

OPTIONS FOR INCREASING WOOD PRODUCTION


Higher demand for wood could be supplied from new plantations and by extracting more from natural forests.

The Living Forests Model projects a significant increase in wood demand (including as a feedstock for bioenergy) over the coming decades, even with increased recycling, reuse and efficiency. According to the model, this demand can be met by a combination of enlarging the portion of the world's natural forests that is managed for production, and establishing new tree plantations.

According to statistics collected by the FAO, almost 1.2 billion hectares of forest (or 30 per cent of the total forested area) are currently designated primarily for the production of wood and NTFPs with an additional 949 million hectares (24 per cent) designated for multiple uses – usually including some extraction of wood and NTFPs (see pie chart). Worldwide over 60 per cent of the growing stock in the production forest area consists of commercial species (ranging from over 90 per cent in Europe to just 20 per cent in Africa), though not all are of harvestable size or in areas available for wood supply⁴⁹.

In 2010, the world's estimated growing stock of wood totalled 527 billion m³ in all forests and plantations and 15 billion m³ in other wooded land⁴⁶. This has decreased slightly in the last 20 years due to net forest loss, but growing stock per hectare has increased⁴¹. Over 165 billion m³ of growing stock (nearly one third of the global total) is in areas zoned for production (natural forests and plantations) or multiple use⁴².

Reported global wood removals in 2010 amounted to 3.4 billion m³, of which about half were industrial roundwood (1.533 billion m³) and half fuelwood⁴³. That means total wood removals were less than 1 per cent of the world's growing stock, and industrial roundwood removals comprised about 1 per cent of the growing stock in production and



Global forest functions in 2010.
Source: FAO

Figures do not add to 100% due to rounding

Growing stock: volume of wood in all living trees in a given area that have more than a specified diameter at breast height (or above buttress if these are higher). Includes the stem from ground level or stump height up to a specified top diameter, and may also include branches above a specified minimum diameter.

multiple-use forests. This suggests there is no shortage of wood in the world's forests; however, the sustainability of extracting more depends on many local variables in community aspirations, ecology and forest management practices. Already, high-value species (such as mahogany, merbau, Chinese oak and ramin) and large saw logs are in short supply in some regions⁴⁴.


SHOULD MORE NATURAL FOREST BE OPENED UP TO COMMERCIAL HARVESTING?

To supply more wood, natural forests can either be logged more heavily or logged lightly over a larger area.

Depending on the scenario, the Living Forests Model projects that between 242 million and 304 million additional hectares of natural forest outside protected areas would need to be managed for commercial harvesting by 2050⁴⁶. The scenarios assume that demand for wood beyond the volumes sourced from plantations will come from well-managed natural forests, and project an expansion of up to 25 per cent above the current area of natural forest used for commercial wood production.

The environmental and social impact of any new logging concession or tree plantation will vary according to local context, management practices, safeguards applied and how revenues are distributed. This makes it difficult to draw blanket conclusions about the respective merits of expanding production in natural forests or more plantations as a means of increasing the global supply of wood.

Similarly, there is no simple verdict on whether it is better to log natural forests more heavily in a smaller area or conduct a lighter form of logging over a larger area. The options will be defined by restrictions under local laws or voluntary sustainability standards, and by what is economically viable. The optimal balance between protection and exploitation of forests is hotly contested from ideological and scientific standpoints. Debates rage over the impacts of logging on forest carbon⁴⁷ and studies have reached sharply differing conclusions on the biodiversity impacts of logging in tropical forests^{48,49}. One recent study concluded that the




economic forces behind industrial logging regimes are several hundred years out of synchronization with the natural cycles of forests⁵⁰. In addition, increased harvesting, particularly of previously undisturbed boreal forests, would likely lead to a major release of carbon, largely from peat deposits⁵¹.

Not all the natural forests currently designated for production are commercially viable, while others are being “mined” by over-harvesting or destructive logging. Optimizing yield from the total area designated as production forest will require some changes in the location and configuration of this area and assumes robust land-use planning. For example, heavily degraded production forests that are no longer commercially viable could be rezoned for other uses that would enable their restoration and regeneration.

SUSTAINABLE WOOD EXTRACTION AS A FOREST CONSERVATION STRATEGY

Forest stewardship, motivated by a commercial interest in maintaining wood supply, can help protect vulnerable forests from illegal logging, encroachment or conversion to farmland.



