

# **Some views of indigenous peoples and forest-related organisations on the World Bank's 'Forest Carbon Partnership Facility' and proposals for a 'Global Forest Partnership'**

## *A global survey*

*The reality is that most governments or corporations have not played positive roles in preserving these remaining tropical and sub-tropical forests. We, the indigenous peoples, are the ones who sacrificed life and limb to save these because these are vital for our survival as distinct peoples and cultures.*

*The indigenous peoples protected the Amazon from ranchers in Brazil, from loggers in Congo Basin countries and from commercial oil palm plantations and the forest industry in Indonesia. It is, therefore, a moral and legal imperative that indigenous peoples be fully involved in designing, implementing and evaluating initiatives related to REDD.*

Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Chair, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Grand Hyatt Hotel, Bali, Indonesia, 11 December 2007, *Statement on the Announcement of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility*, UNFCCC, COP13

## **Briefing by the Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)**

**February 2008**



**Forest Peoples  
Programme**

1c Fosseway Business Centre, Stratford Road,  
Moreton-in-Marsh GL56 9NQ, UK  
tel: +44 (0)1608 652893 fax: +44 (0)1608 652878  
info@forestpeoples.org www.forestpeoples.org

<b>Contents of the Report</b>	<i>Page</i>
Executive Summary	3
Background to the Survey	5
Findings	5
I Concerns over flawed processes	5
II Concerns over the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	7
Lack of a rights-based approach or rights protection	7
III Concerns over the GFP proposal	10
Proposed Targets	11
Proposed Governance Arrangements	13
IV Doubts about the role of the World Bank	15
V Alternatives to the WB proposals	17
VI Some emerging Recommendations	18

## Executive Summary

As governments and citizens around the world become increasingly concerned about biodiversity loss and rapid climate change, the level of international concern about the future of the world's forests has reached levels not witnessed since the late 1980s. New global initiatives and promises of large-scale funding to protect and sustainably manage the world's last remaining forests are emerging from donor governments and from multilateral agencies like the World Bank. In 2006 and 2007, the World Bank developed and launched a Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and also developed a larger proposal to lead a Global Forest Partnership (GFP) which would have major implications for forests and forest peoples.

This briefing is a compilation of views and perspectives expressed by indigenous peoples' and forest-dependent peoples' organizations, and support NGOs, on both the FCPF and the GFP. It is based primarily on a rapid survey conducted by the Forest Peoples Programme in October – December 2007 and incorporates statements made by representative indigenous peoples' fora, including notably the International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change which met prior to and during the UNFCCC COP 13 held in Nusa Dua in Bali, December 2007.<sup>1</sup>

The rapid survey conducted by FPP was conducted as an independent contribution to an initiative led by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) which conducted an external independent assessment of views on the GFP for the World Bank Group.<sup>2</sup> This process of collating views on the proposed 'global forest partnership' only tangentially addressed the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, but allowed a wider range of views to be heard on the GFP.<sup>3</sup>

The World Bank also held a series of information sessions and meetings on the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility in late 2007 and similar statements of concern were provided to the Bank at these meetings (see FPP Briefing on the FCPF for details).<sup>4</sup> This briefing provides reference to these statements where appropriate.

Since the FPP survey was conducted it has become clear that while the FCPF is now launched and will likely become active in the near future, acceptance of the Bank's proposal for a 'Global Forest Partnership' by donor and borrower governments seems far from certain. This briefing thus highlights concerns with the FCPF first and then notes concerns with the Bank's wider GFP plans. The survey and subsequent statements by indigenous peoples' networks and fora reveal a deep sense of unease and concern regarding the World Bank involvement in both the FCPF and the GFP.

Concerns expressed regarding the FCPF include the following key observations:

- the FCPF fails to take into account the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, nor does it provide any other form of effective protection for the rights of indigenous peoples to their lands and territories

---

<sup>1</sup> The International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change (IFIPCC) Statement to the 13<sup>th</sup> Session of Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC SBSTA 27, agenda item 5/REDD  
[http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/unfccc\\_bali\\_ifipcc\\_statement\\_redd\\_nov07\\_eng.shtml](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/unfccc_bali_ifipcc_statement_redd_nov07_eng.shtml)

<sup>2</sup> The results of the IIED-led process are available at <http://www.iiedgfpcconsultation.org/>

<sup>3</sup> IIED invited the Forest Peoples Programme in September 2007 to contribute to its assessment through an international survey of forest peoples' views on the GFP proposals in different regions. FPP accepted this invitation on the condition that its survey, questionnaire and final written report to the IIED would be fully independent.

