

CSM Preliminary Comments on Recommendations of the HLPE report - Sustainable forestry for food security and nutrition

Key points on the set of recommendations:

- **Need to be clearly and specifically focussed on communities directly dependant on forests including ALL groups of small scale food producers and their community forest management (CFM) systems:** The recommendations must be much more specific about whose FSN they are addressing and clearly differentiate between the importance of forests for the worldwide population and for the billions of directly forest dependant peoples and populations. 'Forest dependent people' include nearly all the major constituencies of small scale food producers that are recognised in the CFS reform document - smallholder family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers, Indigenous Peoples, hunter gatherers and this must be clearly acknowledged. Accordingly, the term 'forest dependent' cannot be used so broadly as to include people who derive benefits from logging or other types of commercial activities based on monoculture plantations - this is a completely different model and type of connection to the forest. The term has to be connected to traditional practices of local communities who reside 'in and around' forests and are dependent on forests for their traditions, livelihood, food security and derives their identity, social, cultural and economic well-being and values out of forests.
- **Need stronger grounding in the RtF mandate of CFS and in related rights based frameworks such as UNDRIP and Womens Rights –** All the recommendations should be embedded in the progressive realisation of the RtF (including related rights) of forest dependant communities including small scale food producers, local communities, Indigenous Peoples and traditional peoples. Currently the importance of advancing forest dependent communities' Rights are mentioned only in recommendation 6 and 7. There is also no recommendation on protecting the collective or communal rights over forests and territories they depend on despite this being the main type of rights forest communities tend to practise to conserve, govern and live in their forests.
- **Strong recognition and policy support for the contribution that forest dependant communities make to FSN and forest protection** A big gap in the recommendations is the lack of recognition for the successful and sophisticated methods that forest dependant communities practise to conserve their forests while achieving FSN and dignified livelihoods for themselves and their communities. Forest dependant communities have been widely recognised including by the FAO as

bring part of the 80% of small holders who are feeding the world^{1 2} and require particular policy support to be able to continue doing this. But many of these forest dependent communities are also at the same time conserving forests and deriving livelihoods from them. Broadly categorised as 'Community Forest Management' (CFM) a wide body of research shows that this approach allows people and communities to benefit from forests and land without depleting natural resources or damaging the climate. CFM is also often a more effective and equitable way of conserving forests and biodiversity than the Protected Areas approach. So it is a win-win practise to achieve both FSN and environmental outcomes in forested areas. In order to succeed CFM needs enabling environment for example clear land tenure and secure community rights, genuine participation of forest-user communities in decision-making processes and supportive governmental processes. We do not believe the term Sustainable Forest Management includes CFM since SFM can include industrial tree monoculture plantations or other practises, which have a deeply negative impact on FSN.

- **Must recommend a review of the current very technical FAO definition of forests that equates plantations with forests and that does not account for the social, cultural, spiritual and livelihood value of forests that are key for FSN:** The recommendations do not address the widespread critiques of the FAO definition of forests, despite recognising them in the HLPE report. These critiques are that the definition is very technical and consider forests as merely a collection of trees. This definition benefits mainly the wood and plantations based pulp, rubber and timber industries. It doesn't take into account the social, cultural, livelihood, spiritual values that forests have for forest dependant communities. The FAO definition also does not differentiate between tree plantations and forests – either with regard to their impacts on the achievement of FSN or their contribution to it. In this way they conceal and suppress the deeply negative impacts that crop and tree monocultures have on peoples and their traditional food systems, affecting especially women and the environment. For forest dependant communities, it is clear that plantations are not forests. Especially in the global South for example industrial tree monoculture companies grab millions of hectares of land from communities while the high use of pesticides on these monocultures, affects the nutrition and quality of food available from the local area. The plantations support to climate mitigation, is limited, at best a temporary contribution until the plantation exists, and following a model based on intensive use of fossil-fuels by way of the application of agrottoxins, fertilizers and the transport of wood products. In its mandate of providing policy coherence it is important that the CFS addresses this issue since the FAO's definition, instead of harmonizing and reflecting 'numerous definitions' of forests, has been the main definition and reference used to formulate

¹ FAO factsheet 'small holders and family farmers'

http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/sustainability_pathways/docs/Factsheet_SMALLHOLDERS.pdf

² FAO the State of Food Insecurity in the World 2015 <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4646e.pdf>

the many national forests definitions, further strengthening unequal power relations between industries and the FSN needs of communities affected by such plantations.³

FAO forest definition also does not exclude under its category of 'planted forests' genetically engineered monoculture tree plantations.