The market for wood can motivate good forest stewardship that safeguards a critical resource and protects forest values; or it can destroy the very places where wood grows.

Production forests play a crucial role in maintaining global climate, economic development and biodiversity conservation. They provide vital buffers for, and links between, protected areas. However, the capacity of production forests to provide ecosystem services and sustain timber yields varies greatly depending on how well they are managed and the values protected in the surrounding land-use mosaic. For example, poorly planned selective logging results in waste of harvested wood, unnecessary damage to residual trees and soil, and large canopy gaps that disrupt forest ecology and increase the risk of fire. The Tropical Forest Foundation suggests that 50 per cent less damage to remaining trees during logging operations would increase productivity on a given land base by 20 per cent⁶⁶.

The pursuit of conservation objectives in a forest managed for timber production may mean less wood is removed in each harvesting cycle, reducing revenues in the short term. Yet less intensive forms of logging and the creation of “set-asides” can also help maintain the longer-term productivity of the forest by sustaining ecological, carbon, nutrient and water cycles and decreasing vulnerability of tree species to disease and fire.

However, a forest manager may need to achieve a certain threshold of wood extraction per hectare to make the implementation of environmental and social safeguards viable or to compete with

a possible alternative land-use that would require the forest to be cleared. For this reason, conservationists are often supportive of efforts to develop new markets for lesser-known tropical timber species.

Cameroon, for instance, has an estimated 630 tree species of actual or potential commercial value, of which over 500 are scarcely used at all⁶⁷. In such circumstances, improved markets for lesser-known species might help make responsible forest management viable. This is a double-edged strategy though, as more commercial species may make illegal logging more alluring in regions where governance is weak or encourage the expansion of logging into pristine forest areas.

Another way of making sound forest stewardship more viable is the creation of new market mechanisms (e.g., REDD+) to pay forest managers for environmental services provided. This may motivate management practices that are more sustainable than an operation seeking to maximize timber yields as its only revenue stream. Some stakeholders, however, oppose use of such funds for commercial forestry⁶⁷.


Management plans with environmental safeguards – an essential stepping stone?

The area of tropical natural forest currently used for wood production that is covered by management plans increased by about 35 million hectares between 2005 and 2010, to an estimated 131 million hectares⁶⁸. The gap between forests with no management plan and those under responsible management is huge. While the growth in areas with a plan is a promising sign, the areas without management plans (roughly two-thirds of the 400 million or so hectares of production forest in the tropics) remain vulnerable to degradation or deforestation.

TALKING POINT: A RIGHTS AND RESOURCES VIEW

Forest communities, indigenous peoples and smallholders manage a growing share of the world's forests, and an important share of forest products, services and employment. New rigorous research by the Rights and Resources Initiative analysing the world's most-forested developing countries makes clear that recognizing the rights of these stakeholders has strong social, economic and environmental benefits. It also shows that, globally, the area of forest recognized as owned or controlled by indigenous peoples and communities has increased from 10 per cent in 2002 to 15 per cent today; in the forests of developing countries it has increased from 21 per cent to 31 per cent (around 680 million hectares of forest lands). The 27 countries studied are home to 2.2 billion rural people and include 75 per cent of the developing world's forests. Secure local land rights are key to sustainable development – a global target set at the 1992 Earth Summit⁶⁶. Legislation recognizing or strengthening land rights has also increased dramatically – with, for example, over 50 laws enacted since 1992. Adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007 provided a new impetus, but major progress is still needed: 97 per cent of forest lands in Africa and 60 per cent in Latin America are still being contested.

Given secure tenure rights, many communities and smallholders become highly effective managers, reforesters and producers for high-quality export tropical timber, wood products for fast-growing domestic markets, NTFPs, and key environmental services including water and biodiversity conservation. Chhatre and Agarwal,⁶⁷ for example, link participation in community-owned forests to significantly lower carbon emissions in a sample of 80 forests in East Africa, South Asia and Latin America.

The developed world dynamics between private ownership and wood supply are also changing with demographics, reducing wood supply from some, and increasing it in others. Private forests in the USA contribute much more per hectare to GDP than public forests, and private forest owners in Europe have associated (e.g., through the International Family Forest Alliance (IFFA) ) to supply changing wood markets, promote a next generation of owners and diversify the range of products and services their forests could provide.

Augusta Molnar, Rights and Resources Initiative




A child sitting in front of a recently felled tree on the edge of Virunga National Park, near the provincial capital of Goma in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Communities that depend on forest resources can be important allies in sustainable forest management.