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/unfccc\\_bali\\_ngo\\_statement\\_nov07\\_eng.pdf](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/unfccc_bali_ngo_statement_nov07_eng.pdf) for NGO statement provided to the Bank. For related materials, please see [http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/bases/forest\\_issues.shtml](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/bases/forest_issues.shtml)

Some views of indigenous peoples and forest-related organisations on the WB's 'FCPF and proposals for a 'GFP'

- the proposed 'reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation' activities are untested, and have been seriously questioned or opposed by indigenous peoples
- the proposed FCPF governance structures privilege the interests of governments and business over the interests of indigenous peoples
- the FCPF as designed would mainly benefit the World Bank Group, its staff and consultants, large conservation NGOs, industry and governments
- there is a fear that indigenous peoples will be marginalized by a top-down implementation process, as well as by the centralized forest-policy planning and design process
- affected communities would have few avenues for redress in the instance of conflict or violation of rights stemming from activities supported by the FCPF
- the proposed activities include those that have historically violated the rights of indigenous peoples (including expansion of plantations and protected areas) without any safeguard for local rights-holders.

Specific to the plans for a Global Forest Partnership (GFP), the survey respondents highlighted concerns that the GFP as proposed:

- lacks any recognition of indigenous peoples as rights holders
- contains targets and objectives concerning expansion of certification schemes, of protected areas and/or plantations that will lead to alienation of indigenous peoples from their lands and resources
- risks undermining or impoverishing indigenous forest-based livelihoods and traditional practices in forests through support for conventional protected area systems
- would enable activities that could lead to the expropriation of indigenous peoples' forest lands
- would only deliver minimal or token benefits to indigenous peoples and forest communities
- marginalise indigenous peoples through top-down implementation processes, as well as by its centralized planning and design structure
- lack transparency and accountability in its governance arrangements that do not provide indigenous peoples and affected communities with avenues for effective involvement or representation
- includes planned activities in forests of great concern to indigenous peoples, without reference to any process to address the historic injustices and unresolved and resource conflicts stemming from such activities – in particular respondents highlighted the expansion of protected area systems and the creation of plantations.

## **BACKGROUND TO THE SURVEY**

During October and November 2007, the FPP conducted a rapid survey of views on the World Bank's FCPF and GFP proposals among a number of forest peoples' leaders and activists in Asia, Africa and South and Central America. A genuine and meaningful consultation with indigenous peoples, in compliance with Operational Policy 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples, would require considerably more time, a far larger budget, equitable, consistent and widespread use of face-to-face meetings at the national and community level and provision of the key documents in languages and formats that would be accessible to indigenous peoples' decision-making bodies and representative institutions. Similarly, a full consultation process must include meetings with a range of indigenous persons, representative of women, youth and elders, and must provide sufficient time for traditional authorities and representative leaders to discuss the issues raised in the proposals internally within communities, allowing the effective use of collective and customary decision making processes.

In all cases the FPP stressed to survey participants that the questionnaire and survey exercise are part of a rapid assessment of views and do not constitute a public consultation (which would necessarily require more time and resources to hold inclusive face-to-face meetings and workshops both at the country level and in forest communities). We would like to emphasize also that the 'emerging recommendations' herein are drawn indirectly from responses in the survey and should not be considered a definitive nor final set of recommendations. They are only presented here as indicative of some of the proposals coming out of the survey. Indeed, one of the main findings of this rapid assessment is that full and comprehensive response by forest peoples to the Bank's GFP plans (including recommendations) could only emerge from an in-depth, comprehensive and culturally appropriate public consultation process, which has so far not taken place.

## **FINDINGS**

Observations and analysis provided by the respondents to the survey and supplemented by subsequent statements have been clustered into three main areas of concern: (i) concerns over flawed processes in the development of the Bank's proposals (both GFP and FCPF); (ii) concerns over the content of the FCPF; (iii) concerns over the content of the GFP proposal; and (iv) concerns over role and influence of the Bank. Survey respondents also provided some preliminary thoughts on (v) alternatives to the World Bank proposals, and (vi) emerging general recommendations.

### ***I Concerns over flawed processes***

The survey found that 93% of respondents had heard nothing at all about the World Bank's FCPF or GFP proposals prior to the FPP survey. People surveyed are not happy about the general lack of information on the Bank's plans that may affect them directly. Many respondents, particularly in Asia, are dissatisfied that the process to date has not involved indigenous peoples and forest-dependent communities. They stress that a rapid survey of views is not sufficient. Respondents maintain that the World Bank Group has a duty to consult with forest peoples in a meaningful and culturally appropriate way about its plans that may affect forests and forest communities.

*The greatest risk is in the process to date – the lack of involvement of indigenous peoples – there has been no participation at all. This I think is the biggest problem, and means that the details at the moment in the proposal I do not want to engage with. The details have not been built up with the opinions of indigenous peoples or of forest-dependent peoples. [Indonesia Respondent 2]*

This concern is heightened by a lack of substantive information that indigenous peoples have been able to access on the Bank's proposals, and complaints about 'vagueness' in the limited documents provided to date. In many cases, respondents are concerned that the GFP language on objectives, targets and activities is too vague and does not clearly spell out the criteria the GFP would use to select, promote or fund specific kinds of forest policies or activities in forests. Some of the language – like GFP plans to support plantations – raises concerns, most notably among respondents in Asia, but also in the South and Central America region.

