

**Intervention of Editrudith Lukanga – WFF, Tanzania on behalf of the CSM Working Group on Forestry  
11 October 2017**

The CSM is fully committed to the CFS especially in the spirit of its reform to advance the progressive realization of the right to food and to create spaces for policy convergence and debate, with particular attention paid to the roles of small scale food producers. It is in this spirit that we engaged with the negotiations on Recommendations for Sustainable Forestry for Food Security and Nutrition.

Forests are vital to our constituencies that include indigenous peoples, small scale farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, rural women and workers. Our hope was to achieve recommendations focused on strengthening the rights, autonomy, capacities and protections for these constituencies. But the document falls short of our expectations. Here is our assessment followed by a concrete proposal.

We are glad to see recognition in the document that forests include people, and that people are at the center of the relations between forests and food security and nutrition. We are also glad to see the acknowledgment of the diversity of relationships with and views of what forests and forest eco-systems are, and their spiritual, social, cultural, political and economic importance to our constituencies. The recognition in the document of the contributions of forest dependent communities in conserving forests and in global food production is important, though not sufficient. The importance given to women's rights, empowerment, participation in decision making, and access to and control over resource tenure, as well as the reaffirmation of the need for Free Prior and Informed Consent and legitimate tenure rights is welcome. And we appreciate the explicit recognition of the essential roles of human rights instruments such as the VGGT, UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and of the CBD.

However, we also have deep concerns about the process of the policy convergence and the content of the document. We regret to note that the rushed pace of the negotiations, the low level of participation and non-inclusive nature of the way the negotiation methodology was applied has weakened the Recommendations. The CFS strives towards efficient and impactful policy convergence outcomes. This requires space to build genuine consensus. including time to discuss proposals, sharing equally proposals made by different parties and discussions of key concerns. But this is not what we experienced. We are concerned that some of our previously submitted proposals were not even put on the screen for consideration. Reading comments and text proposals only on the website can make negotiating parties become aware about them, but they cannot replace collective discussion necessary for a policy convergence process. We believe this has affected the content of the outcome since issues crucial for our constituencies and highly relevant to forests and FSN were not discussed.

We strongly criticize that the document does not address or even mention the connection and impacts of industrial plantations on the food and nutrition security of millions of forest dependent peoples and communities. This is a serious omission; plantations are discussed in the HLPE report but are missing in the recommendations document limiting its usefulness in examining significant aspects of hunger and malnutrition.

We also criticize the language that implies commoditization of forests. This is incoherent with a human rights approach.

As the CSM we are ready to support the document but at a minimum, in order to make this policy convergence process relevant, meaningful and impactful,

we propose to include language in the chair's summary of this plenary session to acknowledge that key issues have been left out and to suggest a follow up discussion. Concretely we suggest the following bullet points to be included in the chair's summary.

- *The Committee agrees to hold a specific discussion inviting the Rome based agencies on key pending issues, particularly the relation between commercial tree plantations and food security and nutrition.*

We strongly hope that this text can be supported.

For us it is unacceptable that highly relevant issues in the CFS are not discussed. This goes against the spirit of the CFS.

As always we look forward to contributing to the follow up of this policy convergence.

