

# DRAFT

## INTERLAKEN+10

### Workshop on Governing Forest Landscapes:

#### Lessons learnt from 10 years of experience and the way forward post-2015

3-6 February 2015

*A country-led Initiative (CLI) in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests*

**I. Introduction** - "Trees don't grow only on soil; they grow on appropriate policies and institutions" (Bharat Pokharel).

1. The 11<sup>th</sup> session of the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF11, 4-15 May 2015, New York) will review the effectiveness of the current "international arrangement on forests" (IAF) and on that basis decide how to strengthen the IAF beyond 2015. As a country led contribution to the discussions at UNFF11, the Governments of Switzerland, Indonesia, South Africa, Mexico and Ukraine co-hosted Interlaken+10: "Workshop on Governing Forest Landscapes: Lessons learned from 10 years of experience and the way forward post-2015" (3-6 February, Interlaken).<sup>1</sup>

2. Objectives: Interlaken+10 is the sixth workshop in the following series of CLI workshops on the important topics of forest governance and decentralization:

- Decentralization, Federal Systems of Forestry and National Forest Programmes (27-30 April 2004, Interlaken, Switzerland)
- Forest Governance and Decentralization in Asia and the Pacific (4-6 September 2006, Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Forest Governance and Decentralization in Africa (8-11 April 2008, Durban, South Africa)
- Forest Governance, Decentralization and REDD-plus in Latin America and the Caribbean (31 August – 3 September 2010, Oaxaca, Mexico)
- Forests in a Green Economy for Countries in Eastern Europe, Northern and Central Asia: Lviv Forum (11-14 September 2012, Lviv, Ukraine)

3. These workshops have clearly demonstrated that good governance is of fundamental importance to achieving sustainable forest management and the contribution of forests and the forest sector to sustainable development. The objectives of Interlaken+10 were to:

- Take stock of the experience gained through previous workshops and lessons learned on governance and decentralisation as they relate to forest management and conservation;

---

<sup>1</sup> Interlaken+10 was convened by Indonesia, South Africa, Mexico, Ukraine and Switzerland, and co-organized by the Swiss Federal Office for Environment (FOEN); Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC); Bern University of Applied Sciences, School of Agriculture, Forest and Food Sciences (HAFL); HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); and the Programme for Forests (PROFOR). Co-Sponsors included the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation & Development, the Norwegian Ministry for Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland, the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, FOEN and SDC.

- Reflect on developments over the past 10 years related to governance of forest landscapes,<sup>2</sup> taking into account recent developments and trends globally;
- Identify key issues that need to be addressed in a global forest context; and
- Develop concrete proposals and recommendations to UNFF11 on how to meaningfully address governance issues and foster good governance of forest landscapes as part of the post-2015 IAF and UN development agenda.

This series of workshops were regarded as technical workshops to carry the issue of forest governance forward. Participants were invited to speak in their own personal capacities.

4. Participation: Interlaken+10 brought together over 164 participants from 155 countries and international, regional and non-governmental organizations.

5. Format: Interlaken+10 discussions were organized along two major axes: Regional and topical. Regionally, discussants were grouped into the following regions: Europe, Central Asia and North America; Asia (including the Middle East); Africa; and Latin America. There was also a global group. From the topical standpoint, discussions were organized around the following four topics:

1. Forest tenure and decentralization
2. Forest landscape governance and the green economy
3. Forest governance and biodiversity
4. Forest governance and safeguards in REDD+ Implementation

6. Parallel conference on youth: A parallel meeting (3-6 February) was organized by the International Forestry Students Association (IFSA) on behalf of the UNFF Major Group on “Youth”. This meeting, which developed a vision for the future of IAF and engagement of youth in the areas of international governance, education, technology and SFM, climate and forests, gathered 23 young forest professionals from five continents. The objective of the workshop was to gather the views of the major group Youth and to offer the space for them to develop a concrete policy proposal on the future United Nations forest policy regime, including issues of youth participation and forestry education, in order to frame an input for the UNFF11 conference in May in New York. The group fully embraced the opportunity and, after bringing together and discussing the issues from their different perspectives, informally presented their ideas and recommendations to a group of experts from the main conference for a lively exchange on the draft. In addition, they presented their results to the main conference audience on the last day of the conference. The workshop was funded by the German and Swiss Governments and supported by the main organizers of the conference and the Bern University of Applied Sciences. More detail is provided in Annex 1.