*...the question is how are broad objectives delivered to communities at the grassroots? These objectives for me are too broad, too vague and do not specify by which criteria they would be implemented. There are no answers regarding: (i) how will benefits reach communities? and (ii) how can we be certain we will suffer no negative impacts from these programmes? How will our rights be respected? [Costa Rica Respondent 2]*

*The GFP development and programme objectives look OK, but they may cause problems for forests and forest peoples. I say that because the GFP objectives would be tied to the existing structure and priorities of the World Bank which are linked to big business, markets and States. That is a real concern. It means that the private sector, industry and governments will most likely benefit at the expense of local communities. [Paraguay Respondent 1]*

A common view expressed among those surveyed is that while some objectives and targets may appear potentially positive, forests peoples' experience shows that the 'devil is in the detail'. For example, several respondents in the South and Central America region explain that proposed GFP objectives to support secure tenure for forest peoples could be positive, provided they respect customary and collective rights. However, they advise that the same objectives could prove potentially harmful for forest peoples if based on inappropriate existing laws and policies that in some countries promote individual titles or titles over very limited areas, or that only recognise title over cultivated lands.

Such lack of information available for indigenous peoples was also highlighted at the Bank's public launch of the FCPF at the 13<sup>th</sup> COP of the UNFCCC in Nusa Dua, Bali, in December 2007 was greeted with surprise and consternation by the International Indigenous Forum on Climate Change and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues specifically due to the lack of information provided to indigenous peoples prior to the launch.<sup>5</sup>

The consistent complaints about the flawed GFP and FCPF processes point to a **need for a longer, more sustained and better resourced process of consultation with indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent peoples and communities.**

---

<sup>5</sup> Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Chair, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Grand Hyatt Hotel, Bali, Indonesia, 11 December 2007, *Statement on the Announcement of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility*. Available at [http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/unpfii\\_statement\\_fcpf\\_dec07\\_eng.pdf](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/unpfii_statement_fcpf_dec07_eng.pdf)

## ***II Concerns over the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility***

### Lack of a rights-based approach or rights protection

The lack of any language recognising and protecting the rights of forest peoples is seen as a serious shortcoming in the FCPF. Half of the respondents consider that it would only be possible for the WB proposals to provide benefits for indigenous peoples and local communities if certain preconditions were in place – **namely a rights-centred approach that incorporated the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, targeted the provision of secure tenure to indigenous peoples for their traditional lands and resources, and provided for equitable benefit sharing and accountability.** This point has been reiterated by networks and organizations during and after the launch of the FCPF, with the International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change noting that:

*...REDD will not benefit Indigenous Peoples, but in fact, it will result in more violations of Indigenous Peoples' Rights. It will increase the violation of our Human Rights, our rights to our lands, territories and resources, steal our land, cause forced evictions, prevent access and threaten indigenous agriculture practices, destroy biodiversity and culture diversity and cause social conflicts. Under REDD, States and Carbon Traders will take more control over our forests...*

The IFIPCC went on to note that accepted international standards and law exist that should provide a framework for proposals impacting on indigenous peoples:

*The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 13 of this year and consecrates fundamental rights of indigenous peoples which are relevant to the REDD discussions, especially Articles 10, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32<sup>6</sup>.*

These concerns were reiterated by the Chair of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in her comments to the World Bank at the launch of the FCPF, when she underlined the primary importance of recognizing and protecting rights as the first step to enabling further discussions on the FCPF:

*...the Facility and other actors such as States, corporations and NGOs should unequivocally state that they recognize and respect indigenous peoples' rights as contained in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and that this will be the starting framework of any discussion or negotiations related to the access and use of resources of the Facility. Indigenous peoples' free, prior and informed consent should be obtained before any initiative on REDD is pursued in their territories and forests<sup>7</sup>.*

Applying the World Bank methods of work to carbon financing was one area of concern that emerged, particularly in Central and South America. Although there was very low knowledge among all respondents on the FCPF, one respondent in Costa Rica reported knowledge of a carbon agro-forestry project. The respondent advised that, in his view, the narrow focus on carbon has not been helpful:

---

<sup>6</sup> The International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change (IFIPCC) Statement to the 13<sup>th</sup> Session of Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC SBSTA 27, agenda item 5/REDD  
[http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/unfccc\\_bali\\_ifipcc\\_statement\\_redd\\_nov07\\_eng.shtml](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/unfccc_bali_ifipcc_statement_redd_nov07_eng.shtml)

<sup>7</sup> Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Chair, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Grand Hyatt Hotel, Bali, Indonesia, 11 December 2007, *Statement on the Announcement of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility.*  
[http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/unpfii\\_statement\\_fcpf\\_dec07\\_eng.pdf](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/unpfii_statement_fcpf_dec07_eng.pdf)

*From what I know, the carbon sequestration project I mention has not been so good for indigenous communities, because it did not take into account our traditional forest-related knowledge and our customary practices. In fact, you could even say it marginalised these issues and even eliminated traditional practices and imposed external policies and techniques on our communities. [Costa Rica respondent 2]*

*While financial resources may be important they are not the foundation. They are not the key principle. From the indigenous traditional point of view, nature is not managed by rotten money that risks corrupting or manipulating our associations – especially where a system is based on governments and NGOs, which may become intermediaries between [the schemes] and indigenous protagonists [Brazil Respondent 1]*

