increasing use of wood-based bio-energy is an issue not only for Finland but also globally due to competition for a limited supply of wood. The dialogue participants suggested the following key principles in prioritizing the use of wood for materials or fuel:

- Source raw materials from sustainably managed forests: sustainability must be ensured regardless of the end use (either for timber or bioenergy). There are existing criteria and certification systems for sustainable forest management that can be applied for wood-based bioenergy: For example, how much and which residues can be taken away from forests to maintain sufficient flow of nutrients back to the ecosystem. To assess effectiveness in helping to mitigate climate change, additional factors that should be considered are the direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) savings from production, as well as the indirect land-use changes from wood-based bio-energy production.
- **Efficient uses of wood in a multiple-products approach:** A multiple-product approach can efficiently use forest resources while producing bio-energy. The raw material used for energy can be derived from industry residues (sawdust, chips), harvesting residues (i.e., tops, branches, crowns), thinning material and low-quality wood. The principle of cascading use of wood can be utilized to guide priorities in such a multiple product approach i.e., where timber and paper/pulp production, reuse and recycling are prioritized before energy use.

#### BOX 2 STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION IN FINLAND

#### Provided by Kai Lintunen, Communications Manager, Finnish Forest Association

The overall philosophy of working groups and planning processes in Finland is built around the participation of stakeholders. In the Finnish society, in general, democratically elected organs make the decisions in societal planning, and citizens have an opportunity to either participate or at least be heard and voice their views.

In this vein, participatory planning is deeply ingrained in the Finnish decision making practices regarding forests as well.

On the highest national level this approach is applied in the National Forest Program. The preparation of the program is a process, which involves stakeholders widely in various working groups and fora. The regional forest programs, in turn, are constructed with similar processes.

The National Forest Council at the national level and regional councils are bodies who monitor those programs. They are built around inclusive wide stakeholder participation. In addition, the forest authority boards are based on representative democracy, and consist of a broad scope of interest groups including forest owners, industries, workers' organizations, public authorities.

Metsähallitus, the organization managing state forests has a long tradition of extensive participatory planning, and can be regarded a forerunner. All in all, in planning the use of natural resources the goal is to be open and interactive. In regional planning projects, it is customary to bring together cooperation/working groups of those interested in the use of state lands. The planning takes place involving local expertise, dealing with the use of state lands as well as issues affecting this. It is vital to gain practical insights from the local planning level. It is also crucial to put local expertise to good use in order to increase transparency and raise the acceptance of the operations and endeavors.

Metsähallitus organizes numerous citizens' fora – working groups, hearings, commenting rounds etc. - where projects and/or initiatives are introduced to the public, and where individual citizens can voice their opinions on the planning and actions. This interaction provides important information of the particular local circumstances as well as the goals and aspirations of the local people and stakeholders. The thorough processes allow for the opportunities provided by natural resources and the various needs attached to them to be accommodated.

Assess social and environmental impacts of wood-based bio-energy: In Finland, the increasing demand on bio-fuel is not competing with other uses of forests yet as there is potential to increase harvest volumes from existing forests resources and use more residues from forestry operations domestically. However in terms of global wood supply, the issue is use of wood as a material competes with use of wood for fuel. In Finland as well it is possible that bioenergy users may soon compete for the same wood as timber and paper manufacturers. It is important to ensure legality and environmental and social integrity along the whole supply chain of wood-based bio-energy.

An important aspect in safeguarding social integrity of wood-based bio-energy is to ensure small land owners and local communities receive direct benefits from bio-energy production. To this end, some participants suggested it was important to:

- Level the playing field for sustainably sourced wood-based bio-energy: Subsidies should be removed for unsustainably sourced wood-based energy. Perverse incentives that favor fossil fuels should also be eradicated to support the development of renewables.
- Support sustainable use of wood-based bioenergy in developing countries: According to FAO's



Participants plant the next generation of spruce trees while learning about Finnish family forestry



Local artisans display their traditional handicrafts made of non-timber forest products



The bird's eye view of Stora Enso's Imatra mill, the world's largest producer of liquid packaging board



4Fs participants learning about Finnish family forestry directly from local land owners

States of the World's Forests report 2014, wood energy is often the only energy source in rural areas of less developed countries and is particularly important for poor people. There is a big opportunity in improving those existing uses of wood energy to benefit the livelihood of local communities while promoting more sustainable management of forests resources in developing countries. Existing technologies for woodstoves as well as second generation bioenergy can be transferred to developing countries, based on local context, to improve efficiency of biomass use.

# How to design engagement processes for land-use decision-making at different levels (i.e., local, national, international) and how to reconcile those processes?