## II. Definitions

There is considerable confusion surrounding the terms “forest governance”, “forest-related governance”, “forest- landscape governance”. Here we provide definitions of use.

7. Governance. Governance is the process of governing, the way in which society is managed and how the competing priorities and interests of different groups are reconciled. It includes the formal institutions of government but also informal arrangements. Governance is concerned with the processes by which citizens participate in decision-making, how government is accountable to its citizens and how society obliges its members to observe its rules and laws (FAO 2009).

---

<sup>2</sup> Some prefer the use of forests to the term, ‘landscapes’.

8. Good Governance. The ingredients of ‘good governance’ remain controversial. Here we provide two widely accepted versions: Good governance is participatory, consensus-oriented, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account, and the voices of the most vulnerable are heard (UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP); <http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>).

Good forest governance is normative and is about quality. Important principles that constitute good governance include: stakeholder engagement or participation, fairness, accountability, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness (from Bodegom et al. 2012, An approach for integrating forest governance into national forest-related monitoring systems, **FAO Forestry Policy and Institutions Working Paper No. 29**, Rome).

### **III. Background on the five workshops held from 2004 to 2012**

9. The 2004 Interlaken CLI workshop was global in scope and focused on conceptual and operational aspects of decentralization. The 2006 Yogyakarta CLI workshop focused on requisites for economically and technically viable decentralization and governance reform in Asia and the Pacific. The 2008 Durban CLI workshop emphasized governance and decentralization links with livelihoods, conservation and financial flows in Africa. The 2010 Oaxaca workshop focused on governance, decentralization and REDD in Latin American Countries. The 2012 workshop focused on the role of governance in a pathway towards a green economy in Eastern Europe and Northern and Central Asia.

10. All five workshops:

- Brought together a range of stakeholders from Government, civil society, research institutions, community organizations and the business sector.
- Examined livelihoods, equity, forest conditions and sustainable development more generally in the context of addressing decentralization.
- Employed a variety of communication approaches, including formal presentations, panel discussions, working groups and field trips.
- Facilitated the sharing of experience among countries, stimulated insights, identified lessons learned and developed recommendations for action by UNFF and others.

10. The reports of all the workshops were presented and distributed at the subsequent UNFF session.

### **IV. Lessons learned in the last ten years**

11. A central finding has been the ubiquity of problems relating to the dynamics involved in bridging scales, knowledge and values in multi-level governance:

- a. National and global trends influence social, political, economic interactions at local levels; similarly, local realities influence how such national and global forces play out.
- b. There is increasing fragmentation in dealing with forests at all level and scales, including protective, productive and social functions; there are also differentiated views of SFM.
- c. The values and benefits of forests accrue at different scales:
  1. Decentralization should facilitate responsiveness to local values, but power imbalances can interfere;
  2. National/global values include, e.g. biodiversity, climate and hydrological regulation, soil protection.

3. Decentralization should strive for balance and sustainability of values and benefits across scales.
- d. Main drivers of deforestation are found at multiple scales and are generally outside the forestry sector; effective cross-sectoral policies are required to address them.

## **12. Local level communities and local stakeholders**

- For forest management to be sustainable at the local level (which is crucial for broader scale sustainability), it must deliver significant, net positive benefits to local communities, households, and individuals, not just burdens (timber, REDD+, forest conservation).
- Community-based forest management has been shown to be a viable livelihood strategy and a means to address SFM and climate change, but it requires empowerment of local people, capacity-building at various levels, community support (including recognizing indigenous knowledge, valuing local capabilities, secure tenure).
- Forest law, as reflected locally, consists of inconsistent/conflicting rules, unrealistic prohibitions, burdensome (sometimes corrupt) bureaucratic requirements, and high transaction costs, all of which interfere with compliance with the law.
- Complaint/conflict resolution mechanisms are needed to guarantee community forest management rights are respected in design / implementation of REDD+, protected area management and land-use decisions.

## **13. Landscape level and cross-sectoral coordination**

- Landscape transformation has been driven by national/global policies and markets, changing consumption at all levels and expansion of transnational traders and investors.
- Different landscape actors and production systems, each with different, dynamic social contexts, result in different land uses, which in turn require appropriately calibrated interventions, incentives and sanctions.
- Landscape approaches add complexity. Engagement of women and the vulnerable becomes more difficult. Differing landscape features and administrative boundaries increase conflict and confusion. But cultural similarities across landscapes may be sources of insights, cooperation.
- Need holistic and comprehensive approach to governance reforms. This can bring more coherence/consistency to policies in many spheres that affect forests and forest peoples.
- Cross-sectoral integration of policies should avoid adversely affecting communities (e.g. through a proliferation of regulations) and should ideally contribute to human health and development.