Respondents express a general concern that if carbon payments were to be made through governments or NGOs, then few benefits would be likely to reach the communities who live in and depend on forests.<sup>8</sup> Respondents from Costa Rica and Argentina both maintain that forest and carbon conservation programmes will only work if indigenous peoples' customary lands are demarcated and titled first. These respondents emphasise that failure to secure indigenous traditional forest lands risks them being marginalised or disenfranchised by avoided deforestation or afforestation schemes.<sup>9</sup>

Some respondents point out that sharing and distribution of benefits from avoided deforestation payments would have to be agreed through direct negotiation and prior agreements with affected forest communities. Other observations regarding the FCPF included reiteration of concerns over process and a lack of available information:

*I have never heard of it [the FCPF] but the process is wrong. The World Bank and others have extracted things from the soil, have logged the forests and have created the industries which harm the environment and in all of these actions they have marginalized indigenous peoples. And now they are thinking up solutions which again harm indigenous peoples – the solutions that I have seen victimize indigenous peoples again in their processes, including this one as they have not consulted or talked to indigenous peoples yet. [Indonesia Respondent 2]*

*I have not heard about this FCPF before and do not understand what it would do exactly? In general...any initiative on climate and forests must use a different sort of development and conservation model. The current model does not work. The funds do not reach the grassroots. From what I can see, the Bank is yet again proposing the same sort of top-down model. It will not work. I have no confidence in it. As it stands, the planned forest carbon fund risks sidelining forest peoples and might even cause problems for us. [Costa Rica Respondent 2]*

*I am not too sure what this FCPF means as we have got zero information in Belize on this proposal. I would need more information to comment on this, but whatever they do on carbon and forests, it must respect indigenous rights including our right to free, prior and informed consent. [FPIC] [Belize Respondent 1]*

*From what I gather, the FCPF is emphasising building of 'national' capacities to implement REDD policies, which usually means a focus on State agencies. While these agencies are important, they are insufficient alone and may even be an obstacle for*

---

<sup>8</sup> Peru Respondent 1, November 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Cost Rica Respondent 1, October 2007; Argentina Respondent 2, November 2007.

*effective programmes due to weak institutions, corruption and a bias towards commercialisation that cuts across all States' actions and processes. [Peru Respondent 2]*

*With this imposed initiative of the FCPF nothing would change and things will carry on as normal: poor people and indigenous peoples will be used and exploited. If we really want to fight environmental and climate change, then each country must act. They must stop contaminating the atmosphere. We will not save the world with simple environmental messages. [Panama Respondent 1]*

Several respondents voice serious concerns over the FCPF emphasis on carbon trading:

*If it is certain that the [FCPF] proposal is putting forward market approaches and trade in carbon as the main solution I would be concerned. Why? Because carbon credits do not address the problem. That is how I see it. The real challenge is to reduce pollution in industrialised countries, which must make a stronger commitment to cut their GHG emissions. Involving forests in carbon trading does not do that – from what I understand anyway. The Fund must be tied to other funding sources that do not use carbon credits. [Cost Rica Respondent 1]*

*The Bank's FCPF proposals as they stand are not good because they promote carbon trading. They are based on a mainly commercial model with public funds for use by the State and companies to get markets working. I see nothing in the Bank's plans about human rights or the rights of indigenous peoples. The fund should involve States and rights holders and be based on public finance so that there are genuine commitments and duties under international law. Involving the market is not a good idea. [Panama Respondent 4]*

*I do not think that carbon credits will solve climate change. There is no doubt that climate change is happening: we are seeing droughts, then floods. Also just seeing forests as a single issue like carbon is not helpful. Forests are not just about carbon. [Suriname Respondent 1]*

*...it is worrying if the FCPF is mainly promoting carbon trading.... Efforts to include forests in tackling climate change might be helpful, but only if the root cause of industrial pollution is tackled at the same time, and only if we indigenous and other forest peoples are empowered and fully respected in climate policy initiatives. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

Several respondents highlight the contradictions in the World Bank approach to forests and sustainable development within its overall global portfolio and its lending policies. They point out that the Bank Group is still financing industrial-scale logging, fossil fuel extraction and transportation, agribusiness and industrial plantation expansion, which are all linked to deforestation and degradation, violation of forest peoples' rights and climate change.