- **Does not tackle the drivers of rising deforestation** – The HLPE report recognises that primary forests are being destroyed by plantations and that this has negative impacts on FSN. Yet the recommendations make no mention of stopping deforestation by addressing its drivers – expansion of industrial agriculture, wood and energy. The narrative of the report places forest conservation and agriculture as opposing and mutually exclusive outcomes without recognising that it is industrial agriculture that makes the primary contribution to deforestation. Industrial agriculture being responsible for 30% of deforestation in Africa and Asia, but close to 70% in Latin America. Several studies show that the main cause of deforestation especially in the tropics is large scale production of commodities soy, palm, cattle for export.^{4 5} We do not need to fall into the trap of accepting the expansion of industrial agriculture without questioning whether this demand is desirable or sustainable. FAO documents show that we already produce enough food to feed a rising global population and that curbing the huge amounts of grains directed towards biofuels, industrial livestock as well as reducing food waste would release an additional 50 – 60% of grains without the need for more industrial agriculture and forest destruction. The recommendations should promote sustainable models of agriculture such as agroecology including agroforestry.
- **Forest workers are not mentioned**: Other than a small mention in the full report the challenges faced by forest workers or their rights are not mentioned. Workers on plantations face a range of impacts from poor labour terms and conditions to exposure to pesticides.

³ Chazdon, R.L., Brancalion, P.H.S., Laestadius, L. et al. *Ambio* (2016) 'When is a forest a forest? Forest concepts and definitions in the era of forest and landscape restoration' doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0772-y

⁴ <http://globalforestatlas.yale.edu/land-use/industrial-agriculture>

⁵ Laurance, W. L.; Albernaz, A. K. M.; Fearnside, P. M.; Vasconcelos, H; Ferreira, L. V. 2004. "Deforestation in Amazonia". *Science* 304, 2004, pp. 1109- 1111

| # | HLPE Proposal | CSM Comments |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Forests and trees contribute directly and indirectly to FSN in numerous ways. They are a source of energy, foods and other products. They provide livelihoods for an important part of the worldwide population, often the most vulnerable. Forests perform vital ecosystem services, including the regulation of the water and carbon cycles and protection of biodiversity, that are essential to agriculture. These contributions vary according to types of forests and the way they are managed. They are of course particularly important for forest dependent people but have also impacts on a very large scale. Sustainable forest management aims to maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental values of all types of forests, for the benefit of present and future generations, leaving no one behind.</p> | <p>ADD chapeau to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give a clear focus for the policy recommendations – towards improving the FSN for the millions of communities directly dependent on forests and who are most at risk from the loss of forests and lack of forest access, use and control rights. • Reaffirm the social, cultural, spiritual, environmental and livelihood importance of forests to these forest dependant communities and recognise their existing community forest management systems. • Make the clear link between the CFS mandate and forests – All of the categories of small scale food producers and those identified as family farmers or smallholders by FAO including smallholder family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, Indigenous Peoples, hunter gatherers are dependant on forests for their contribution to global FSN but are also at risk from forest governance at all levels that do not take this into account. • Ground in Rights framework and CFS mandate |
| 1 | <p>DEVELOP AND USE POLICY-RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE ON THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS OF FORESTS AND TREES TO FSN:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States should identify local communities and Indigenous Peoples as the primary trainers, practitioners and holders of scientific and traditional knowledge. They are responsible for community management on a day-to-day basis. It is not an academic issue. While |

States and academic institutions should take measures to inform and train FSN policy-makers and practitioners about the importance of sustainable forests for FSN. This should be done using participatory methodologies that enable the co-construction of knowledge about the contributions of forests and trees to FSN, at different spatial and temporal scales.

In particular, they should:

a. build the necessary capacities, professional training and organizational changes needed for participatory expertise and research;

b. design metrics and collect data that are disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, social class, age and other social parameters, to measure the multiple, direct and indirect, contributions that forests and trees make to FSN through production, ecological processes, income and livelihoods, cultures and well-being, with a particular focus on the FSN status of forest-dependent people;

c. gather data on nutritional trade-offs between increased income and changing diets on the one hand, and socio-cultural, economic, environmental and health impacts of deforestation and forest degradation on FSN on the other hand;

d. improve trans-sectoral, systemic data

we recognize the role that the academia can play, we must also recognize that many academic approaches to the forest facilitate a simplistic understanding of it, and therefore facilitate management practices that harm and destroy Forests. Academic actions should play a role in strengthening the needs expressed by local communities and Indigenous Peoples in community forest management.