## **14. National level: Central government roles and constraints**

- Inconsistencies in policies/laws/regulations create/worsen grey areas where corruption and illegality can flourish. Effective collective action can improve regulation and enforcement.
- Central governments tend simply to devolve responsibility with little or no authority or finance.
- Dysfunction of public institutions can be a stumbling block to governance reform. Institutional innovations such as third-party certification, independent observers and Monitoring Reporting and Verification approaches for REDD+ can promote change, as can bottom up pressure from an informed, empowered and proactive population.
- The national level also can and should play an important role in providing guidelines, interacting with international actors, and promoting information flow, financing and monitoring.

- A degree of command and control measures can protect and help sustainably manage forests; these are best based on science and robust analysis (including analysis of local human and natural conditions), with transparency and accountability.

#### **15. Regional and trans-national levels and cooperation**

- Governments need to play a more active, concerted role in stimulating markets for sustainable products (such as certified wood products, wood energy, NTFPs) and services (including carbon offsets).
- Enhancing trans-boundary cooperation in forest protection, forest law enforcement, data analysis and research; sharing resources for regional capacity building are also key.
- Need for regional learning platforms and channels for continuing exchanges on forest-related issues among regional stakeholders –governments, scientists, indigenous and local peoples and their organizations, business and health sectors and others—to support regional cooperation, strategy development and concerted action.

#### **16. Global level: governance of the world's forests**

- Lack of a comprehensive stewardship for forests:<sup>3</sup> There has been some progress towards common discourse and conceptual reference frames but the global forest governance regime remains fragmented.
- There is a serious challenge in translating stated national commitments into concrete actions.
- There is a need to increase the efficiency, effectiveness and capacity of global platforms dealing with forest-related issues to deliver equitable outcomes.
- There is a need to connect more effectively with global platforms to regional platforms.
- Acknowledge the power and potential of lower level actors, as their wishes/responses interact with higher level policies. This can lead to flexibility, feedback and learning in policy/implementation processes at all levels.
- However, some doubts remains that such outcomes can be delivered from the global level considering the experience of the past 20 years.

### **V. Key issues and findings discussed in the workshop**

The findings from the four thematic groups are summarized here:<sup>4</sup>

#### **11. Forest tenure and decentralization**

This group emphasized the following:

- The need to recognize the efficacy of local communities and indigenous peoples to manage their forest resources sustainably when forest rights are clearly recognized. The growing body of empirical evidence was discussed, demonstrating that where communities exercise strong, devolved forest tenure rights environmental and social outcomes are better.

---

<sup>3</sup> Stewardship of forests, as used in this report, means providing leadership to promote the vital significance of forests for economic and social development and environmental protection of all countries, to integrate forests and the broader sustainable development agenda and to promote implementation of sustainable management of all types of forest and trees outside forests at all levels through *inter alia* providing relevant policy recommendations and advice, fostering coordination and collaboration with relevant stakeholders, mobilizing resources and high level political support, effective influencing of major international/intergovernmental processes and providing substantive support for activities carried out to this end.

<sup>4</sup> The results from the regional groups are presented in detail in Annex 2, with challenges and recommendations highlighted there.

- In light of the growing trend for communities to take responsibility for managing forests, changes are needed in the roles of forestry agencies. These agencies should shift from their longstanding role of direct regulation and enforcement to protecting local rights and providing technical advice, in a more advisory and facilitative manner.
- Complexity and high transaction costs can constrain effective forest management by communities.
- There is a need to build on lessons learned from 10 years of work on governance and tenure when considering a possible amendment to the Non Legally Binding Instrument on all Types of Forests, especially in light of the evolving Sustainable Development Goals. Governance and tenure security could usefully be included in Global Objective 2.
- Adopt and encourage countries to implement the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security adopted by the FAO Committee on World Food Security in 2012.
- Build consensus on the necessary elements of a governance system/good governance, building on existing tools such as Profor/FAO guidelines<sup>5</sup> and WRI forest governance assessment framework.<sup>6</sup>

## 12. Forest governance and biodiversity

This working group concluded that the principles of governance of forest landscapes apply equally to the governance of biodiversity conservation.

