



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

MWW

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!

Scoping Dialogue on Understanding Deforestation-Free (UDF)

28–29 October, 2014 | New Haven, CT, USA

Co-Chairs' Summary Report

By Sophie Beckham, Skip Krasny, Milagre Nuvunga, NigelSizer, and Rod Taylor

INTRODUCTION

The Forests Dialogue (TFD) convened a scoping dialogue on Understanding Deforestation-Free,* hosted by the Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, on 28–29 October 2014. The dialogue brought together 39 experts representing a diversity of sectors including industry, civil society, and non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations (see page 13 for a complete participants list). Participants brought to the discussion deep professional expertise in the forest sector, as well as diverse experiences in observing, pressing for, designing, and implementing deforestation-free commitments.

This dialogue, funded by WWF, the International Institute for Environment and Development, Mondi Group, and International Paper, was the first scoping exercise under the TFD initiative on Understanding Deforestation-Free (UDF). The initiative aims to:

- Explore commonly held views on what is meant by 'deforestation-free';
- Identify risks and opportunities associated with implementing deforestation-free policies; and
- Establish specific, practical ways forward on key issues, and ensure preparedness to pursue them.

This report summarizes the key issues and questions that emerged from the dialogue which warrant further discussion. After treating these, the report concludes with participant-identified proposed ways forward. The dialogue agenda, a background paper, presentations made during the dialogue, and other related materials are posted on the TFD website. A number of important issues are raised in the background

* As used throughout this document, the term 'deforestation-free' includes all of the various terms which are used to indicate an end to deforestation. The Co-chairs do not specifically endorse this particular phrasing.



Introductions during the UDF Scoping Dialogue



Participants during introductions



Darrel Webber from the RSPO during a breakout session



Breakout session on Understanding Deforestation-Free questions

paper and dialogue concept note that were not addressed at length during the dialogue, but that the Co-chairs wish to acknowledge as relevant for future consideration.

KEY ISSUES FOR UNDERSTANDING DEFORESTATION-FREE

The trend toward governmental and corporate deforestation-free pledges related to the sourcing of key commodities beyond forest products has emerged in the span of just a few years. This scoping dialogue provided an opportunity to take stock of these pledges, the steps that have been taken to implement them, and the potential impacts that these actions might have. A rich discussion elicited clear fracture lines around definitions, concepts, and the implementation of deforestation-free commitments.

Definitional Issues

Differing understandings of the terms ‘forest’ and ‘deforestation’ make it challenging to monitor and verify progress made toward meeting deforestation-free commitments:

Various definitions of ‘forest’ reflect regional differences in forest type and cultural understandings of what constitutes a forest. Disagreements extend even to basic questions such as whether plantations should be considered forests. Manifold definitions introduce confusion when many of the actors who are committing to eradicate deforestation from their supply chains are multinational corporations with supply chains that span the globe. Standardizing the definition of ‘forest’ would both help to create a common language, which some participants called for, and to clarify the scopes of deforestation-free commitments, facilitating stronger accountability. At the same time, however, some participants cautioned that flexibility must be maintained so that local voices can help shape how ‘forest’ is defined.

Most voluntary commodity certification standards have some form of prohibition on the clearing of forests and other natural ecosystems, but these vary greatly. They use a combination of criteria to guide forest activities, including maintenance and enhancement of high conservation values (HCV), legal compliance, protection of certain soils (e.g., peat), and respect for local and indigenous people’s rights to give or withhold free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). The High Carbon Stock (HCS) methodology, tested in Indonesia and potentially adaptable to regions with different forest types, is proposed as a new way to differentiate between a ‘forest’ that must be protected and severely degraded or non-forest vegetative cover that may be cleared. Its proponents recommend that it be applied in combination with existing criteria to determine which areas could be cleared without breaching deforestation-free commitments. It would be beneficial if more stakeholders were to be involved in developing the HCS methodology, via the High

Carbon Stock Steering Committee, to ensure its robustness and legitimacy and to determine how best to integrate it with other tools for addressing deforestation.