- Design adequate, trustworthy and valid instruments that can be used by communities in order to keep track of the contributions forests make to food, climate, and systemic services as well as of the problems that arise in systems and their components due to the loss of species in forests.
- States and FAO should provide better data on the particular contribution to FSN of forest communities. Public institutions in charge of forest management should provide support to IPs and local communities to conserve forest and strengthen their community forest management systems to protect and monitor the flora and fauna. An improvement in the quality of life of these communities should be sought while guaranteeing their Human Rights over their territories. Such institutions should respect and recognise the collective rights of IPs and local communities over resources and to govern and related relevant country laws, policies and legislations.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>collection in FSN and forestry monitoring systems, on the use of wild foods (animals, plants, mushrooms) and forest products, including for dietary quality and diversity, poverty alleviation, health and medicinal purposes, as well as harvest impacts, to ensure long-term availability of wild foods and forest products;</p> <p>e. strengthen FAO INFOODS studies on the nutrient composition of wild foods.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>ENHANCE THE ROLE OF FORESTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESSES AT ALL SCALES WITHOUT COMPROMISING THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE FOOD OF FOREST-DEPENDENT PEOPLE:</p> <p>All stakeholders should use an ecosystem approach to promote the sustainable management of forests and trees, from local to global levels, in order to preserve ecosystem functions of forests and trees, as well as their contributions to FSN.</p> <p>In particular, states, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other stakeholders should:</p> <p>a. Recognize and enhance the role of forests and trees in regulating climate, water cycle and water quality, as well as in biodiversity conservation;</p> | <p>This set of recommendations could be improved by the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Make them more specific 2) Frame them as positive actions rather than only prevention of negative. While we agree that violations of the RtF of forest communities should be prevented, there is also the duty to take positive action to realise the RtF. We should be guaranteeing and ensuring the RtF of forest dependant people. 3) Frame environmental and FSN outcomes and potentially mutually reinforcing rather than opposing. We agree that RtF of forest communities should be protected in the face of some types of environmental policies. However it is equally important to promote governance and management systems that provide both FSN, livelihood and environmental outcomes – (genuine) Community forest management being the most well evidenced of these. <p>Based on this we would include the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise and promote the potential of Community Forest Management to achieve FSN, environmental and forest conservation outcomes. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>b. Promote the role of forests and trees to limit soil erosion and land degradation, and to restore land;</p> <p>c. Consider how the implementation of initiatives designed to address environmental issues will affect local communities' and indigenous peoples' access to forest foods, and how this might impact dietary diversity and quality.</p> <p>a)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise that sustainability of forest systems is achieved through a systemic and holistic relationship of forests with local communities, its components and other systems. • States and FAO should include in their forest policies adequate mechanisms to stop the conversion of primary forest to monoculture tree plantations, recognising that plantations have negative impacts on the environment, health, livelihoods and the RtF. For example the impact of the use of pesticides and fertilisers in plantations on socio-environmental health. • Stronger language to prevent the negative impacts on forest communities and FSN from state sponsored and conventional, exclusive model of 'protected areas' • We would remove or re-word the recommendation a) in order to not make recommendations on 'conservation' and 'environmental' outcomes without addressing the priorities of forest communities' and their FSN. • Re-word recommendation b) To promote the role of forests in achieving the RtF of forest communities while delivering environmental benefits such as regulating climate, protecting biodiversity and enhancing organic soil matter. |
| 3 | <p>SUPPORT THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF FORESTS TO IMPROVE LIVELIHOODS AND ECONOMIES FOR FSN:</p> <p>States and the private sector should:</p> <p>a. develop and promote participatory forest planning and management policies and measures that enable access to nutritionally</p> | <p>This set of recommendations should be aimed at States since it concerns policymaking and management. Although we do not believe the private sector should be excluded its role should primarily be to comply with national and international legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation a) should include community forest management as the best example of participatory forest management systems |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>important forest foods, in particular for forest dependent communities and indigenous peoples;</p> <p>b. promote and enable income generation and livelihoods opportunities in local communities, through the sustainable management and use of forest resources, particularly for those living in mountains and other remote areas;</p> <p>c. integrate low-carbon, renewable energy schemes in forest management plans to achieve multiple benefits, including adequate access to fuel for food preparation;</p> <p>d. increase public investments to support community-driven, forest-based enterprises for sustainable livelihoods, culture and well-being;</p> <p>e. invest in social and technical innovations to minimize health risks associated with the use of fuelwood and wood stoves;</p> <p>f. develop transformative, transparent and understandable marketing information systems for non-wood forest products.