THE ROLE OF TREE PLANTATIONS: 1

Target scenario: a Pro-Nature scenarios: Ending deforestation and degradation in forests will require expansion of a range of plantation types. The Living Forests Model projects that under a combination of the Target and Pro-Nature scenarios around 250 million additional hectares of new tree plantations would be established between 2010 and 2050 (see figure). This scenario combination assumes near zero loss of natural forests after the year 2020 and precludes the creation of new plantations within natural ecosystems in priority areas for conservation⁶⁸. The model also factors in the costs over successive rotations of increasing use of fertilizer and pest control to maintain productivity. These plantations would take many forms – from coppiced willow and poplar to feed combined heat and power plants in cooler northern regions, mixed plantations of native species for high quality timber products, or “fastwood” acacia and eucalyptus plantations nearer to the equator.

scenarios (Pro-Nature and Pro-Nature Plus) of the Living Forests Model which project that the remaining natural ecosystems are conserved (i.e., no further conversion of these ecosystems to cropland, grazing land, plantations or urban settlement) in areas identified as important for biodiversity by three separate conservation mapping processes using a UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) dataset. These scenarios assume that current land uses (e.g., cropland or forestry) in these areas remain constant and continue to produce food or wood.



Projected expansion of tree plantations (in million ha) under the Living Forests Model's Target and Pro-Nature scenarios combined, by region between 2010 and 2050. Source: IIASA

THE ROLE OF TREE PLANTATIONS: 2


In the right place and managed sustainably, tree plantations can reduce the pressure to bring natural forest areas into production.

Intensively managed plantations of introduced and/or native tree species established through planting or seeding for rapid production of biomass (5 to 25 years).

Tree plantations made up only 7 per cent of total forest cover in 2006, but provided 50 per cent of industrial roundwood⁶⁹. A growing proportion can be described as **intensively managed plantations**, with a rotation of 5 to 25 years. These supply around 40 per cent of plantation wood and their area has increased by 2 per cent per year since 2000, mostly in Asia, Oceania and South America⁶⁸. They yield far more wood per hectare than natural forests, with the highest yields achieved close to the equator (see figure). Improvements in landscape planning and planting techniques could boost productivity even more.

Uncertainties remain, however, about the long-term impacts of tree plantations. Most intensively managed plantations are in their first or second rotation and are so new that long-term environmental impact studies are unavailable.

To realize the productivity benefits of plantations with positive rather than negative social and environmental impacts, further expansion of tree plantations should be focused on degraded land, while maintaining or restoring natural ecosystems in the surrounding landscape, safeguarding the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities, and promoting greater benefit-sharing.




THE ROLE OF TREE PLANTATIONS: 3

Along with improved practices, advances in biotechnology could further boost plantation yields. But the precautionary principle⁶² must be applied in deciding if and how they are deployed and such advances must first gain social acceptance.

The Living Forests Model assumes that future tree plantation yields will match the best yields achieved today for a given combination of climate variables and soil type⁶³. However, in theory biotechnology, whether through conventional plant breeding or genetic modification, could improve plantation yields and reduce globally the portion of land that needs to be dedicated to wood production.

So far there has been very limited commercial deployment of genetically modified (GM) trees and no international consensus exists on the potential risks, benefits and ethics of GM technology (see box). Wherever GM organisms are proposed to be released into the environment, WWF advocates a strong precautionary approach with respect to environmental and social impacts and transparent monitoring for such impacts. National regulatory frameworks for environmental use and release of GM organisms (including field trials and commercialization) should support and implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety⁶⁴.



GM trees

An extract from: **The Forests Dialogue Scoping Paper on GM Trees**⁶⁵

Gamberg and Sandoe⁶⁴ note “that if modern biotechnology is to stand a chance, three main conditions for public acceptance must be met: utility, low risk, and an assurance that the biotechnology is used in a decent way”. But they also note that surveys suggest these are necessary but not sufficient conditions, and that “moral acceptability is a better predictor ... than risk or usefulness”. Thus, a fundamental challenge for proponents of GM trees is to build public trust⁶⁵, in part by finding ways of demonstrating to members of civil society that GM trees satisfy these conditions and tests. Societies will continue to rely on technological advances, such as those offered by genetic modification⁶⁶; conversely, as aspects of the agbiotech debate (amongst many others) illustrate, scientific advances do not necessarily or inherently confer legitimacy or gain social acceptance. More profound social processes are necessary to engender legitimacy and acceptance of scientific innovation for which the balance of potential benefits and risks is uncertain, and this applies to GM trees as to other such technologies.