Varying terms used to communicate deforestation-free pledges make it difficult for stakeholders to know what exactly is being committed to:

A range of terms is used, by actors making deforestation-free commitments and by the news media that reports about them, including ‘no deforestation,’ ‘zero deforestation,’ and ‘zero net deforestation.’¹ Participants expressed frustration that these terms sometimes overlap with one another and do not always communicate a clear meaning. For example, it is often unclear whether commitments indicate that no conversion of forestland is permissible or whether conversion is possible but within certain bounds. Similarly, commitments are not always clear about the baseline dates by which products must not be associated with deforestation and by which suppliers must conform to procurement rules. A number of stakeholder groups have expressed concern that commitments may not consider conversion of natural forests into plantation forests to be deforestation, or even forest degradation. Some participants noted that one of the reasons we have not seen more deforestation-free commitments than we have is that governments are wary of making pledges that could be interpreted as hindering economic development, and that companies are concerned about sending mixed messages to their customers. Clarifying these terms might therefore spur additional commitments, and would enable stakeholders to more easily hold the actors who make commitments accountable to them. However, some participants acknowledged that it would be ideal to reach a consensus on the definitions of these terms, but stressed that this may be too difficult to achieve. The more pressing need appears to be to focus on developing best practices and tools that are scalable to realize deforestation-free objectives.

Conceptual Issues

Deforestation-free commitments frame their objectives negatively rather than pursuing a positive goal such as sustainable landscape management:

There are pros and cons to this approach. On the one hand, ‘zero deforestation’ and related phrases are attention-grabbing. They are stark, idealistic, and evocative, which both makes for great headlines and helps to rally public support around combating deforestation. On the other hand, this approach can foist a disproportionate share of the costs of compliance onto producers, which may not be fair or always feasible. Moreover, it may not inspire upstream supply chain participants to collaborate on solutions, and may not provide much confidence that deforestation-free commitments will result in their intended impacts. If producers and land managers feel that they have not been adequately engaged in the decision-making processes that generate such commitments, they may simply strengthen their relationships with downstream actors that impose less stringent requirements. More work is needed to understand how best to frame efforts to combat deforestation and how to motivate upstream actors to participate proactively in eliminating deforestation from agricultural commodity production.



Brainstorming during a breakout session



Sophie Beckham from International Paper during a breakout session



TFD Steering Committee members during a breakout session



Breakout session with Rod Taylor from WWF

There is disagreement about whether deforestation-free policies should permit no deforestation whatsoever, or prohibit only “unacceptable” deforestation:

Some participants felt that given the duration and pace of global deforestation, we need immediate action to prevent further loss, and that deforestation-free commitments are a means to actualize this objective. Many participants disagreed, contending that ‘deforestation-free’ cannot fully bar conversion of forestland. Not only is this objective unattainable since the real world does not operate in absolutes, but it is undesirable as it would significantly curtail economic prospects in under-developed locations and undermine the ability of local people to make their own land use decisions. Local buy-in is critical to the success of efforts to reach a deforestation-free outcome, and several participants pointed out that communities, developing country governments, and producer companies often balk when confronted by the notion of ‘no deforestation,’ which they typically interpret to be equivalent to ‘no development.’

If ‘deforestation-free’ is interpreted as prohibiting only unacceptable deforestation (in other words, deforestation-free = ‘managed deforestation’), three questions become critical.

First, what is the line between acceptable and unacceptable deforestation? Participants raised the possibility that there may need to be a hybrid approach, in which landscapes are divided into mosaics of protected areas where no deforestation of any sort is permitted, areas where conversion for other economic uses is both allowed and encouraged, and buffer areas where more limited forms of deforestation take place.

Second, how can it best be communicated to actors who are wary of anti-development motives disguised as forest conservation initiatives that deforestation-free approaches do not preclude, and may even promote, development?

Third, should deforestation-free commitments include a de minimis exception where a small amount of a commodity produced on deforested land enters a supply chain, or where a converted area below some minimum threshold contributes to supply? Some participants argued that this type of flexibility is necessary to enable companies with large supply chains to feel comfortable making commitments without fearing that they might inadvertently violate them due to uncontrollable factors.

The range of corporate actors operating in the forest sector is not monolithic:

Companies differ from one another both in terms of the degree of reform needed to de-link their supply chains from deforestation, and in terms of their level of responsibility for historical deforestation. Many companies, including some of the world’s largest forest products producers and users, are ‘good’ actors who have for years been applying concepts of responsible forest management and procurement. Although these compa-

nies are generally not the primary targets of downstream actors' deforestation-free commitments, the commitments impose the same requirements on them as on companies that have far more work to do in eradicating deforestation from their operations. Both categories of companies should be involved in the UDF dialogue process to provide their perspectives. In addition, different types of remedial action should be required of companies in each category before they may be considered to have become deforestation-free. A balance needs to be struck between rewarding companies with a history of deforestation for reforming versus granting them equal recognition for becoming deforestation-free as companies that have been less implicated in historical deforestation. However, care must be taken that consensus does not stall over a debate concerning 'common but differentiated responsibilities' such as that which has hampered international climate talks.