Challenges include the following:

- Governance reform processes take time and are vulnerable to shifts in political priorities.
- There is fragmentation of forest issues and insufficient participation of many major stakeholders (notably civil society & private sector).

## 13 Forest landscape governance and green economy

This group emphasized the need for long-term investments to incorporate stakeholder interests, in support of more equitable processes, and the difficulty (but necessity) of improving evidence-based indicators for monitoring and evaluation.

### Challenges

- Inadequate understanding of the compatibility of SFM with a Green Economy, taking into account the application of green economy principles at the operational level.
- A consensus has not yet been reached on the valuation and payment for ecosystem services within a green economy framework, taking into account the diverse values of landscapes / ecosystem services / cultural and spiritual values.
- Forest sector priorities have not taken into account policies in other sectors and are therefore not fully integrated into the overall policy framework (i.e., there is a need for removal of perverse incentives and subsidies).

---

<sup>5</sup> PROFOR/FAO 2011, Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance, Rome.

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.wri.org/publication/assessing-forest-governance>.

- The private sector has not been adequately integrated into the private sector in forest policy development and implementation at international and national levels.
- Corporate social responsibility in forest industries has not yet progressed sufficiently to ensure SFM.

#### **14. Forest governance and safeguards in REDD+ implementation**

This discussion included an overview of REDD+ from UN-REDD perspective, an example of a REDD+ project in the Philippines, and an analysis of the benefit sharing mechanisms in several countries, all with special emphasis on how UNFF can contribute to the REDD+ safeguards work. It emphasized the complexity of the issue (e.g., seven UNFCCC safeguards, 152 indicators in the Philippines).

Challenges:

- How best to encourage the adoption and operationalization of the safeguards that are being developed
- Inadequate sharing of lessons learned with regard to REDD+
- Leveraging and scaling up of forest governance
- Coordination between UN-REDD and other initiatives and clarification of safeguards and approaches to them, both within and between countries
- Effective mechanisms/platforms for multiple stakeholder involvement, including indigenous peoples
- Elite capture and lack of transparency - significant issues in the various benefit sharing mechanisms tried

### **VI. Key issues/points raised by workshop participants**

#### **A. UNFF and Global Objectives on Forests**

- The implementation of SFM and achievement of the four global objectives on forests (GOFs) is critically dependent on good governance at all levels.
- The current four GOFs are not well formulated and contain overlapping elements that are difficult for countries to assess and report on.
- There are also significant gaps in the four GOFs in the areas of governance, scientific/technical cooperation, and forest product production and value-added processing, which form the basis for many of the national and international actions contained in the Forest Instrument and are notable themes reflected in the SDG targets.
- UNFF has weak links to other international forestry processes.

#### **B. Governance and its evidence base**

- There is no single form or model of government associated with good governance. The principles of good governance can be applied in systems of government that range from highly centralized to highly decentralized.
- The term “governance” is often used interchangeably to refer to the international institutional architecture, as well as to the way a country takes decisions and applies the rule of law. These are different concepts.

- Putting in place measures for good governance can be difficult and is not without costs; the challenges of good governance often go well beyond the forest sector.
- The role of science in forest governance is only effective if the science is independent.
- Mechanisms to connect discussions and resolutions to action/follow up on the ground are needed.
- Indicators designed to measure forest-related governance already exist. These need to be applied and reported on at global, regional and national levels.

### **C. Economic, financial and livelihood concerns**

- Good governance and a stable national investment climate go hand in hand; good governance is needed to generate private commercial investment, both domestic and international, in SFM.
- There is a difficulty with financing of forest-related initiatives, particularly at the local level.
- Work is needed on the whole value chain for forest products – value-added processing, etc. (cf. the findings of the Forest Legality Alliance).<sup>7</sup>
- Forest benefits are not equitably distributed, particularly with regard to women and forest peoples.

### **D. Tenure**

- Secure land tenure for communities and indigenous people has multiple benefits, including reducing deforestation and forest degradation, improving forest management and enhancing livelihoods.