*...Indigenous organisations here have never seen the FCPF proposals. Nonetheless, I repeat that Bank claims that it is to tackle global climate change are difficult to swallow. Among indigenous peoples in Argentina the Bank does not have a good image on climate and environmental issues, due to its massive support for extractive industries. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

### **III Concerns over the GFP proposal**

In addition to procedural concerns noted in Section I above, across the three regions surveyed most respondents have substantive concerns about the contents of the GFP proposals. The great majority of respondents consider that the World Bank's GFP proposals as they stand would generate considerable risks for forest peoples. The single most common fear and concern was that the GFP would be dominated by, and attend to, the priorities of large outside interests including international conservation NGOs, national governments and big business, thereby marginalising indigenous peoples and forest communities. Respondents in all regions observe that **there is a significant power imbalance between indigenous peoples and state structures (and international organizations) and special protections would be required to ensure that indigenous peoples were able to enjoy effective participation.**

*One risk is that the World Bank and its partners will take most of the power in the project, they will dominate ... indigenous peoples and local communities will take only a slight role in the [GFP] project. It may be said that people will participate, but we are only a small part of a much bigger agenda. The risk is this [GFP] project will extend greater control over us. [Indonesia Respondent 1]*

*The forest protection and management programmes must directly involve affected communities and must not be dominated by government officials, politicians and consultants. We do not want to see corrupt state officials and state agencies involved in programmes that are supposed to benefit our communities and our forests. [Costa Rica Respondent 1]*

*The risk is that any Bank initiative on forests would be overly influenced by powerful vested interests of large companies, States and rich international conservation NGOs...the World Bank really works for these interests... their interest is profit, trade, making money or improving their public image. Many of these powerful groups actively oppose indigenous demands and seek to weaken their position. That is the problem. There is a risk that we may well be marginalised or only offered token participation so the priorities of indigenous peoples will not be attended to and their demands on forests will not be met... [Argentina Respondent 1]*

*The main risk is that indigenous peoples will not be involved properly and that our Mayan ways of understanding the forest will not be respected. The government here is not respecting our rights and is not accepting court rulings in our favour. The government is not on our side. That is my worry with these big Bank plans that put governments in charge. That is a risk for us here... [Belize Respondent 1]*

*There is a danger that globally the proposed GFP would only really work for the benefit of the Bank itself and for governments. The truth is they [governments] are not really interested in indigenous peoples. In Suriname the government does not even legally recognise us. Unless our rights and interests are taken into account the GFP, if it comes into being, could be a big problem for indigenous peoples and their forests. So many governments, like the government of Suriname, just see natural forests as the domain and property of the State. They do not recognise our inherent property rights. [Suriname Respondent 1]*

*The biggest risk I see is that the GFP would be useful for governments and large conservation organisations, but we would experience it as another untransparent imposed programme that we might have to challenge once again. [Guyana Respondent 1]*

There is also widespread concern about existing conflicts over land tenure and conflicts over land use and title, and the lack of mention in the proposals about how such ongoing conflicts would be addressed. Respondents stress that existing conflicts over land tenure, land use and land titling in all regions stem from previously established protected areas, industrial logging, the expansion of plantations, and from unresolved claims to traditional and customary lands and resources.<sup>10</sup> In one response to the proposed GFP objectives, it is noted that:

*There is no mention of how to deal with existing conflicts – many of which have come from forest policies still in existence. How will the World Bank deal with existing land and resource conflicts on indigenous peoples' lands and territories? This includes areas that are planned to become part of GFP activities – if there is conflict there already, how will the WB deal with this?* [Indonesia Respondent 2]

*First correct the problems inherent to indigenous and forest people related to forest, because in Kenya indigenous people are reduced and marginalised due to eviction from protected areas and resettlement.* [Kenya Respondent 1]

### Proposed Targets

Most respondents hold serious reservations and concerns about the GFP targets as proposed. Despite one target on poverty reduction, a general concern exists that the GFP targets would be geared towards the agendas of outsiders at the expense of the rights, livelihood security and traditional practices of indigenous peoples and local communities. Respondents to the FPP survey repeatedly brought up the same lack of mention of protection for human rights, highlighting in particular the lack of a proposed 'target' to be achieved that related to the protection and recognition of rights:

*There is nothing in the proposed targets on rights. There has to be a target to respect indigenous peoples' rights. The framework for the target should be based on language on land and territorial rights included in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* [Panama Respondent 2]

*I see problems with these targets: the risk is that human rights and indigenous peoples' rights will not be respected. There is no target on rights.* [Suriname Respondent 1]

*Targets must include ones to recognise and respect indigenous peoples and traditional forest dwellers, including recognition of their inherent, aboriginal and customary rights, their right to collective property and their right to own, manage and control their forests. Otherwise, other targets like No 4 [above] on protected areas, could result in harm for indigenous peoples.* [Argentina Respondent 1]

*[Additional targets required are:] (i) Support for community teams for forest and natural resources conservation and management; (ii) Strengthening of community organisation for the sustainable management of forests, and (iii) Protection of collective knowledge.* [Mexico Respondent 1]

*At least two targets are missing. These are: (a) collective rights of indigenous peoples over their forests and territories are recognised and their holistic management of their natural resources is consolidated. (b) Management of conservation areas by indigenous peoples and indigenous conservation regimes promoted.* [Peru Respondent 2]

---

<sup>10</sup> NE India Respondent 2

Particular concerns are also expressed about Target 2 that aims to bring 300 million ha of 'production forests' under 'sustainable management'. Respondents point out that this production target risks supporting large scale logging companies and superficial certification processes that overlook damage to forests and communities (some respondents stress that this risk is identified based on actual experience with flawed certification schemes).

Many of these respondents, particularly in Africa and Asia, see serious risks associated with GFP Target 4 that aims to expand and strengthen existing protected area systems. They are seriously worried that this GFP target could result in economic and physical displacement, restrictions on indigenous and traditional forest livelihoods and impoverishment, and would fail to address existing conflicts caused by the creation of protected areas.

*Target 4... 50 million hectares of new protected areas... can you imagine for a minute how many people would be affected by this? 'Effective management' – does this mean co-management with the people? Or management by the people? Or management purely for interested parties, management of protected areas without people in them?*

*This is a nightmare. When you declare protected areas in developing countries, you take the people out. They say that this does not happen, but it does, it is the truth of what we see in our own country. Maybe there is best practice for this, but I don't see alternatives at the moment. Protected areas always mean that people must go out from the forests. [Indonesia Respondent 1]*

*Target 4: the idea of protected area has been a tool to evict, harass, torture pastoralists and hunter gatherers....Organizations funded by the GF Programme will employ modern techniques of conservation which are adverse to indigenous peoples' lives and the forest. [Kenya Respondent 1]*

*Target 4 is very provocative for indigenous peoples. [Cameroon Respondent 3]*

*I see risks in terms of the target on protected areas. In the Mexican case, protected areas have marginalised local access to natural resources among a significant number of indigenous peoples. This has affected their culture and has privileged private companies in relation to ecotourism projects and bio-prospecting. [Mexico Respondent 1]*

*There is a risk that the plans drawn up to approach these targets are not based on the principles of respect for rights, accountability and transparency. The targets might then be counter to the rights and interest of indigenous peoples who depend on forests. I am especially talking about Target 4, for example, on protected areas. [Costa Rica Respondent 1]*

### Proposed Governance Arrangements

In response to specific questions regarding the governance arrangements proposed by the Bank the majority of respondents articulate serious misgivings and consider the current proposals inadequate. They emphasise that multi-stakeholder committees and similar approaches do not enable effective local participation in governance and decision-making on forests:

*...there must be guarantees that indigenous peoples are at the decision-making table in their own right, as a distinct member. The people at the table must be capable and direct representatives of indigenous forest peoples. They should be fully prepared and trained for this work. [Costa Rica Respondent 1]*

*In any governing body of any entity that might affect indigenous peoples directly there should be adequate representation of indigenous peoples through their own representatives. We cannot be taken to be just another 'stakeholder.' We are not just another 'sector' and cannot sit next to 10 other 'sectors' who will out-vote us time and again. We must have a special status on any governing body that gives a larger voting power or some other safeguard to ensure that we will not be sidelined.... [Guyana Respondent 1]*

*The governance structure would have to ensure effective indigenous participation and recognition of our basic demands before we sat at the table. Key demands include the restitution of our ancestral lands that were taken away by conservation agencies, parks and companies in the past...Of course, the chances that governments would accept this are not high in many countries at the moment. This is why we say the GFP as proposed is not likely to benefit our cause. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

Respondents surveyed stress that more inclusive and innovative arrangements (such as increased voting powers) would have to be developed to properly recognise indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities as rights holders and ensure their effective involvement in any international or local forest body. Current proposals for participation of indigenous peoples in the governance arrangements are seen to be significantly lacking:

*As I see it, the governance mechanism proposed does not ensure that the voice of affected people will be listened to or taken in account. [Mexico Respondent 1]*

*I have little confidence in this [proposed] governance structure. As I say, given the proposals of the Bank as they stand, this model will not work. [Costa Rica Respondent 2]*

*I am not convinced [by these proposals]. There is a need to ensure indigenous and community-based organisations that actually work with communities are involved. I don't see any mechanism for that... [Belize Respondent 1]*

*They [the Bank's GFP governance plans] are not acceptable, because they do not provide structures or guarantees that the priorities of indigenous participants would be addressed in a timely and genuine way. The whole body is in danger of serving the interests of big conservation NGOs, extractive companies and governments. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

Several respondents stress the need for effective and inclusive governance mechanisms, emphasizing the need for accountability in the decision making structures of the Bank's proposals:

*...the accountability of any forest partnership body must be to the community level. Communities must be informed how much money has been spent and on what precisely. They must be shown what the actual results have been. There must be new ways of being accountable, including the presentation of oral reports and not just written documents. All this should be done in the local languages. [Costa Rica Respondent 2]*

*To promote accountability there would have to be recognition of indigenous peoples as rights holders and as parties with distinct interests and particular concerns that must be duly accounted for in the governance structure. [Panama Respondent 4]*

*There is a need for more debate and in a way that is not technocratic that ensures greater understanding among those parties that live far way in their homes in the forest – [the debate] should not be among supposed 'expert' representatives. [Brazil Respondent 1]*

*Any global forest alliance would have to be accountable to the communities involved through evaluations, including in community assemblies, or other types of evaluation that assess compliance with agreements with affected communities, which should be binding. There should be independent monitors of any new global forest body and these monitors should be selected by indigenous forest peoples. [Peru Respondent 2]*