Deforestation-free commitments are limited in scope:

Two limitations to the scope of deforestation-free pledges are particularly important to consider. First, pledges take a single-issue approach by focusing exclusively on deforestation as the problem in need of solving. In reality, deforestation is one of several critical threats to the natural world; participants noted that forest degradation contributes significantly to greenhouse gas emissions and declining ecosystem services, and that non-forest ecosystems such as savannahs are equally at risk of loss. A narrow focus on deforestation could result in too little attention paid to forest degradation and loss of other ecosystems types, as well as deflect attention from other environmental dimensions of sustainability such as impacts of pesticides and fertilizers, and social dimensions such as human rights, social justice, and water security. Moreover, as some participants noted, the ultimate objective is not an end to deforestation per se, but realization of sustainable land management as a component of sustainable development. The alternative to narrowly focusing on deforestation would be to take a broader landscape conservation approach, in which deforestation-free efforts might feature prominently, but would be treated holistically alongside related challenges. There does not appear to be a clear answer as to whether a targeted focus on deforestation is more likely to achieve success (albeit limited in scope) than an effort to address the problem of deforestation as part of a matrix of land use challenges.

The second way that voluntary deforestation-free approaches are limited in scope is that they seek to combat deforestation solely by influencing international supply chains despite deforestation having multiple drivers. Expansion of agricultural commodity production (primarily palm oil, pulp & paper, beef, and soy) has been called out as the leading driver of tropical forest loss,² but deforestation-free policies may have limited effect on other drivers such as subsistence agriculture and infrastructure expansion, which participants noted can in certain geographies eclipse the contribution of industrial agriculture to total forest loss. Further, the relative contributions of various drivers to overall deforestation could shift in the future; if agricultural conversion were to be overtaken by other deforestation drivers, voluntary deforestation-free initiatives would become less directly relevant in the effort to eliminate deforestation.



Participants listening to a background presentation on UDF



Glenn Hurowitz from Climate Advisers speaking to participants



TFD's Akiva Fishman presenting the UDF background paper



TFD's Gary Dunning officially welcoming dialogue participants

Incorporating zero deforestation into existing forest conservation instruments could expand the scope of deforestation-free commitments, but could be problematic:

Some participants wanted to avoid adding new tools on top of those already in place to address deforestation, arguing that existing tools are complex enough, and that adding more would take too long, create inefficiencies and confusion, and spread thin attention and resources devoted to any one mechanism. Instead, the forest and agriculture sectors should simultaneously integrate existing tools such as certification, REDD+, and legality verification, and make them robust enough to adequately address the problem of conversion. In the case of certification, this could mean strengthening standards, introducing optional extra standards for those wishing to supply deforestation-free products, improving audit procedures, and extending certification to commodities that do not currently have certification schemes, such as beef. Other participants argued that having multiple tools available for addressing deforestation, such as independent HCS audits, is beneficial because each tool represents a different approach to achieve the end goal. Moreover, there is a risk inherent in expanding the scopes of a limited number of tools to try and encompass all forestry issues—including conversion, sustainable management, etc.—in that the tools could become unwieldy and difficult to apply.

Implementation Issues

There is a tension between the need to speedily confront the urgent challenge of deforestation versus the benefits of taking a slower approach:

Some participants stressed the need to act immediately because the world is rapidly losing forests. Others contended that a slower approach will produce better results in the long run. Hasty action, they argued, might both lead us in the wrong direction and lock in mistakes far into the future. Deforestation is often a symptom of weak governance and enduring governance reforms are seldom achieved overnight; lengthy processes are typically needed to enable the participation of marginalized stakeholders in decision-making, implement institutional reforms, and create new incentives to maintain forests. In addition, it may be beneficial for companies with a presence in landscapes that are experiencing deforestation to remain engaged with the landscape and with other actors in the area because engagement may more effectively foster change than would complete withdrawal. Some participants responded that the solution is to act quickly, but to remain nimble and open to modifying selected approaches as new information becomes available. They argued that mistakes are inevitable, but the perfect should not hold up the good; it is better to make mistakes while moving the needle rather than delaying action to consider all options while deforestation continues. Certain types of information may only come to light after initial steps are taken to implement deforestation-free policies, such as who all of the stakeholders are who need to be engaged in a

particular region. In addition, rapid action will send market signals and increase the momentum behind the deforestation-free movement.