### **E. Capacity building**

- Capacity is inadequate at various levels, particularly as regards the ability of forestry actors to communicate strategically with other sectors and other actors.
- Many countries lack the capacity and expertise to deal with other sectors (e.g. agriculture, transport, energy) that are the drivers of deforestation, and address disparities in power among stakeholders.
- The development of effective, equitable governance takes time (cf. advances in the Model Forests Network after 20 years of work or the experience of the Adaptive Collaborative Management Program at CIFOR).

### **F. Communication and decisionmaking**

- More effective and regular communication and sharing of experience could lead to useful learning across sectors and among stakeholders.
- Many forest-related governance issues deal with a country's fundamental decision-making processes regarding land tenure and access to forest resources, civil society participation and transparency.
- Effective mechanisms for cross-sectoral coordination are basic elements of good governance at all levels.

---

<sup>7</sup> See for instance, the FLA Risk Tool: <http://www.forestlegality.org/risk-tool>.



## **VII. Recommendations directed to UNFF with regard to UNFF11 and to the Post 2015 IAF**

Participants of the CLI endorse the following recommendations, recognizing that a variety of opinions have been expressed. We have opted for greater inclusivity, striving to maximize the insights available to UNFF in its coming deliberations.

1. Develop a fifth global objective on forests that addresses good forest-related governance and make this a basic aspect of reporting on implementation of the Forest Instrument.
2. Initiate activities at UNFF and beyond that will contribute to a broader stewardship mandate for the world's forests.
3. Include as a function of the CPF or its successor to support/facilitate efforts by countries and build their capacity to improve forest-related governance, including for example by strengthening land tenure security, mechanisms for effective cross-sectoral and stakeholder coordination, and enabling environments for investment in SFM at local and national levels.
4. Revise the Forest Instrument to explicitly address issues related to forest governance, including aspects of good governance (tenure security, secure rights and stronger voice of indigenous people and local communities, justice and rule of law, etc.).
5. Explicitly include the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the final SDG indicators addressing land tenure security (e.g. SDG 1 and 5).
6. Position the UNFF to have a key role in the monitoring and review of the forest related aspects of the SDGs.
7. Initiate a process, within the pertinent framework and in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, to inform REDD+ processes on broader forest governance issues relevant to SFM/REDD+ and to help operationalize the REDD+ safeguards, including monitoring of its implementation.
8. Provide a platform to share experiences and lessons learned related to forest governance among countries and across regions and processes, and provide channels for these lessons to inform Forum decisions.
9. Attract and meaningfully engage the private sector, women, local communities and indigenous peoples, other Major Groups and regional/subregional bodies, including through the creation of interactive platforms and identifying new and emerging issues.
10. Bearing in mind the special needs of countries, support and facilitate country efforts to strengthen forest-related governance, in particular their efforts to:
  - a. Enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and equity of decentralization where appropriate.
  - b. Strengthen policies, regulations and mechanisms to enhance incentives for investment in SFM at all levels.
  - c. Improve transparency and access to information (e.g. on concession operations, forest inventories) and address corruption and illegal forest activities.

- d. Utilize national forest programs and similar frameworks to engage industry and civil society stakeholders at all levels.
  - e. Improve strategic communication and coordination among forest stakeholders, between the forest sector and other sectors, and across levels of governance.
  - f. Strengthen the equitable distribution of benefits across forest-related value chains, including through technology transfer, R&D support, extension and policy support, particularly for small and medium enterprises.
  - g. Promote the needs and interests of the range of forest dependent populations, especially women and marginalized groups.
  - h. Reinforce, build on and integrate local institutions, knowledge and capabilities in forests and forest management.
  - i. Raise awareness of the current and potential contributions of local communities and indigenous peoples to SFM.
  - j. Contextualize forests of the broader landscape, including cultural landscape, recognizing the safety net functions of forests (subsistence, disaster risk reduction).
11. Facilitate access to financing of forest-related initiatives (such as REDD+, GEF, Green Climate Fund, etc.), for countries for SFM, particularly for initiatives at the local level.
12. Provide guidance on the valuation of forest resources and services at local and national levels, improved benefit sharing mechanisms, implementation of PES schemes, and developing green national accounting systems, including through market mechanisms.
13. Encourage countries to adopt a common framework as a starting point for monitoring and assessing forest-related governance, in pursuit of a global stewardship mandate.