WHERE IS NON-FOREST LAND POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE FOR NEW TREE PLANTATIONS OR RESTORATION OF NATURAL FORESTS?

In many regions there is potential to regain lost forest cover through mosaics of new plantations, natural forest restoration and responsible farming.

Map A (see next page) represents the maximum forest area the Earth could naturally support. Areas of existing tree cover are in dark green and currently non-forested areas, with the biophysical characteristics needed to make restoration of tree cover a possibility, are in light green. These are mainly areas where forests have been cleared since the last ice age, and currently comprise croplands, grasslands and degraded lands. Within these areas restoration of tree cover could take many forms – from ecological restoration for biodiversity objectives to agroforestry or intensively managed plantations.


Map B (see page 26) excludes current tree cover and shows the potential forest and tree plantation productivity in terms of expected mean annual increment of above-ground carbon in the potential areas for restoration of tree cover (light green areas in Map A). The darker green areas are where restoration of tree cover would have greatest productivity. Depending on the purpose of the restoration, this would determine the speed at which carbon is sequestered, commercial timber is grown or habitat is restored.

WWF does not advocate the restoration of tree cover in all or most of the areas in Map B, which simply identifies areas with biophysical characteristics capable of supporting forests. A decision to restore tree cover in a specific place, for whatever purpose, must involve local

Agroforestry

ecologically-based natural resources management system that, through the integration of trees on farms and in the agricultural landscape, diversifies and sustains production for increased social, economic and environmental benefits for land users at all levels.

Diet Shift scenario
a scenario of the Living Forests Model where the total global consumption of animal calories is maintained at the 2010 global average with convergence in per capita consumption across regions (i.e., those now below the global average consume more in the future, while those now above the global average consume less).



stakeholders, respect the aspirations of local communities and recognize the right of indigenous peoples to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to activities that will affect their rights to their lands, territories and other resources⁶⁴. The type of restoration is critical – restored natural forests, for example, will have higher biodiversity conservation value than single-species tree plantations.

Depending on the circumstances, restoration of tree cover could enhance or conflict with food production. Allocation of land and water between crops, pastures, forests or tree plantations will ultimately depend on global consumption patterns and public sector policies around food, water and energy security. Changes in food consumption patterns (such as those outlined in the Diet Shift scenario⁶⁵) will determine how much land with potential for restoration of tree cover could be taken out of food production without creating food shortages.

Many of the potential restoration areas overlap WWF's Global 200 ecoregions⁶⁶, a representative sample of biomes and habitat types where conservation would achieve the goal of saving most life on Earth. Sustainable land-use mosaics and restoration of forest cover are critical components of strategies to enhance ecological integrity and conserve biodiversity in many of these ecoregions.


GLOBAL POTENTIAL TREE COVER

World Totals

Natural Forest (NF) 4,347 M ha (million hectares)
 Short rotation plantations (SRP) 7.29 M ha

Europe (EU 27+rest of Europe)
 NF 174 M ha
 SRP 0.02 M ha

Former Soviet Union
 NF 1,196 M ha
 SRP 0.00 M ha




Map A: Global potential tree cover map. The Global Land Cover 2000 map was used to identify existing tree cover (dark green). The IIASA G4M biophysical model was used to identify areas where forests could occur (light green). The latter are non-forested areas with the biophysical characteristics needed to make restoration of tree cover a possibility⁹⁰. This is based on climate variables (temperature and precipitation) and soil characteristics from the Harmonized World Soil database⁹¹.

POTENTIAL AREAS FOR RESTORATION OF TREE COVER

Map B: Potential areas for restoration of tree cover. This builds from Map A by excluding existing tree cover. Within the potential areas for restoration of forest tree cover, the map shows potential forest productivity, in terms of expected mean annual increment (MAI) of above-ground carbon. The green shading indicates relative differences in expected productivity. Areas named in brown are examples of WWF Global 200 ecoregions with strong potential for restoration of tree cover.

World 2,155 Million Hectares (M ha)




© ANTHONY B. RATH / WWF-CANON



This pine nursery is part of a timber cooperative in Oaxaca, Mexico.