Deforestation-free commitments must involve and benefit marginalized stakeholders:

Participants stressed that local stakeholders (e.g., communities, local governments, and smallholders) are integral to the success of deforestation-free initiatives. Beyond being the most direct stewards of the forest and surrounding lands, their knowledge and aspirations will need to be taken into account in tailoring deforestation-free commitments to particular geographic contexts. Moreover, forests are a primary source of livelihoods for communities around the world, so any decisions that are taken with respect to forest management directly affect community members. Similarly, smallholders may be disadvantaged relative to larger companies in meeting arduous auditing and traceability requirements associated with deforestation-free commodity sourcing. However, international actors presently dominate the decision-making processes being used to develop and implement deforestation-free commitments. Many of these commitments include procedural protections for local stakeholders, such as guarantees that free, prior, and informed consent will be sought, but this does not necessarily incorporate local views into the framing of deforestation-free criteria and implementation systems. Further, community consent is neither static nor permanent; contexts may change, leadership or community views may shift, and new needs and desires may emerge.

To ensure that deforestation-free initiatives at the very least do not harm communities, smallholders, or the mandates of local authorities, they must establish a framework for site-specific systems that continually seek local consent from the relevant stakeholders, are appropriate for local conditions and can address grievances should they arise. In addition, a precautionary approach should inform investment decisions to ensure that smallholders are not shut out of the international market. Actors implementing deforestation-free policies might focus their efforts on large landholders, at least initially, and promote actions that counteract the disadvantage to smallholders by providing training, capacity-building, and subsidies to defray audit costs.

Clear tenure and tenure security are foundational to the success of deforestation-free initiatives:

Long-term planning of any kind depends on a degree of certainty that fundamental conditions will remain constant. Deforestation-free policies represent just such a long-term arrangement, which depend on the actors who are responsible for managing the forest having stable tenure. Clear tenure and security in that tenure are critical for two reasons. First, the communities or other land managers who work to actualize the deforestation-free commitments made by other parties need to be sure that they have long-term control over their land so that they can effectively plan for forest conservation while meeting their livelihood needs. At the same time, the actors who make deforestation-free commitments and depend on local land managers to implement them require certainty that other actors will not assert control over the forest and make changes to the way the land is managed. Conservation plans could easily be disrupted, for example, if a previously uninvolved community were to begin clearing land based on a



Dialogue co-chair Skip Krasny, from Kimberly-Clark, welcoming participants



TFD Steering Committee member Cécile Ndjebet from REFACOF



Joshua Martin from the Environmental Paper Network



Matt Daggett from Greenpeace

claimed right, or if a government were to issue a new concession to communally-held land in the belief that the community lacked ownership rights.

Implementation of deforestation-free pledges must extend to other commodities and geographies:

In the past 20 years, numerous companies and banks operating in the pulp & paper sector have committed to deforestation-free policies, in part through support and implementation of forest certification schemes such as the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). Many of the recent voluntary deforestation-free commitments are focused on pulp & paper and palm oil production in tropical forest-rich countries where voluntary certification schemes are not available or are under development. The commitments that appear to be furthest along in the implementation process have centered on palm oil. Moreover, implementation is furthest along in Southeast Asia, and to a lesser extent, Brazil. Progress has been more limited in the context of beef and soy, and implementation has yet to start in most parts of the world. Participants stressed that deforestation-free commitments will have to encompass, at a minimum, the other commodities that are commonly associated with deforestation, and will have to be adapted to geographies with different forest types and political, economic, social, and cultural contexts. The question then becomes, to what extent are the tools that are being developed and used to implement deforestation-free commitments in the pulp & paper and palm oil sectors and within certain regions applicable to other commodity sectors and geographies? Where they are not immediately transferrable, how can they be adapted?