General guidance at international and national levels that allows flexibility and freedom of decisions at local level: Ideally, clear national targets linked with international commitments should define what values and services are to be maintained in the long-term. Some participants suggested that when setting those targets, equal weight should be given to the three pillars of sustainability (i.e., the environment, society and the economy). Those targets can provide general guidance for decision-making and implementation at sub-national or forest management unit levels. Lessons learnt through sub-national processes and implementation could be fed back to inform and adapt national and international legislative framework.

Some participants also highlighted that effective decision-making process need to ensure women are actively engaged. Consideration could also be given to accommodating traditional engagement and decision-making processes at local level.

- Knowledge-based decision making at local level: In Finland, it is mandatory for private land owners to join forest associations (although the legislation is soon to change to make membership an option instead of an obligation). Associations can support private landowners in informed strategic land-use decisions within the national legislative framework. Associations can also facilitate small landowners to make decisions that can benefit them collectively in the long term at landscape scale. Environmental NGOs also play an active role in educating landowners on sustainable land use options and the values of ecosystem services. Secure land tenure can empower decision-making at the local level and incentivize landowners to make decisions that are sustainable in the long-term.
  Consultations and dialogues among different stakeholders at all levels: In Fin
  - land, there are platforms for dialogues and consultation among all stakeholders at all levels. (See box 2) There are still some challenges: For example, too much consultation that leads to no decisions; minority voices may not be reflected in

the final decisions. But most platforms are successful - they are built upon mutual respect, trust, and common understanding and interests among different stakeholders. Furthermore, they are facilitated by respected chairs/moderators. It takes time and continuous effort to build trust and respect among different stakeholders which makes the Finland model not so easily transferable to other contexts where there is deep mistrust among stakeholders.

### What is the role of certification in land-use decision-making, if any?

Certification has a role to play in land-use decision making but the nature of the role depends on:

- Level of forest governance: Where governance is weak and the level of social inclusion is low, certification can have an important role to play in providing guidance and a framework for land-use decision-making that takes environmental and social issues into consideration. Where governance is strong and there are established inclusive processes, certification's contribution will be limited.
- Scale of land holdings: Certification can have impacts at landscape level when the single land management unit covers a large area or small landowners are collectively governed to obtain group certification at scale.
- The degree to which local land-use decision-making and zoning are synchronized: With poor synchronization there can be a conflict between certification and regulatory requirements. But there is potential for certification systems and their stakeholders to lobby for alignment between regulatory and voluntary standards.
- Existence and strength of a market signal: The demand from consumers for certification will largely decide how much impact new certification will bring for land use decision making (e.g., if certification can provide a price premium or market access then there will be more landowners who want to adopt certification standards when managing their land).

A question remains on whether certification schemes can be adapted and consolidated to effectively deal with multiple commodities within a landscape. Certification standards also need to balance flexibility (through allowing adaptation of principles to fit local contexts) with the need for clear simple and consistent rules to communicate accurately and credibly to consumers.

#### Other key issues discussed:

- Promoting consumption-side measures: Dietary shifts and waste reduction especially for food and energy - combined with recycling and re-use can ultimately reduce pressures on forests and other natural resources.
- Preparing and adapting the current land-use decision-making processes in Finland for climate change: Finland has adopted a national adaptation strategy in 2005. Climate adaptation measures need to be integrated into all sectors including forest policy and forest management systems. Climate risk assessments are needed to provide knowledge needed to adapt current

systems (e.g., risks for forest fire; pest and diseases). It is vitally important to nurture strong social capital so the society can be more effective and adaptive in the face of natural disasters: for example, the strong social capital that supported Japan's recovery from the devastation tsunami caused in 2011.

### CONCLUSIONS

The previous field dialogues in Brazil and Indonesia explored landscapes where there are visible competing demands in a landscape: In Capão Bonito, we saw the competition between large scale agriculture, forest plantations, small-scale family farming and conservation. In Central Kalimantan, there are conflicts between oil palm plantations, rubber, peatland and forest conservation. In Finland, forests dominate the landscape and serve multiple functions providing food, fuel, fiber and various ecosystem services. There is better governance compared to Brazil and Indonesia and more established stakeholder engagement processes in Finland. This has enabled open discussions on how to accommodate conservation needs and increasing demand on bioenergy into the future of Finnish landscape in the changing climate. The discussions in Finland have shed light on how to overcome some of the key challenges identified in previous 4Fs dialogues including:

- How to conduct integrated, participatory and rights-based land use planning?
- How to better value ecosystem services when making land-use decisions?
- How to include and support small land owners?
- The role of international standards and policies (e.g., certifications) in land-use decision making?