TALKING POINT: THE FAO'S VIEW ON PLANTED FORESTS

Planted forests can be environmentally sound sources of renewable energy and industrial raw material. Covering 264 million hectares worldwide they can support rural livelihoods, help communities raise their standard of living, and advance sustainable development. Planted forests contribute to maintaining ecological processes, to mitigating climate change, and to restoring degraded lands. In many countries they have emerged as a substantial component of natural resource use and will continue to become an increasingly important part of the landscape, given their critical significance for local economies, forest industry and products, energy and the environment.

FAO will continue to support developing countries in their efforts towards sustainable management of planted forests as documented in the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Management of Planted Forests . FAO further adopts an important role in facilitating an informed public debate about the

controversy of planted forests and in supporting major stakeholder groups, including the public, to better understand the role of planted forests in integrated ecosystem management and sustainable development.

Dr Walter Kollert, FAO Forestry Department

HALTING ILLEGAL LOGGING

Although the illegal trade remains on a massive scale, solutions to this problem are emerging.


Improved enforcement of forest laws and increasing regulation of trade in wood products is helping reduce illegal logging. Research carried out by Chatham House estimates that illegal logging has fallen 50 per cent in Cameroon, 50–75 per cent in the Brazilian Amazon and 75 per cent in Indonesia since 2000⁷¹.

New trade regulations targeting illegal logging

Governments in consumer countries are introducing prohibitions on trade in products containing illegally sourced wood and other policy measures linked to the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) initiatives⁷². The 2008 amendment of the US Lacey Act⁷³ makes it an offence to import, handle or sell illegally sourced wood products⁷⁴. The EU Timber Regulation⁷⁵ will enter into force in 2013, requiring those placing wood products on the EU market to exercise due diligence to ensure the wood was legally sourced. The Australian government is also developing an Illegal Logging Prohibition Bill, which, if passed, will regulate due diligence requirements for importers and processors. However, other growing markets for wood products have yet to take firm action. China, for example, has commissioned a study into the country's role as an importer of illegally sourced wood, but has no official plans to develop legislation to tackle the issue⁷⁶.

Traceability

One critical step in reducing illegal logging and associated trade is accurate tracing of wood along the supply chain. Without traceability a business cannot be sure that the wood or fibre in products it sells, uses or manufactures originates from a legal source. Technology is making full traceability more feasible. Better labelling devices (such as bar-coded tags or radio-frequency identification chips that can be scanned electronically) on logs or processed material enable efficient and accurate data capture at critical points along the supply chain. Internet-related data management systems are harder to forge or falsify than paper-




based manual-entry systems. DNA and isotopic⁷⁷ testing as well as fibre analysis can be used to check suspicious claims about the source or species of wood in a product. However, in regions where the trade in logs or processed wood is fragmented (involving numerous intermediaries) and opaque (e.g., characterized by cash transactions and poor official record keeping), full traceability may only be feasible if governance and government-led tracking is strengthened and if buyers simplify their supply chains and use the emerging tracking and tracing systems.

However, legality is only a step towards sustainability. Elements of sustainability, such as good governance, inclusiveness and maintaining forest ecosystems, usually require actions that go beyond mere legal compliance.

WHAT QUALIFIES AS SOUND MANAGEMENT OF PRODUCTION FORESTS?

“Sustainable forest management” is a much-contested term and no simple consensus definition exists. However, the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) principles provide a useful benchmark to assess the sustainability of production forestry.

There have been many attempts to define sustainable forest management, by bodies such as Forests Europe⁷⁷ and the International Tropical Timber Organization⁷⁸. All have their merits, but no global definition has been agreed. WWF believes that the FSC[®] principles serve as a useful checklist of critical aspects of forest management that is environmentally sound, socially just and economically viable.