Appropriate monitoring and verification procedures need to be developed:

Some participants argued that clear key performance indicators (KPIs) are critical, for two reasons. First, governments and companies need clear targets to aim for, both to give them the confidence to make deforestation-free commitments to begin with and to facilitate implementation. Second, investors—who are increasingly concerned with the origins of the commodities that serve as inputs to the businesses they invest in—are demanding increasing amounts of information to fill the gaps left by current certification schemes, and unprecedented levels of transparency. KPIs need to be standardized because investment is a dominant driver of business decisions in the global economy, and investors require KPIs that allow them to make cross-company and cross-sectoral comparisons. Other participants cautioned, however, that standardized KPIs engender the very cookie-cutter approach that needs to be avoided because deforestation differs by location and cannot be measured in the same way everywhere. Different drivers of deforestation, actors involved in forest conversion, and underlying tenure dynamics are just some of the factors that preclude the use of uniform metrics. In addition, some corporate and governmental commitments go beyond ‘deforestation-free,’ outlining

strong social safeguards that may not factor into KPIs that try to create lowest common denominators of corporate practice.

As discussed above, there is disagreement about whether deforestation-free should be pursued as a standalone objective or as a component of existing instruments to combat deforestation. If the stand-alone approach were to win out, participants raised three key questions regarding how verification would function. First, would every unit of a commodity that is covered by a deforestation-free pledge need to be subject to the same degree of scrutiny, or would a risk-based approach be adequate, whereby commodities originating from areas at higher risk of deforestation receive greater attention? The former approach would provide greater certainty that no commodities associated with deforestation have entered the supply chain, while the latter approach would significantly reduce compliance costs where supply chains do not include risky markets. The second question concerned how the verification payment system should be structured to ensure that auditors are truly independent. A clear step would be to end the practice in which companies that are seeking certification directly pay auditors, but other steps might be needed as well. The third question was how to ensure that producer companies are made accountable for deforestation across all of their operations rather than simply a subset where deforestation impacts are well-known.

Support for deforestation-free objectives must expand beyond the corporate sphere:

The deforestation-free agenda has been driven, to this point, largely by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and pioneering companies and government officials. Participants noted that sustaining the pressure to maintain and expand deforestation-free commitments will require two developments. First, there will need to be a transformation in the marketplace built on the backs of end consumers who use their purchasing power to demand responsibly produced products. Participants pointed out that some companies that have yet to make deforestation-free commitments are still unsure how such commitments will impact their business, suggesting that there is not yet a clear demand signal from the market for deforestation-free goods. In the long run, it will be especially important for consumers in non-Western countries to start demanding deforestation-free products so that commodity streams do not simply bifurcate such that deforestation-free commodities go to Western countries, while commodities responsible for deforestation continue to be produced and simply go elsewhere.

The second necessary development is increased government involvement, since there is a limit to the amount of change that corporate deforestation-free commitments can effect on the ground. Companies face incentives to leverage their commitments to advocate for stricter regulations and stronger enforcement of anti-deforestation policies, as this would create a level playing field with respect to companies operating in the same market that have not made commitments. One strategy that participants suggested in terms of how to build governmental support for the deforestation-free agenda is to make the case that deforestation-free policies are, despite what the sound bite connotes, equitable and aligned with sustainable development.



Miriam Prochnow from Apremavi



João Talocchi from Greenpeace



Uta Jungermann from the World Business Council for Sustainable Development



Antti Marjokorpi from Stora Enso

Governmental and private sector deforestation-free targets must be reconciled:

Many governments have set deforestation-free targets within their borders, either by signing the New York Declaration on Forests, or through separate commitments.¹ In many instances, the territories covered by these commitments contain landholdings that are simultaneously covered by one or more of the raft of corporate commitments to eliminate deforestation from supply chains. Despite this overlap, governmental and private sector commitments exist in isolation from each other, and the processes by which they have been developed are wholly independent. Participants highlighted a need to better understand how jurisdictional and supply chain commitments interact with each other. For example, how can a government's territorial deforestation-free commitment bolster a company's ability to meet its supply chain commitment with respect to supply that originates in the covered territory? Conversely, how can corporate commitments that focus on actors who deal in commodities support government efforts that are focused on the land base from which those commodities are extracted?