## **Annex 1 – Students’ Input**

## **Annex 2: on Regional Variation**

### **Regional issues and recommendations**



While most regions acknowledged some progress in decentralization and governance related to forests, the following issues and challenges remain, along with region-specific recommendations:

#### **1. Africa**

- Limited or no financial resources at the local level to support SFM
- Inadequate capacities of various stakeholders, especially the local communities
- In some cases, still unclear communication channels for information flow
- Weak forest policy and legislative frameworks in some countries
- Marginalization of women and youth in forest management planning and decision making
- Reluctance of governments/the state to devolve sufficient authority to local communities to own and manage the forest resources
- Inadequate transparency in the sharing of forest benefits and resulting conflicts among various stakeholders and lack of trust for state forest managers
- NGOs play increasingly important roles in SFM but lack coordination within the forest sector to increase their accountability.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Recognize and involve women and youth as important stakeholders.
- Recognize the increasingly important roles of NGOs in forestry work and establish mechanisms for their involvement and accountability .
- Develop clear frameworks for resource ownership (tenure regimes) to promote commitment of various actors in SFM.
- Promote forest restoration efforts at various levels.

#### **2. Asia issues and challenges:**

- Weak interagency coordination at country level
- Weak voice and economic incentives for the poor
- Limited area and quality of forest resources available for community forestry
- Contribution of forests to GDP and valuation of its various functions
- Policy and legal frameworks are either non-existent or not implemented
- Lack of clarity of tenure rights of local communities and indigenous people
- Uncertainty about how to “sustain the gains”
- Conflicting objectives on the use of forests, e.g., conservation versus use
- Limited capacity of rights holders and stakeholders
- Lack of clarity in the roles, responsibilities and rights of duty bearers and rights holders
- Lack of true decentralization and devolution

#### **Recommendations**

- Support capacity building in response to the need for a reorientation of global objectives of forests (SFM, education, access to finance and insurance, etc.).
- Support/develop platforms for learning and communication, including (a) sharing learning on the implementation and monitoring of the Forest Instrument, (b) catalyzing

national systems for effective and user friendly communication strategies and (c) promoting sharing forums at regional levels.

- Support assessments in the following spheres:
  - Valuation of forests to show its contribution to GDP and other goods and services
  - Identification of stakeholder capacity gaps
  - Needs assessment of major groups in effective engagement of SFM at all levels
  - Identification of bottlenecks and monitoring mechanisms to combat corruption in the forest sector
  - Need for national forest programmes
- Facilitation, support and implementation of the agreed provisions on
  - Secure tenure rights
  - fair access to market
  - effective association of rights holders
  - basic support services
  - facilitation of the mainstreaming, integrating and coordination of related policies, and a process of formulating national and local policies and programmes
  - identify and recognize the multiple goods and services of the forests
- Develop a monitoring and reporting system for the Forest Instrument, guidelines for the assessment of the Forest Instrument
- Recognize the varying needs and capacity of LFCCs and SIDs

### **3. Europe, Central Asia and North America region**

Unlike the other regions, some participants in this group did not automatically consider decentralization itself necessarily to be a desirable goal. This group noted improvements in representation, coordination and use of funds.

#### **Challenges:**

- Meaningful involvement of indigenous peoples
- Economic interests overriding indigenous peoples' interests
- Local authorities/communities need to have the capacity and willingness to report/be accountable.
- Shift and increased workload to local authorities on forest management without adequate funding from the national or local levels
- Adequate balance of shared responsibilities between the central and local levels; as well as among forest related sectors
- Conflicting interests of different stakeholders in forestry

#### **Recommendations:**

- Decentralization, where needed, must be systematic with adequate funding and capacity, addressing the problems being experienced, with full participation of relevant stakeholders.
- UNFF should actively build bridges to engage with other sectors (i.e. water, agriculture, energy, biodiversity, construction, tourism, etc.)
- UNFF should encourage member States to establish multi-stakeholder platforms at different levels, and involve them in inter-sessional activities.
- UNFF should carry out an analysis of social, economic and environmental costs and benefits of good governance.