</p> <p>a)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation b) should emphasise that income generation should respect the ways communities interact with forests and their types of transactions, such as bartering. Income generation should not place more pressure on species nor promote disorganisation or rupture of pre-existing relations. Accordingly implementing genuine Free Prior and Informed consent including the right of communities to say no to ‘development’ and ‘management’ initiatives is vital. • Recommendation c) should only refer to small scale, community owned and managed renewable energy schemes. The hugely negative impacts of come large scale energy schemes such as biofuels and bioenergy are well documented. • Recommendation d) re-worded to incorporate increase in “public policies” rather than “investment” and including “use, access and control rights, security of tenure and Free Prior Informed consent” to support community forest management and community controlled and owned forest based enterprises. Recognising that in many cases it is better policies rather than investments that are needed to encourage genuine community management. • Recommendation f) should mention the outcomes of Smallholders access to markets policy roundtable, which explicitly addressed this issue of markets for local products and made policy recommendations. <p>Additional recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support initiatives of organisations of indigenous peoples and other stakeholders in order to carry out activities for resilience of |
|--|---|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>forest-dependent vulnerable peoples. For example agroforestry and silvopasture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States should address the negative impacts of resource grabs due to plantations and large scale agriculture especially industrial livestock on land use change and deforestation and on livelihoods and FSN for forest dependant people. • Adopt appropriate technologies (to local culture, climate, local cosmovision and organisation) when establishing care of forests. |
| 4 | <p>PROMOTE MULTIFUNCTIONAL LANDSCAPES FOR FSN THAT INTEGRATE FORESTS AND TREES AS KEY COMPONENTS:</p> <p>States, IGOs, local authorities, conservations agencies, NGOs and other stakeholders should:</p> <p>a. strengthen the contribution of forests and trees, within landscape mosaics, in the provision of fundamental ecosystem services to support agricultural production, including pollination and water and nutrient cycling;</p> <p>b. promote integrated planning and local adaptive management of landscapes with strong acknowledgement of the multiple functions and uses of forests and trees;</p> <p>c. promote a nutrition-sensitive landscape approach to integrate the multiple goals of FSN, sustainable forestry, land use and biodiversity</p> | <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>a) Should include support for territorial planning approaches based on communities' management, knowledge and tenure rights rather than only landscape management. Recognise community forest management as they way that many IP and forest dependant people are already practising management, and are in need of public policy support.</p> <p>b) Should include, within the multifunctionality of forests, their contribution to landscape conservation, culture, values and practices linked to spirituality and religion.</p> <p>c) Should recognise the contribution of primary forests to climate change mitigation and adaptation, enrichment of biodiversity and to chemical, physical and biological soil fertility versus plantations, which do not contribute to these outcomes.</p> <p>d) Should include specific recognition of agroforestry as part of agroecology that is already being practised by many forest communities and small producers and needs policy support.</p> <p>e) Should make specific reference to VGGTs and its recommendations on how to protect different formal and informal tenure systems of local communities in applying these approaches.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>conservation for human, animal and ecosystems health;</p> <p>d. promote and invest in research and technologies aiming at developing and up-scaling diverse suitable agroforestry systems within integrated landscape mosaics;</p> <p>e. ensure that governance mechanisms at different scales enable sustainable integrated landscape approaches that: articulate different functions of forests and trees (including wood and food production, biodiversity conservation and sociocultural benefits); consider short- and long-term objectives; recognize and reduce conflicts between stakeholders.</p> | |
| 5 | <p>ACKNOWLEDGE THE IMPORTANCE AND STRENGTHEN THE ROLE OF FORESTS AND TREES IN ENHANCING RESILIENCE AT LANDSCAPE, COMMUNITY AND HOUSEHOLD LEVELS FOR FSN:</p> <p>States, IGOs, local authorities, conservations agencies, NGOs and other stakeholders should:</p> <p>a. identify and strengthen the ways in which forests and trees contribute to build resilience at landscape, community and household levels;</p> <p>b. develop integrated food-forestry systems</p> | <p>Here we would change all the recommendations to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation a) and b) should recognise that we already know the multiple ways in which small scale producers and forest communities especially women are working in forest areas to create resilience – fishers and mangroves, peasants and forest peoples and peat lands. These systems need to be acknowledged and strengthened. • They should also recognise that local food systems, small-scale producers and agroecological approaches are vital to strengthen resilience. <p>Additional recommendation:</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>building on local knowledge that contribute to enhance resilience of landscapes, communities and livelihoods;</p> <p>c. strengthen the capacity of forest-dependent and indigenous peoples, local communities, local organizations and national institutions to mainstream and enhance the concept of resilience of landscapes, communities and households in policies, plans and projects that address the forest-FSN nexus;</p> <p>d. determine and provide the institutional and financial requirements to integrate and implement resilience-enhancing dimensions of forests and trees into policies and programmes.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the conversion of primary forest into plantations as a leading cause of non-resilient forests that are at threat from forest fires, lack of genetic diversity, lack of their ability to regulate the climate and inability to provide diverse and high nutrition foods. |