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The key issues and questions that came out of the scoping dialogue will need to be addressed if deforestation-free commitments are to play a significant role in reducing deforestation globally. Due to how new the deforestation-free phenomenon is, there are very few studies or programs that seek to understand it or foster its development or spread. This scoping dialogue took place at a critical juncture, after many governments and companies have made deforestation-free pledges and are now trying to implement them. Participants felt that the dialogue process has an important role to play in helping to develop and disseminate information that can guide the uptake and implementation of deforestation-free policies in a way that effectively protects forests while balancing the interests of all stakeholders.

Participants called for a number of follow up actions coming out of the dialogue:

- ➔ **Field dialogues.** Participants emphasized the need to get out into the field to better understand the challenges to implementing deforestation-free commitments, as well as possible solutions. Field dialogues will also be important for understanding the impacts that commitments have on the ground with respect to both forests and the people in and around the forests. Suggested field sites include Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, China, Gabon, Riau (Indonesia), and Russia. TFD has a long track record of successful outcomes from such field-based processes.

- ➔ **Simple document on what ‘deforestation-free’ means to different stakeholders**, including communities, local governments, national governments, commodity producers, downstream companies, pressure groups, consultants, and end consumers. This piece could be shared widely and serve as the basis for a broadened dialogue that includes more stakeholders, as well as for consolidating the international forestry community’s understanding of ‘deforestation-free.’
- ➔ **Assessment of the landscape of actors engaged in the deforestation-free agenda.** The assessment should highlight who is doing what, and with whom; where and when in the timeline of implementing a deforestation-free pledge these actions are being taken; and how are they being taken. In addition, assessment should report on the impacts that deforestation-free commitments have had to date.
- ➔ **Assessment of the currently available tools for addressing and monitoring deforestation.** Examples include the various certification schemes for commodities that are grown on forested or formerly forested land, high conservation value audits, and the HCS method for using carbon stock to identify forests, as well as monitoring systems such as Global Forest Watch. A clear understanding of the range of existing tools will inform further discussions about how they can help to implement deforestation-free commitments, and the gaps that new tools could fill.
- ➔ **Analysis of existing data on deforestation** so that it can be brought to bear on continued dialogues around deforestation-free. For example, understanding where deforestation is taking place and the relative contributions of different drivers and particular actors to overall deforestation in those geographies would inform the local tailoring of deforestation-free efforts.
- ➔ **Case studies on the positive contributions and limitations of other policy instruments for reducing deforestation**, including certification, REDD+, moratoria on agricultural expansion, and legality verification. Case studies should look at instances where deforestation was successfully halted and consider which elements of which instruments were responsible for the success. Other case studies should examine instances where efforts failed and the reasons why. Another important focus should be to understand the roles that communities play in contributing to or reducing deforestation. Such a consideration could build on the report by the World Resources Institute and the Rights and Resources Initiative on the relationship between local rights and climate change mitigation.³
- ➔ **Principles of deforestation-free pledges and guidelines for developing and implementing them**, customized to actors at different stages of the supply chain. Principles and guidelines would help standardize deforestation-free pledges at a high level, while allowing flexibility in tailoring them to fit local contexts. This would facilitate the adoption of deforestation-free pledges by actors who have yet to make them (often, as participants noted, because they are uncertain how they would undertake implementation). In turn, this would help address concerns that deforestation-free pledges could cause commodities associated with deforestation to be diverted to non-Western markets rather than being de-linked from deforestation, or that they could simply

shift the primary driver of forest loss from the expansion of palm oil, pulp & paper, beef, and soy cultivation to the production of other commodities.

- ➔ **Fostering regional/local dialogues to tailor deforestation-free approaches to different geographies.** TFD is well positioned to build consensus around high-level questions confronting development and implementation of deforestation-free commitments that apply everywhere. But for some of the more applied issues, where local factors take on more prominence, dialogues that take place at a smaller scale may be better suited to identifying solutions.
- ➔ **Partnering with ongoing initiatives** that are working to implement deforestation-free initiatives, including the Tropical Forest Alliance 2020 and the Consumer Goods Forum. TFA2020, in particular, is expected to receive a major boost in January 2015, with support from the Netherlands, Norway, the UK, and the US. It will also be important to understand what other platforms are doing in the deforestation-free space, such as the Innovation Forum, and to partner with them where appropriate.
- ➔ **Calendar of events focused on deforestation-free.** Participants felt that it would be helpful to maintain a calendar that tracks deforestation-free meetings and conferences in order to ensure that TFD stays current and able to add value to the global deforestation-free discussion as it evolves. Organizations and processes to keep track of in this regard include: Innovation Forum, HCV Resource Network, CGF, WEF, FAO, UN Principles on Responsible Agriculture, UN Global Compact, Chatham House/WRI/CLUA transatlantic dialogue, and ASEAN.