FSC's 10 Principles of Forest Stewardship


- 1. Compliance with laws and FSC principles**
The Organization shall comply with all applicable laws, regulations and nationally ratified international treaties, conventions and agreements.
- 2. Workers' rights and employment conditions**
The Organization shall maintain or enhance the social and economic wellbeing of workers.
- 3. Indigenous peoples' rights**
The Organization shall identify and uphold indigenous peoples' legal and customary rights of ownership, use and management of land, territories and resources affected by management activities.
- 4. Community relations**
The Organization shall contribute to maintaining or enhancing the social and economic wellbeing of local communities.
- 5. Benefits from the forest**
The Organization shall efficiently manage the range of multiple products and services of the Management Unit to maintain or enhance long-term economic viability and the range of environmental and social benefits.
- 6. Environmental values and impacts**
The Organization shall maintain, conserve and/or restore ecosystem services and environmental values of the Management Unit, and shall avoid, repair or mitigate negative environmental impacts.
- 7. Management planning**
The Organization shall have a management plan consistent with its policies and objectives and proportionate to scale, intensity and risks of its management activities. The management plan shall be implemented and kept up to date based on monitoring information in order to promote adaptive management. The associated planning and procedural documentation shall be sufficient to guide staff, inform affected stakeholders and interested stakeholders and to justify management decisions.
- 8. Monitoring and assessment**
The Organization shall demonstrate that progress towards achieving the management objectives, the impacts of management activities and the condition of the Management Unit are monitored and evaluated proportionate to the scale, intensity and risk of management activities, in order to implement adaptive management.
- 9. Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forests**
The Organization shall maintain and/or enhance the High Conservation Values in the Management Unit through applying the precautionary approach.
- 10. Implementation of management activities**
Management activities conducted by or for The Organization for the Management Unit shall be selected and implemented consistent with The Organization's economic, environmental and social policies and objectives and in compliance with the Principles and Criteria collectively.

FOREST CERTIFICATION TO IMPROVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Forest certification enables the buyers of wood products to seek assurances that the wood was legally harvested and came from a well-managed forest.

Forest certification is a voluntary process, usually market driven, where an accredited body verifies the legality and social and environmental qualities of forest management against an agreed standard⁷⁰. Increasingly, such standards are set at a national level with equitable participation of all relevant stakeholders. The link from the forest floor to final point of sale as a certified forest product is achieved through an audited chain of custody.

Perhaps 30 per cent of the world's production forest is certified, and around 13 per cent of this under FSC⁸⁰. To have the greatest impact, certification will need to expand significantly in those regions, particularly the tropics, where forests suffer most from destructive forestry, and do so while maintaining quality standards and systems. Longer term, voluntary certification has the ability to generally raise standards of forest management, certified or not, by for instance highlighting outmoded forestry practices⁸¹.



What does WWF regard as credible forest certification?
Certification of good forest management by a third party under a system requiring:

- Alignment with globally applicable principles that balance economic, ecological and equity interests;
- Participation of all major stakeholders in the governance of the system and in the development of broadly accepted standards for responsible forest management;
- Respect for legal and traditional rights and maintenance of High Conservation Values;
- Independent, robust mechanisms for verifying and communicating the performance of certified forest managers.

WWF considers that FSC is currently the only credible forest certification system, while other major schemes have significant shortcomings⁸².

PEFC: Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification, a major certification organization.

Certification facts

As of 28th October 2012:


- 405 million hectares of forest and plantations were certified under the two major international schemes (FSC and PEFC), this figure includes some forests certified under both schemes⁸³;
- 164 million hectares were FSC certified (about 106 million hectares of natural forest, 13 million hectares of plantations and 45 million hectares of semi-natural and mixed plantation and natural forest)⁸⁴;
- 241 million hectares were PEFC certified⁸⁵;
- Only 4 per cent of tropical production forests have been certified under any scheme⁸⁶.

The potential supply of industrial roundwood from all certified forests and plantations (under all schemes) was estimated as 447 million m³ roundwood equivalent in mid-2011, about 25 per cent of global production⁸⁷.

DOES FOREST CERTIFICATION MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Studies indicate that FSC certification has a positive impact on economic, ecological and social aspects of forest management, but more research is needed.

While many studies describe benefits of forest certification (see box for some examples), measuring the impacts of forest certification presents many challenges. The majority of the studies are based on indirect approaches – not field-based assessments – and the few with primary data have faced challenges in attributing observed impacts to the certification intervention⁸⁸. More well-structured studies are needed to fully evaluate the impact of FSC and other forest certification schemes.



Tropical forests in general

An extensive study of Corrective Action Requests (CARs)⁸⁹ looking at FSC-certified operations in natural tropical forests concludes that FSC certification has a positive impact particularly in the fields of: health and safety of employees and their families; management plans; monitoring; use of reduced-impact logging; and protection of rare, threatened species. The study found that the number of CARs given in certification assessments was decreasing over time, suggesting that companies have incorporated management activities that are in line with FSC requirements as standard best practice.