- The forest sector should contribute to the work being carried out under the system of environmental-economic accounting under the UN to reflect the value of forests in national accounts.
  - Countries should support mechanisms (i.e. private owner associations) to increase the efficiency of small scale forestry.
  - Explore ways to strengthen the active and positive engagement of indigenous peoples in forest management.
  - Carry out further work to establish incentive mechanisms (such as PES) that allow forest owners to capture the benefits for providing ecosystem services.
4. **Latin American and Caribbean Region** – Although a number of positive changes were identified in these countries, the focus here is on the remaining issues and challenges:
- Fragmentation of governance among scales and between technical personnel and decision makers
  - A tendency to consider that ‘one size fits all’ in thinking about conservation
  - Limited recognition of human diversity and diverse livelihood strategies, as well as adequate access of local communities to decision-making processes
  - Inequitable benefit sharing with/among local communities
  - Lack of coordinated policy-making and mainstreaming of good forest governance
  - Poorly designed instruments to translate policy into action
  - Decentralization still seen as a goal attainable in the “short” term
  - Inadequate generation and storage or management of information
  - Persistent dichotomy between decision-makers and technicians /practitioners within public entities
  - Lack of recognition of the full value of forest benefits
  - Limited progress in realizing the potential benefits of public–private partnerships to fund and support SFM
  - Lack of attention to forests and SFM in the agendas of regional governance bodies (e.g. CARICOM, UNASUR, CAN)

#### **Recommendations**

- Encourage better coordination and communication across scales, in response to additional financial resources and opportunities for capacity building.
- Encourage and support stronger institutions at the sub-national level with adequate capacity to implement actions on the ground and to fulfill their mandates.
- Support better coordination between agencies that focus on development, participation, and environmental issues.
- Design and provide better tools and mechanisms that allow translation of policy visions into operations on the ground with adequate financing.
- Support use of existing tools/mechanisms more efficiently and in an integrated manner.
- Generate and provide governments with clear guidelines for environmental governance at subnational level (e.g. mainstreaming land use planning at different scales).
- Encourage holistic approaches that address forests in support of effective environmental governance.
- Support efforts to move decentralized government agencies beyond monitoring and control, and transform them into strategic partners for forest management.
- Strengthen governmental recognition that decentralization is actually a long-term effort that includes and needs institution building.

- Seek out and build on existing development and social mechanisms that can channel resources and capacities from national to local and vulnerable population (e.g., social development mechanisms, national conservation programmes)
- Encourage governments to design and implement monitoring, in cooperation with decisionmakers, to organize environmental information in an effective manner (nationally and sub-nationally).
- Encourage holistic, multi-scale land use planning and joint prioritization of areas with multiple land management goals.
- Encourage improvements in participation of forest sector in national accounting systems while assessing different methodologies and means to do so.
- Encourage countries to improve tracking/traceability systems for forest products.
- Recognize the relevance of forest-related services to risk reduction efforts and as safety nets for vulnerable populations.
- Encourage engaging market actors, recognizing the diversity of objectives of enterprises, with clearer set of goals and mechanisms.
- Assess the role of COFLAC (FAO) and its possibilities within the new IAF to start refining a roadmap based on knowledge sharing and exchange of lessons learnt.
- Evaluate the feasibility / need for proposing a technical regional body to assess countries in forestry related issues and design governance structures.

## **Global Region**

This group considered a range of subjects from general definitional issues (e.g., forest landscape vs. forests within landscapes); and architectural governance vs. good governance (including participation issues). They found a number of improvements had occurred globally; but also identified a range of shortcomings/challenges:

- Good governance is difficult and expensive, and no one is ready to pay the costs.
- Challenges go far beyond the forestry sector.
- Role of science in forest governance only works if science is actually independent.
- The global economic system may provide a creative alternative to ensure good governance.
- Corruption remains a strong incentive for bad governance.

Several capacities and mechanisms were identified as needing improvement as well:

- Need capacity and expertise to deal with other sectors that are the drivers of deforestation (e.g., agriculture, energy).
- Need capacity to understand and address disparities in power, for multistakeholder discussions.
- Need mechanisms to connect discussions and resolutions to action/follow up on the ground.
- Work is needed on the whole value chain for forest products – value-added processing, etc.; build links to sectoral discussions in SDGs.

## **Recommendations**

- Develop/add a fifth global Objective on Forests that deals with governance.
- Secure a national commitment to transparency and access to information (e.g., on concessions, forest inventories, etc.).
- Promote explicit support through the SDGs for recognition of forest rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and develop relevant forest-related indicators.

- Build consensus on the necessary elements of a governance system/good governance, building on existing tools such as PROFOR/FAO guidelines and the WRI forest governance assessment framework.
- Use UNFF's convening power to inform REDD+ processes on broader forest governance issues relevant to REDD+.
- Establish an international reporting requirement on forest governance.

DRAFT