One of the key issues discussed above reemerged while the participants discussed next steps. Some participants favored rapid action while others urged a slower process to allow action to be informed by greater reflection. A consensus seemed to emerge around an approach that moves simultaneously on both quick and more methodical tracks. It was agreed that action items of an information-gathering nature, such as field dialogues and research reports, need to be produced quickly because there is a pressing need in light of the fast-moving field of deforestation-free commitments to understand the challenges associated with these commitments and their implementation. In addition, efforts to forge partnerships with other actors who are advancing the discourse around deforestation-free should be fast-tracked so that efforts going forward can be coordinated, particularly because there is currently much attention being paid by powerful actors to the issue of deforestation-free. Meanwhile, ultimate solutions to the challenges that have been identified and those that will become clearer with the information-gathering phase can follow a lengthier process of debate and reflection.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the 39 individuals who took part in this scoping dialogue, the Co-chairs wish to thank the following organizations for their support of the Understanding Deforestation-Free initiative: the World Wildlife Fund, the International Institute for Environment and Development, Mondi Group, and Inter-

national Paper. In addition, many thanks go to the Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies for hosting the dialogue.

Akiva Fishman (The Forests Dialogue) provided the first draft and coordinated editing of this summary.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Fishman, Akiva (2014). Understanding ‘Deforestation-Free’: The State of Play and Issues to Consider during TFD’s October 2014 Dialogue. The Forests Dialogue, New Haven, CT, http://theforestdialogue.org/sites/default/files/files/Understaning%20Deforestation-Free_background_Final.pdf.
- ² See e.g., Rainforest Conservation Fund, ‘Conversion for Agriculture’, www.rainforestconservation.org/rainforest-primer/3-rainforests-in-peril-deforestation/d-causes-of-tropical-rainforest-destruction/3-conversion-for-agriculture; NASA Earth Observatory, ‘Causes of Deforestation: Direct Causes’, http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/Deforestation/deforestation_update3.php; World Wildlife Fund, ‘Threats: Deforestation’, <http://worldwildlife.org/threats/deforestation>.
- ³ Stevens, Caleb, Robert Winterbottom, Jenny Springer, & Katie Reytar (2014). Securing Rights, Combatting Climate Change: How Strengthening Community Forest Rights Mitigates Climate Change. World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C., www.wri.org/securingrights.

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Robin Barr	The Forest Trust
Sophie Beckham	International Paper
Chris Buss	International Union for Conservation of Nature
Joji Cariño	Forest Peoples Programme
Tuukka Castrén	The World Bank
Michael Chung	Johnson & Johnson
Jim Colla	Bureau Veritas
Matt Daggett	Greenpeace
Erika Drazen	The Forests Dialogue
Gary Dunning	The Forests Dialogue
Akiva Fishman	The Forests Dialogue
Peter Gardiner	Mondi Group
Jillian Gladstone	Carbon Disclosure Project

Jeffrey Hayward	Rainforest Alliance
Xiaoting Hou	The Forests Dialogue
Robert Hrubes	SCS Global Services
Glenn Hurowitz	Climate Advisers
Uta Jungermann	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Chris Knight	PricewaterhouseCoopers
Skip Krasny	Kimberly-Clark
Antti Marjokorpi	Stora Enso
Joshua Martin	Environmental Paper Network
Jessica McGlyn	Catalynics
Ivone Namikawa	Klabin
Cécile Ndjebet	African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests
Milagre Nuvunga	MICAIA Foundation
Ghan Shyam Pandey	Global Alliance of Community Forestry
Cassie Phillips	Weyerhaeuser
Miriam Prochnow	Association for the Preservation of the Upper Itajaí Valley
Päivi Salpakivi-Salomaa	UPM - The Biofore Company
Nigel Sizer	World Resources Institute
Miriam Swaffer	Union of Concerned Scientists
João Talocchi	Greenpeace
Jeremy Tamanini	Dual Citizen
Rod Taylor	WWF International
Gemma Tillack	Rainforest Action Network
Lucia von Reusner	Green Century Capital Management
Dominic Walubengo	Forest Action Network
Darrel Webber	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil