



Earth Negotiations Bulletin

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Vol. 13 No. 17

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Wednesday, 11 September 1996

HIGHLIGHTS FROM IPF-3 TUESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 1996

Working Groups I and II convened morning and afternoon meetings on the second day of the third session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests. Working Group I heard statements on national forest programmes and land use plans, traditional forest-related knowledge and forest assessments. Working Group II continued consideration of international cooperation in financial assistance and technology transfer.

WORKING GROUP I

Working Group I began with further discussion of programme element I.1 on national forest and land use plans (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/14). BRAZIL noted the relationship of C&I and NFP to other programme elements such as resource and technology transfer. With COSTA RICA, COLOMBIA and MOROCCO, he called for flexibility in the concept of NFPs. With SWITZERLAND, he opposed prescription of activities. He emphasized the market and commercial context, and, with SWITZERLAND, MOROCCO and ITALY, a continuing forum for forest dialogue. COSTA RICA noted historical deforestation in developed countries, and said public fora on implementation must evolve out of the NFP process.

SWITZERLAND emphasized essential proposals for action and coordination at the national and international levels. COLOMBIA highlighted private sector financing responsibilities, and, with MOROCCO, called for water and soil conservation references. MOROCCO highlighted forest threats from other sectors and inappropriate exploitation, alternative national sources of financing, terms of trade and land tenure security, and, with PORTUGAL, attention to increasing civil society's role. ITALY emphasized coordination between all UN bodies. DENMARK questioned the US call for a holistic ecosystem approach while opposing the concept of NFPs.

Co-Chair Holdgate introduced programme element I.3 on traditional forest related knowledge (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/16). Beatrice Torres, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, reported on traditional forest-related knowledge (TFRK) under the CBD. She urged wider application of TFRK and equitable sharing of benefits. COICA said TFRK should be the exclusive property of those who develop it. States should regulate the use and dissemination of TFRK with indigenous peoples' involvement. COLOMBIA said any forest strategy should be based on TFRK with full prior knowledge and consent; rights should be determined at the state and international levels. The EU said benefits of TFRK should be shared equitably and

indigenous peoples should be consulted in the development of land use plans and SFM programs. UNESCO said the cultural dimension of natural resource management must be properly addressed. The UKRAINE said experiences of local communities should be taken into account, particularly communities inhabiting protected lands. NORWAY supported a comprehensive approach to IPR for TFRK.

JAPAN, supported by AUSTRALIA, CANADA and COSTA RICA, highlighted the CBD's major responsibility on this issue. GERMANY sought delineation of traditional, local and contemporary knowledge. The NETHERLANDS said indigenous peoples should be involved in any change to information-sharing schemes. The INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF THE INDIGENOUS-TRIBAL PEOPLES called for the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights to their knowledge, territories and sustainable self-development. She recommended that TFRK be protected by national legislation. DENMARK highlighted the need for social equity in participation in the development of forest and land use plans. GABON urged a study on equitable sharing of profits derived from TFRK.

MALAYSIA said rights from TFRK should be determined within the context of national laws and jurisdictions. BRAZIL sought a *sui generis* type of protection for TFRK, the compilation of existing legal instruments and country-specific inventories. WWF said any action to protect TFRK should be based on indigenous peoples' fundamental rights to land, resources and cultural property. PAPUA NEW GUINEA said rights to TFRK should be addressed on a piecemeal basis. Incentives should be established for contributions. AUSTRALIA noted that agreements on indigenous knowledge are possible without government intervention. CANADA called for collaboration with the CBD on biodiversity prospecting. The US questioned any attempt by IPF to facilitate contracts between governments and TFRK owners and attempts to establish international IPR for TFRK, and also noted it was premature to incorporate conclusions of COP-3 of CBD.

The G-77/CHINA called attention to trade issues related to TFRK and forest management practices. IUCN, supported by the PHILIPPINES and ZIMBABWE, noted that "TFRK" does not recognize all values of community forest systems. The PHILIPPINES called for local empowerment, participatory approaches and strengthening of local institutions and noted an upcoming UNEP/GEF conference on indigenous knowledge. The AD HOC NGO FOREST WORKING GROUP called for an IPF recommendation for international legislation on IPR and negotiation capacity building of forest dwellers. Jean Clement

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*© <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Chad Carpenter, LL.M. <chadc@iisd.org>, Deborah Davenport <ddavenp@unix.cc.emory.edu>, Emily Gardner <egardner@hawaii.edu>, and Kira Schmidt <kiras@iisd.org>. The Managing Editor is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The sustaining donors of the *Bulletin* are the International Institute for Sustainable Development <iisd@web.apc.org>, the Dutch Ministry for Development Cooperation and the Pew Charitable Trusts. General support for the *Bulletin* for 1996 is provided by the Overseas Development Administration (ODA) of the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the Swedish Ministry of Environment, the Swiss Federal Office of the Environment, the Ministry of the Environment of Iceland, the Ministry of Environment of Norway and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. Specific funding for this volume is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources Canada and the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. The authors can be contacted at their electronic mail addresses or at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are automatically sent to e-mail distribution lists (ASCII and PDF format) and can be found on the gopher at <gopher.igc.apc.org> and in hypertext through the *Linkages* WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/> on the Internet.

(FAO) then introduced the Secretary-General's report on programme element III.1 (a) on scientific research, forest assessment and development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/20). He highlighted the need for national assessment capacity and new resources for the FAO's Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (FRA2000).

The EU, supported by the US, requested information on the time frame and resource planning for the FRA2000, called for utilization of existing data, supported user provision of resources for data collection and capacity building. The US called on the FAO to consider ways to improve FRAs beyond 2000, redirect existing resources toward it and collaborate with UNEP. Collaboration with other forestry and educational organizations was later echoed by UNESCO. She warned against confusing a "core data" proposal with efforts for global harmonization of C&I for management. AUSTRALIA said national forest inventories are an essential tool for planning and decision-making. Clarification is needed regarding how inventories will match up against C&I. SWEDEN sought strengthening of national capacities and institutions for gathering data. He suggested rolling regional assessments. JAPAN stressed the need to standardize key definitions and classifications in FRAs. AUSTRIA recommended comprehensive FRAs, incorporating social and cultural aspects. C&I should be used to prioritize data gathering.

WORKING GROUP II

Delegates deliberated the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/19), which discusses the role of ODA and, *inter alia*, proposes a working group on innovative ways to generate financial resources, a code of conduct for forest-based private companies and a set of indicators for evaluating international cooperation. BRAZIL said IPF should examine ways to direct private investment toward SFM. He supported the proposed working group and recognized the need for a code of conduct. EGYPT said the problems of countries with low forest cover should be better reflected in the proposals for action. MOROCCO supported the code of conduct and the working group. MALAYSIA said the code of conduct should be private-sector driven. JAPAN questioned the need for a working group and said the code of conduct needs further consideration.

NEW ZEALAND stated that while NFPs are important, they are not a prerequisite for SFM. COSTA RICA, on behalf of the G-77/CHINA, said that private sector activities have not been conducive to SFM so they must be carefully monitored, and alternative means of financing must be explored. FINLAND recommended that more emphasis be placed on creating favorable conditions for long-term private investment in SFM, including incentives for small-scale and micro-enterprises, internalization of environmental costs and appropriate pricing of environmental goods and services. CANADA said that the proposed code of conduct needs to be further specified. It must be voluntary and not overshadow the need for regulation of foreign investment at the national level. He also noted that the role of ODA should not be overemphasized. Market-based incentives and private sector activity should not be portrayed as a substitute for ODA but as a complement to ODA and national efforts in developing countries.

IRAN said the report shifts the focus on generating new and additional finances from the international to the national level. CUBA stated that capacity strengthening should be funded in developing countries and incorporated into deliberations on international cooperation. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA recognized the need and potential to mobilize private investment in SFM in developing countries, but noted that a lack of information and insecurity of investment create obstacles to realizing this potential. GABON questioned whether the proposed code of conduct would be national or international, and

suggested the former would be more appropriate given differences in countries' circumstances.

On technology transfer, the report calls for, *inter alia*, using technology needs assessments (TNA) and requests an expert group to propose measures on technology adaptation. The US said that TNA is one approach among many, supported the expert group initiative and questioned the utility of establishing new research institutions. The US, supported by AUSTRALIA, also proposed that IPF identify research priorities. SWITZERLAND highlighted the need for mechanisms to extend research findings to the field level. CAMEROON stressed sub-regional research and ZIMBABWE recognized the need to build on indigenous technology.

The UK underscored the development of appropriate technologies within developing countries. CANADA said he does not favor the creation of new institutions, as suggested in the expert group proposal. He noted that technology can also flow from South to North, and that many Canadian forest stakeholders could benefit from improved flows. AUSTRALIA supported trilateral cooperation, where a developed country facilitates transfers between developing countries. NORWAY supported the use of TNA and communication technologies to facilitate access. PAPUA NEW GUINEA stressed the importance of TNA to developing countries and North/South flows of "high-tech" transfers. INDONESIA described the efforts of the Consultative Group on Indonesian Forestry (CEIF) as a forum for information-sharing on SFM. GREENPEACE emphasized bottom-up approaches and community-based technology transfers. IUCN urged countries and research organizations to document and inventory traditional SFM technologies, such as agroforestry practices and traditional soil and water conservation methods. MALAYSIA said that while South-South cooperation has much potential, it should be assisted by donor countries.

BRAZIL said the report fails to mention ideas raised at IPF-2, such as a document detailing successful examples, and called for a meeting devoted specifically to technology transfer issues. MOROCCO highlighted scientific research efforts in the Mediterranean basin and noted the importance of traditional local technologies. COLOMBIA called for more active participation by governments to ensure that clean technologies are transferred. CANADA noted that the CBD is considering a clearinghouse mechanism on technology transfer with regard to biodiversity, so the IPF should take advantage of the opportunity for synergy with this endeavor to avoid duplication. CHINA recommended the addition of text asserting the need for developed countries to transfer environmentally sound technology to developing countries. CIFOR said the section of the report on research and development should recognize the weakness of forest research in Africa and the need to fund more research initiatives in that region.

IN THE CORRIDORS

NGO reactions were mixed regarding the treatment of traditional forest-related knowledge. Some were pleased at the number of ideas put forward, while others were disappointed at the "truncated" treatment of the subject. Some expressed reservation at suggestions by number of delegations to defer to the CBD's primacy on the issue, noting that the recent SBSTTA meeting could not agree on substantive recommendations on indigenous knowledge. One observer wondered whether the IPF would pass, punt or run with the issue.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR

Working Group I will meet at 10:00 am in Room XIX.

Working Group II will meet at 10:00 am in Room XX.

|