Borneo

The Deramakot Forest Reserve (DFR) in Sabah, Borneo covers 55,000 hectares and was originally licensed for logging in 1956. In 1989, it was designated as a model site to develop sustainable forest management and all logging activities were suspended. A new management system with reduced-impact logging was implemented in 1995 and DFR was FSC certified in 1997. Studies comparing DFR with similar conventionally logged forests have shown DFR to be more effective in sustaining biodiversity⁹⁰; it is one of the few areas in Sabah containing all five Bornean wild cat species, including the bay cat (*Pardofelis badia*) – one of the world's rarest wild cats⁹¹. DFR is also estimated to have 54 tonnes more carbon per hectare stocked in the above-ground vegetation than the Tangkulap Forest Reserve (a conventional logging site)⁹².

Gabon

A study from Gabon⁹³ looking at the quality of wildlife management of forest concessionaires concluded that FSC-certified operations comply significantly better with national legislation and IUCN recommended best practices compared to non-certified companies.

Brazil

In plantation forestry in Brazil, FSC-certified operations performed substantially better on social and environmental aspects than non-certified companies⁹⁴.

BIG CHALLENGES, POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

WWF has three key platforms for engaging the forest products industry in the uptake of responsible practices.

Global Forest & Trade Network (GFTN) ⇌

GFTN is the world's longest-running and largest forest and trade programme, involving nearly 300 companies, ranging from small operations supplying local markets to large, fully integrated multinational companies, in over 30 producing and consuming countries. Companies participating in GFTN commit to responsible purchasing of forest products or to achieving credible forest certification in the forests they manage. Participation is based upon annual performance towards long-term targets. Participants have been a key force in generating market demand for legal and certified products and achieving certification in some of the world's most valuable and threatened forests.




**GLOBAL
FOREST
& TRADE
NETWORK**

New Generation Plantations project (NGP) ⇌



The NGP project is a platform bringing companies and governments together with WWF to develop and promote better plantation management. The NGP concept describes an ideal form of plantation that:

- maintains ecosystem integrity – including biological, carbon, nutrient and water cycles;
- protects and enhances High Conservation Values – biodiversity, ecosystem services and social and cultural values;
- is developed through effective stakeholder involvement – local communities, governments and NGOs;
- contributes to economic development – creating jobs and helping businesses and economies.


MAINTAINING
ECOSYSTEM
INTEGRITY



PROTECTING AND ENHANCING
HIGH CONSERVATION
VALUES



DEVELOPED THROUGH EFFECTIVE
STAKEHOLDER
INVOLVEMENT
PROCESSES



CONTRIBUTING TO
ECONOMIC
GROWTH
AND EMPLOYMENT

Paper Sector Transparency Tools

WWF has created a range of tools to reduce the ecological footprint of paper:

- Best measures for a paper efficient office; ⇌
- A guide explaining the potential environmental costs of paper and how to minimize these, including practical tips for buyers and producers ⇌;
- Check Your Paper, an online database ⇌ of brands transparent about their environmental footprint, to assist responsible buyers; it scores how well a paper performs on responsible fibre sourcing, clean production and climate impacts.
- An Environmental Paper Company Index, ⇌ showcasing paper producers' global environmental footprint in different product categories. In 2012, these were fine paper, tissue and packaging.

CHECK YOUR PAPER
Database of eCo-rated papers

Know the footprint of the paper you buy
Access transparent paper brands on
checkyourpaper.panda.org

RISING TO THE CHALLENGE - WOOD PRODUCTS AND FORESTS IN PERPETUITY


The key challenge for the wood products industry in a future with zero net deforestation and forest degradation is how to supply more wood products with less impact on forests.

“WE ALL FACE UNCOMFORTABLE CHOICES AND TRADE-OFFS, BUT ONLY BY TAKING BRAVE, INFORMED DECISIONS CAN HEALTHY, SUSTAINABLE AND EQUITABLE HUMAN SOCIETIES BE ENSURED, NOW AND INTO THE FUTURE.”⁶⁸

The future looks bright for responsible producers of wood products. Demand should continue to grow as emerging and developing nations use more paper for hygiene, education and packaging and more wood to construct and furnish better houses and buildings. Wood should increasingly substitute for many alternative materials that are less sustainable, more energy intensive and bring a heavier pollution load. New technologies are likely to enable greater use of wood to make biofuels, pharmaceuticals, plastics, cosmetics and textiles. This growing demand should be tempered by less prodigal consumption in richer societies, new efficiencies and more recycling.