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Stakeholders in Finland have proposed to continue multiple stakeholder dialogues beyond the forest sector on 4Fs. The Forests Dialogue and its partners will promote learning from the Finland dialogue through its network and international platforms including Global Landscape Forum in Lima, December 2014 and World Forestry Congress in Durban, 2015.

Building on the partnership established and lessons learnt through the 4Fs initiative, The Forests Dialogue will seek to form a Landscapes Consortium - a group of global organizations representing business, civil society groups, intergovernmental organizations and academia. The Consortium will seek to build a portfolio of work directed at better understanding and implementing a "landscape based approach" as a means to achieving more sustainable and inclusive development in selected landscapes, with specific emphasis on the interactions between global commodity supply chains, land use governance, and local level land-use decision-making processes. Potential members of the Landscape Consortium include WWF, IUCN, WOCAN, PwC, WBCSD and TFD.

#### A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

In addition to the 53 individuals who took part in this dialogue, the Co-chairs also wish to thank the following organizations for their vision and support:

Co-organizers and sponsors: Metsäteollisuus, Stora Enso, UPM, Metsä Group, MTK, WWF, Metsämiesten Säätiö, Finnish Forest Foundation, Metsähallitus and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD).

Xiaoting Hou (The Forests Dialogue) supported and coordinated the drafting and editing process of this summary.

### REFERENCES

- <sup>i</sup> Kai Lintunen, Finnish Forest Association, Well-being from Green Economy, Background Paper for TFD 4Fs Dialogue in Finland, http://theforestsdialogue.org/sites/default/files/tfd\_4fs\_finland\_back-groundpaper.pdf
- Pertti Rassi et al, The 2010 RED List of Finnish Species, Helsinki 2010, http://www.ym.fi/download/ noname/%7B8EDFDAD7-3291-48AB-9CB3-484CEAF4C2AA%7D/32852
- Fnnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2013: http://www.metla.fi/metinfo/tilasto/julkaisut/vsk/2013/ vsk13\_06.pdf
- <sup>iv</sup> http://www.fao.org/forestry/energy/en/

#### PARTICIPANT LIST

Lennart Ackzell	Federation of Swedish Family Forest Owners
Violaine Berger	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Chris Davidson	MeadWestvaco Corporation (MWV)
Peter Dewees	
Gary Dunning	The Forests Dialogue
Jan Fryk	Skogforsk (The Forestry Research Institute of Sweden)
Manuel Gonzalez	CONOSIL
Heikki Granholm	Finnish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Ben Gunneberg	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification

Juha Hakkarainen	Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners (MTK)
Jukka Halonen	Finnish Forest Industries Federation
Pertti Heikkuri	Representative, Finnish Sami Parliament
Aleksi Heiskanen	WWF Finland
John Hontelez	Forest Stewardship Council International
Paula Horne	Pellervo Economic Research Institute (PTT)
Xiaoting Hou	The Forests Dialogue
Riikka Joukio	Metsä Group
Peter Kanowski	Australian National University
Skip Krasny	Kimberly-Clark
Marten Larsson	Skogsindustrierna (Swedish Forest Industries Federation)
Timo Lehesvirta	UPM
Petri Lehtonen	Indufor
Kai Lintunen	Finnish Forest Association
Paivi Makkonen	Metsa Group
Antti Marjokorpi	Stora Enso
Norka Moya Solis	Institute of Promotion and Sustainable Development of Small Company
Ivone Namikawa	Klabin
Janne Näräkkä	Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners (MTK)
Cécile Ndjebet	African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests (REFACOF)
Ruth Newsome	Unilever
Nick O'Connor	Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU)
Sami Oksa	UPM
Johan Olausson	Tetra Pak
Antti Otsamo	Metsähallitus
Lina Palm	SCA
Steven Patriarco	The Forests Dialogue

Ren Peng	Global Environmental Institute	
Anders Portin	Finnish Forest Association	
Miriam Prochnow	Apremavi	
Deric Quaile	Shell	
Pekka T. Rajala	StoraEnso	
Ritva Reinikka		
Jussi Ripatti	Metsä Group	
Lisa Robins	Robins Consulting	
Liisa Rohweder	WWF Finland	
Tomi Salo	Finnish Forest Industries Federation	
Päivi Salpakivi-Salomaa	UPM	
Mengistie Sintayehu	Zenbaba Union	
Makweti Sishekanu	Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU)	
Rod Taylor	WWF International	
Ho Thanh Ha	Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry (HUAF)	
Tint Lwin Thaung	The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC)	
Francisco Yuraszeck	Empresas CMPC	