# APF Net Curriculum 3 INternational dialogue on forestry issues

## **Lecture 11 Global policy issues affecting the sustainable management of forests (Part 2)**

## **Video 2**

## **The New York** **Declaration on Forests - 5 top forestry experts respond**

## **Transcripts Duration: 00:06:24**

(Daniel Nepstad, Executive Director, Earth Innovation Institute)

I think the New York Declaration on Forests is a very important step because it does capture a lot of our innovation that’s coming forward and it has great sign on it. In a few years with a new set of principles and criteria, it could have sharper teeth on deforestation. I think the big innovation that's starting catching attraction is not formally captured in some of the outcomes, except through the announcement of the Rio Declaration, is this idea that we start to define success and sustainability at the scale of entire territory and not at the scale of the farm or the mill. If we can achieve that, then the world of the private sector which is all about risk aversion and wondering if the people who are growing products and selling it to them are doing clearing or involved in that labor practices to a broad and more proactive, positive agenda of rule development. But I think the New York Declaration on Forests is a big deal.

(Peter Holmgren, Director General, CIFOR)

Obviously, we have the forest declaration which is a very important document and it's supported not only by countries but also by private corporations, by jurisdictions at the province level, by civil society, by indigenous people and this broad support is really something good that it came out from the climate week.

(Carlos Nobre, National Secretary for R&D Policies, MCTI, Brazil)

Of course, I welcome the declaration as most of UN declaration is sufficiently vague to accommodate all tastes, but of course it's in the right direction, and certainly Brazil is probably the country which will contribute to a lot to achieve of that. (But you didn't sign it) Well Brazil did not sign for diplomatic and that's say, legal restrictions because it says zero... deforestation in Brazil, a lot to take allows for a small amount of deforestation. So the diplomats, we are not certain Brazil has the power to sign something that we go against national domestic legislation, it's only for that. However, Brazil is intended, it's really getting to zero deforestation soon.

(Eduardo Brondizio, Professor of Anthropology, Indiana University Bloomington)

I think the UN declaration goes a long way in recognizing forest as a major target, you know for conservation, for climate change mitigation in the coming 10-20 years. Great step forwards, it puts forwards, which now has been on the marginal lands side of the equation and seeing it's not part of the productive agriculture, it's gonna be given attention. On the other hands, it does just that. It seems to put force on the conservation side more than on the management side. I don't think it highlights enough the economic potential that forests offer. So why it's a very important step forward, I think is the opportunity of bring more clearer message that forests are also central to the economy more broadly, or central to many of the other underlying environmental surveys that stand seats like New York. So forest cuts across all those functions and they line declaration recognized as important. I think we need to continue to move in that way, and continue to call attention to the potential forest for the broader economic impact and economic improvement of many communities.

(Louis Verchot, Research Director, Forests and Environment, CIFOR)

I think there are a lot of positive elements in the UN declaration. The emission reductions in the deforestation reductions target are very positive. The objective is trying eliminating deforestation to engage with the private sector that something is new, is useful and I think the more thing we see here, rather than the climate we hear in New York, is the private sector engagement is at a much higher level of it has been in the past. It's that we haven't seen the level of commitment or the level of representation of the private sector in discussions that we've seen here in New York. CEOs and major companies, not the low level officials from these companies, coming, but making real engagements and commitments to anything, things can actually be verified later on and followed up on. So I think that's something that's new. I think the declaration is a little bit short in that it really focuses on forests as an entity and not as forests as an element within the landscape. So it's really all about forest and it sort of missed on the connections. So I mean forests are related to other things that are happening in the landscapes and they are related to other things that are happening in the economic landscapes that seem to be a bit missing than what did I think it is originally. So I think there is a lot of positive elements, but the shortcomings are significantly enough to actually worn some comments on this, and try to move this along. You know Peter Holmgren in his comments talked about setting the forest declaration, setting the agriculture declaration side by side, you are much more compelling and finding the links between those that are much more compelling agenda. I think that really is the case to integrate what you want to, what the world wants to achieve in forest, integrate that with what they are trying to achieve in agriculture, is essential to actually achieving the objectives but also essential to making sure that you don't work across purposes, by dividing up what you are trying to do in these different sectors, and treating them as separate sectors, we actually need to bring them close together.