Alongside the need for recognition of indigenous peoples' rights and inclusive governance mechanisms, respondents in the Asia-Pacific region emphasise the need for forest partnerships to include existing international bodies (outside the World Bank) that work on indigenous issues:

*...a body should be established with links to relevant UN agencies – particularly for Indigenous Peoples issues, the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues should be involved... [Bangladesh Respondent 1]*

The need to involve indigenous peoples in all levels of decision-making at the international, regional, national and local levels is emphasized by the majority of respondents. The need for involvement at all stages of forest partnership design and implementation is likewise stressed:

*...involving the affected peoples in the process of designing, strategic planning, making action plan, implementation, monitoring and evaluation [and] building their capacities in required fields. [Nepal Respondent 1]*

*Provided such partnership address the rights and interests of Indigenous forest communities, then it would be fine. The guiding principles should be respect, equity and fairness. [Kenya Respondent 2]*

*Democratic principles and transparency in the management, and participation in the conception and the implementation [of the GFP] are needed. [Cameroon Respondent 6]*

Respondents generally express doubts that indigenous and other forest peoples would be equal partners in a GFP run by the World Bank. Many are concerned that GFP priorities would be dictated by the interests of powerful partners like industry and large conservation NGOs. Respondents emphasised that initiatives to protect forests must have forest peoples and communities as primary partners and prevent corrupt parties entering the partnership.

*The policy under this global forest partnership is set up to be top-down, and I do not have any dream that such a process will be good for the people. Can we reverse the process? No. I believe this process will still go on, even while I totally disagree with it. It is all top-down and this is a serious concern.. [Indonesia Respondent 1]*

*The greatest risk is that the GFP will manage centralised funds controlled by agencies with little experience in forest issues. Funding would be used based on a narrow business vision that would pay little attention to cultural diversity and indigenous peoples and their relationship to forests and natural resources. [Mexico Respondent 1]*

*The most serious risk is...weak participation by indigenous and other forest peoples in the decisions and programmes of any GFP which would serve to reinforce the imposition of top-down projects on their territories and forests. [Peru Respondent 2]*

#### **IV Doubts about the role of the World Bank**

This survey finds a high and widespread level of doubt among respondents, especially in South and Central America and Asia, about the suitability of the World Bank Group to lead such a major global initiative on forests. Respondents explain that these doubts stem to a large extent from their negative experiences with past and current World Bank interventions in forest areas and the Bank's past and ongoing lending to fossil fuel extractive industries, industrial logging, plantations and agribusiness. They judge many of these Bank activities to be counter to the conservation and sustainable use of the World's forests as well as to global efforts to tackle climate change.

*Unless there are serious reforms in the rules about how the Bank operates and how it works with indigenous peoples, then the risk is that the GFP will serve other interests and not the interests of indigenous peoples. We are not just 'stakeholders'. We are rights holders and should be treated as such. The Bank's plans just treat us as another 'stakeholder.' [Panama Respondent 4]*

*I don't see why the World Bank is looking at the idea of a global forest partnership – they usually talk about free trade, and liberalization, but not partnership and support for indigenous peoples and local peoples. [Indonesia Respondent 1]*

*The World Bank naturally seeks profit to survive itself. So I am a bit sceptical about entering a partnership with it. In this case I feel that Forest Peoples/Indigenous Peoples need not join hand with such a big boss.... Perhaps consortiums of representatives of Forest Peoples at national level and their regional representatives at global level, together with other investors and stakeholders, may also lead [this partnership] together instead of a single World Bank. However the rights of indigenous peoples should at no cost be ignored. [Nepal Respondent 1]*

*While the Bank may do small pilot loans and forest conservation projects, more generally indigenous peoples in Argentina have heard that the World Bank Group is supporting the extraction of fossil fuels on a large scale. We see a big contradiction in what the Bank is doing and what it is planning and saying publicly on climate change. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

*I remember that the Bank did not accept the recommendation of the Extractive Industries Review to phase out its funding for fossil fuel industries a few years ago: how can the Bank say it is now committed to fighting climate change when it still lends large amounts of money to extractive industries which in the end cause continued emissions of global warming gases? It does not make sense to us. We see that the Bank and its lending strategies are a major driver of climate change and so we do not understand how on the one hand it is launching climate mitigation policies and planning more support for forest protection programmes, but on the other hand it continues to support oil, gas, mining and agribusiness sectors that cause deforestation and pollution. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

*No [the Bank would not be the right lead agency]. Instead of the Bank preparing programmes for forests and indigenous peoples, these must come from initiatives of the peoples themselves and their own organisations, based on the indigenous and local vision. The policies must not be imposed from outside. [Panama Respondent 3]*

*I must say I have my doubts and I would have questions about the suitability of the Bank to lead a global alliance on forests. I am doubtful because the Bank has a poor record of consultation with the real people who matter: with the communities and organisations who live in or depend on forests. Again and again you can see they deal with governments most of all. Getting them to listen to indigenous concerns requires a lot of time and effort... [Guyana Respondent 1]*

