

## CFS Forestry – Comments on the Rapporteur’s Proposal – 2 October 2017

### Comments from United States

#### General Comments

This document regularly uses “ensure” when it intends more achievable terms like “promote”, “facilitate”, or “encourage”. Given the variety of stakeholders involved in this area and given that this is a non-binding document, please strike all use of the word “ensure” from this document. (This is not mentioned as a U.S. comment below each time it shows up in the document, but it should be revised in all instances in the document.)

There is a grammar issue in the recommendations. The sections start out “All stakeholders to...” There is no lead-in such as “The report contains recommendations for all stakeholders to...”

In general, we prefer the term “sustainable forest management” over “sustainable forestry”, in large part to get beyond the typical understanding that “forestry” refers simply to felling trees. We would prefer to see this language throughout, though we recognize that it cannot be changed in the title at this stage: “sustainable forest management for FSN.” This would be more consistent with the recommendations, such as I.c, which refers to “sustainably managing forests”, and the title of section III that cites “forest management.”

#### Introduction

The last sentence of the first paragraph in the introduction has become a lengthy list of eco-services, which are repeated and more clearly articulated in recommendation I.b. We recommend revising this sentence to read “Forests generate income for local people and provide essential ecosystem services that are essential for agriculture.”

We suggest editing modifying the first sentence of paragraph two in the introduction to reflect that fact that land use conversion to agriculture can be driven by other factors, such as land conflict or land tenure issues, or indirect land use change. In such cases, land may be converted to agriculture, but it is not the underlying cause of the deforestation.

Paragraph three’s “the progressive realization of the right to adequate food” should read “the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security,” so that it accurately reflects the agreed language in the CFS guidelines on this subject. Per the “ensure” comment above, please change “ensuring their equal access to natural resources” in paragraph three to “promoting [/facilitating] their equal access to natural resources.”

## **I. ACKNOWLEDGE THE IMPORTANCE OF AND ENCOURAGE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF FORESTS AND TREES FOR FSN**

It is unclear what “recognize” means here. It is further unclear how stakeholders might tangibly implement I.a.

For grammatical correctness, please switch “sustainably” and “managing” in I.c.

## **II. DEVELOP AND USE POLICY-RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE AND DATA ON THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS OF FORESTS AND TREES TO FSN**

“The co-construction of knowledge” implies that knowledge is created in ways other than through the gathering of evidence and analysis. This should be reworded.

Revise II.b. to read “Design metrics and collect and share data that are...”, because this data is most useful if it can be shared. It is unclear how stakeholders might design metrics to measure the contributions that forests and trees make to FSN through cultures and well-being.

Please add nutritional content to II.c., to read “including for nutritional content, dietary quality and diversity, poverty alleviation...”.

In II.d. , “Neglected and Underutilized Species (NUS)” may be a food security term, but “Lesser Known Species (LKS)” is the more appropriate term in the forest community.

## **III. DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT POLICIES FOR INTEGRATED AGRICULTURE AND FOREST MANAGEMENT FOR IMPROVED AND SUSTAINABLE FSN**

In III.b., what does it mean to “Provide the institutional and financial requirements” to do these things? We suggest clarifying, in particular as it could suggest financial commitments that all states may not be in a position to make.

In line with the “ensure” comment above, “ensure” in III.d. should be changed to “promote” or “facilitate” in order to more accurately reflect what we are actually looking for states implementing these voluntary guidelines to do. Per the “right to adequate food” comment above, the rights language should read “the progressive realization of their right to adequate food in the context of national food security.” Also, please add “members of” before “forest dependent communities and indigenous peoples ...” This right would be an individual human right, not a collective right - it belongs to the individuals within those collectives, not to the collectives themselves.

Is there a reason that the recommendation in III.e. focuses solely on “unproductive, abandoned” lands? Forest restoration should be done on “degraded forests” in general, not just on unproductive, abandoned lands. Forest restoration allows the ecosystem to be restored to its optimal ecosystem functions, which is a win-win situation overall for agriculture, forest, and food security.

III.h. is unclear – the use of “forest management plans” in the first sentence implies that this should be done when managing a forest (i.e. using more environmentally friendly equipment in harvesting) but not in FSN. However, it seems that the intent may be different, so we suggest the following revision of III.h.: “Promote and integrate the use of low-carbon, renewable energy schemes in FSN planning by providing access to fuel for food preparation and investing in social and technical innovations to minimize health risks associated with the use of fuel wood.”

We recommend that III.i. be reworded for clarity to “Facilitate the full and effective participation in order to address the FSN concerns of all stakeholders in forest certification and environmental schemes.”

#### **IV. SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VGGTS TO SECURE FOREST DEPENDENT COMMUNITIES’ AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ TENURE RIGHTS FOR THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE PRODUCTIVITY AND RESILIENCE OF THEIR LANDS**

In IV.a, to the extent that this is talking about both human rights and property or tenure-related rights (which may not fit into the box of human rights), this should be better clarified and differentiated since they are not the same thing. Moreover, human rights are held by individuals, not by communities or collectives. In addition to modifying the “ensure,” please reword this clause to something like “respect the individual human rights of smallholders, individuals belonging to local communities, and indigenous peoples.”