| 6 | <p>RECOGNIZE AND RESPECT LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCE TENURE AND USE RIGHTS OVER FORESTS AND TREES FOR FSN:</p> <p>States should:</p> <p>a. ensure local communities', forest dependent communities' and indigenous peoples' access to and use of forest resources for the realization of their right to adequate food;</p> <p>b. ensure that policies, legislation and programmes that affect forests and trees respect</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation a) needs to be reframed so that it recognises indigenous and other communities' rights to land and their territories, to ensure that that these rights are fully respected. This goes beyond the right to access and use forest resources but rights to govern, control and manage them, and make decision on how to do so based on expressing their traditional ways of living. It is essential to specifically highlight and protect the tenure rights of women, and respect their role and traditional forest related knowledge. • Recommendations a) b) c) d) and e) must include genuine FPIC to be properly applied. Any policies and programmes must be via genuine participatory methods including FPIC and communities rights to say no. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>and ensure the rights of indigenous peoples, smallholders and marginalized communities, including the rights of indigenous peoples over their genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge;</p> <p>c. legally protect customary land and natural resource tenure and use rights of food-insecure people over forests and trees for FSN through formal instruments consistent with legal frameworks; 6</p> <p>d. Ensure and enforce access, use and tenure rights of vulnerable and marginalized groups to forests and trees, especially in the face of large-scale infrastructure development as well as land grabbing and the establishment or expansion of protected areas;</p> <p>e. collaboratively develop rights-based initiatives with indigenous peoples to enhance the productivity and resilience of forests and tree-based systems, and incorporate these initiatives into policies, programmes and practices</p> | |
| 7 | <p>STRENGTHEN INCLUSIVE FOREST GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS ACROSS SECTORS AND SCALES FOR FSN: States and other stakeholders should:</p> <p>a. Strengthen policy coherence across forestry,</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This must include a recommendation to explicitly support community forest management and governance structures that enable and enhance it including addressing the discrepancy that sometimes exists between community governance and national policies and governance. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>agriculture, education and other sectors at different scales, in order to ensure sustainable forest management strategies for improved FSN;</p> <p>b. promote effective incentives for the sustainable production and consumption of forest products for FSN;</p> <p>c. promote a rights-based approach to the governance of forests and trees for FSN, ensuring compliance with international human rights law and standards,⁷ including standards of transparency and accountability;</p> <p>d. ensure that laws, policies and programmes affecting forests and trees avoid or minimize negative impacts on FSN, create forest governance regimes that incorporate FSN concerns, clearly define the roles, rights and obligations of various stakeholders, and are effectively enforced;</p> <p>e. ensure the full and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders in forest policy development, governance and management at all scales, particularly of women as well as vulnerable and marginalized groups, including indigenous peoples, and forest dependent communities, by providing them with adequate support and capacity building;</p> <p>f. ensure the full and effective participation of</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It must also include FPIC the need to respect community organisational forms of decision-taking as a vital part of good governance • Specifically recognize the rights of women, including their access and tenure rights • Recommendation h) should recognise that many certification schemes are structurally flawed and forest communities take active decisions to not engage or even confront them. So they cannot be forced to participate in them. • Remove recommendation i) The use of the terms 'Co-production' and 'co-management' completely depoliticize the struggles over power, resources and life that exist between forest communities and corporations and does not adequately address the failure of many CSR schemes. • The consultation processes on watershed management and land use planning are necessary mechanisms. <p>Additional recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the definition of forests in FAO and other places that allows conversion of primary forest to plantations, which have deeply negative impacts on FSN. |
|---|--|

concerned stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and forest-dependent communities, in order to integrate FSN concerns in the creation and management of protected areas;

g. facilitate the implementation of processes that take into account the impacts of forestry management on FSN at different spatial and temporal scales;

h. ensure that forest certification schemes include FSN concerns of all stakeholders by facilitating their full and effective participation;

i. promote inclusive co-management and co-production initiatives that are co-developed with relevant stakeholders, including through concessions, and corporate and social responsibility schemes