*Although there may be some beneficial pilot Bank projects on forests and indigenous peoples in a few countries, the Bank is not the right agency to protect the world's forests – for reasons I have outlined above: damaging loans to extractives sector, large-scale energy projects..., support to logging companies, industrial agribusiness and exclusionary protected areas... [Argentina Respondent 1]*

The restricted mandate of the World Bank, to reduce poverty through sustainable economic development, was also cited as being at odds with more holistic local perceptions of development and the sustainable management and use of the world's forests:

*I certainly don't think the WB is the appropriate one given its mandate and its activities – it essentially promotes economic development on its own terms. This would be opposite or run contrary to the needs of indigenous peoples. [Northern Respondent 1]*

Most respondents communicate the view that some sort of collective international partnership to protect the world's forests could be worthwhile if organised and funded according to the principles of equity, respect for human rights, transparency and accountability. However, over two thirds of respondents either do not consider that the World Bank would be the appropriate agency to head up such an international forest partnership, or have doubts about the existing capacity of the Bank to lead such a partnership in a way that might provide genuine benefits for forest peoples. The survey finds that while, for the most part, respondents are not averse to some sort of global partnership on forests, they would prefer to see a rights-based partnership initiative with an inclusive governing body located within the UN family (outside the World Bank Group).

## V *Alternatives to the WB proposals*

For these reasons, many consider that some sort of global forest alliance outside the World Bank Group could be useful, provided that it were based on direct engagement with indigenous and other forest peoples and on respect for self-determination, human rights, equitable benefit-sharing, transparency and justice. Some respondents suggest that such a global partnership on forests could be headed up by other international agencies like UNEP, IFAD, the UNPFII or the EU, among others. These respondents stress that indigenous peoples and forest-dependent peoples or local communities needed to be effectively involved *at all levels of decision making*. A few respondents, mainly in South and Central America, consider that existing frameworks for international development do not offer potential for the establishment of a useful global forest alliance headed by any governmental or UN agency. These respondents suggest that at this time the most effective forest alliances are those between forest peoples, regional and global social movements and their supporters.

*...with different frameworks a partnership for forests could work. It would need to be a partnership that truly respects the traditional knowledge and practices of indigenous and other forest peoples and would build on their way of thinking and their own models of land use. Such a partnership could bring benefits to us and could help protect forests. I am not sure how this body could be set up, but it would have to work closely with indigenous peoples and their organisations. [Costa Rica Respondent 2]*

*If the partnership were located outside the World Bank Group and based on a set of key principles then some sort of forest alliance might be beneficial: a partnership where each partner has their rights fully defined and respected could do some good. [Panama Respondent 4]*

*An alliance of indigenous peoples and support organisations could be useful, organised according to the principles of legitimacy of collective rights of indigenous forest peoples and their control over territory and resources; as well as the principles of ...transparency, equity and interculturality. [Peru Respondent 2]*

*A forest partnership would be more effective at a regional, rather than global level. One main precondition for effectiveness would be that indigenous peoples are involved in the governance and decision-making of the regional body and that our engagement and the operation of the partnership would be based on respect for rights, equitable benefit sharing, transparency and development with identity. The Partnership would have to commit to supporting forest governance and ownership by indigenous and other forest peoples. If these sorts of guarantees could be met, then some sort of forest partnership could be helpful, but not one headed by the World Bank. [Argentina Respondent 1]*

## **VI Some emerging Recommendations**

The survey indirectly recorded a range of recommendations. Those respondents calling for major changes in the GFP process and proposals recommend that they should, *inter alia*:

- be based on widespread public consultation to ensure an inclusive process of GFP design and planning, in a structured and well-resourced manner, incorporating the views of indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities
- be redesigned with the concept of rights-based development and human rights protection at their core, including reference to and use of international law and standards and the inclusion of new rights objectives and targets
- address existing conflicts and competing claims to land tenure, in conformity with international standards and agreements
- address non-acceptance of indigenous land and territorial rights at the national level, and include measures to deal with these problems through the proposed partnership
- include governance arrangements that counter power imbalances at sub-national, national, regional and international levels and ensure effective inclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities.

The International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change likewise recommended further extensive consultation processes, including for the UNFCCC to:

*...organize with The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues an Expert Meeting on Climate Change Mitigation Strategies Impacts on Indigenous Peoples. Furthermore, we urge the Convention to participate actively in the next session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues whose special Theme is Climate Change<sup>11</sup>.*

Without these and other changes noted in this report, these respondents affirm that they could not endorse the GFP. Other respondents advise that the Bank should abandon its GFP and FCPF plans completely. They suggest that forest peoples and the international community should explore alternative options for global forest alliances outside the World Bank Group.

---

<sup>11</sup> The International Forum of Indigenous Peoples on Climate Change (IFIPCC) Statement to the 13<sup>th</sup> Session of Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC SBSTA 27, agenda item 5/REDD  
[http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest\\_issues/unfccc\\_bali\\_ifipcc\\_statement\\_redd\\_nov07\\_eng.shtml](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/forest_issues/unfccc_bali_ifipcc_statement_redd_nov07_eng.shtml)