Critical enablers of a forest products sector that contributes positively to the health of the planet include:

- **Better forestry:** e.g., ensuring legality and sustainable forest management; more sustainable plantations; rationalized and inclusive landscape-scale forest zoning; responsible procurement practices.
- **Better technologies:** e.g., increased mill and recycling efficiencies; new low-footprint wood products.
- **Better governance:** e.g., stronger social safeguards; effective enforcement of regulations.
- **Better policies:** e.g., incentives to reduce the rate of forest conversion and destructive logging, such as public policy measures to reward forest stewardship that delivers carbon storage, biodiversity conservation or water regulation services.
- **Better information:** e.g., long-term ecological impacts of various



forms of natural forest management and intensive plantations.

- **Wise consumption:** e.g., more repeat use of individual wood fibres; new consumption patterns that meet the needs of the poor while eliminating waste and over-consumption by the affluent. This includes wood products as well as food and energy, as all commodities are competing for land and water.

There is no fundamental reason why ZNDD cannot be achieved while sustaining a vibrant wood products industry and meeting people's needs. However, this assumes that the forest industry adopts sympathetic approaches to ecosystems, local communities and small forest owners. The forest products industry has the potential to be either a friend or an enemy of a living planet.

In this chapter, we have assumed that wood production can be managed to address social and environmental concerns. The next chapter of the report will focus on projected areas of future loss (“deforestation fronts”) and the implications for biodiversity conservation.

GLOSSARY, NOTES AND ACRONYMS

Agroforestry: ecologically-based natural resources management system that, through the integration of trees on farms and in the agricultural landscape, diversifies and sustains production for increased social, economic and environmental benefits for land users at all levels.

Bioenergy: energy derived from biomass, which can be used to generate electricity, supply heat and as a liquid biofuel.

Bioenergy Plus scenario: a scenario of the Living Forests Model where bioenergy feedstock demand is based on the “global 2°C scenario” derived from the POLES (Prospective Outlook for the Long-term Energy System) model.

Biomass: biological material derived from living or recently living organisms, such as wood and other crops. Biomass may also include biodegradable wastes that can be burnt as fuel. It excludes fossilized organic material which has been transformed by geological processes into substances such as coal or petroleum.

Cellulose: the basic structural component of plant cell walls, cellulose comprises about 33 per cent of all vegetable matter and is the most abundant of all naturally occurring organic compounds. Not digestible by humans, cellulose is a food for herbivorous animals (e.g., cows, horses), is processed to produce papers and fibres, and is chemically modified to yield substances used in the manufacture of such items as plastics, photographic films, etc.

Container board: container board is a type of light-weight paperboard specially manufactured for the production of corrugated board (formed by gluing one or more fluted sheets of paperboard to one or more flat sheet). It is typically used in the packaging of large materials.

Diet Shift scenario: a scenario of the Living Forests Model where the total global consumption of animal calories is maintained at the 2010 global average with convergence in per capita consumption across regions (i.e., those now below the global average consume more in the future, while those now above the global average consume less).

Do Nothing Scenario: A Living Forests Model projection of what the world could look like if our behaviour continues in line with historical trends. The Do Nothing Scenario anticipates land-use change due to: (a) demands for land to supply a growing global human population with food, fibre and fuel; and (b) continuation of historical patterns of poorly planned and governed exploitation of forest resources. Key assumptions in this scenario are:

- By 2050, world population reaches 9.1 billion and per-capita GDP almost triples.
- Demand for commodities is driven by changes in affluence (measured by GDP) and human population growth.
- Aggregate historical trends in agricultural productivity gains continue.
- The average human diet in a country changes according to historically observed relationships with per-capita GDP.
- Forestry and agricultural production does not expand into protected areas, but unprotected natural habitats can be managed for production of timber or converted to timber plantations, cropland and pasture.
- Total primary energy use from land-based biomass feedstocks doubles between 2010 and 2050 due to projected energy demand and the competitiveness of bioenergy technologies and supply chains.

Energy wood: woody biomass that is not used for household fuelwood or the production of wood-based products.

FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Fibre: cellulose-filled cells that are extracted from biological material (e.g., wood, bamboo, agricultural residues) and used to manufacture a variety of products, including paper.

Fuelwood: roundwood that will be used as fuel for purposes such as cooking, heating or power production. It includes wood harvested for fuel from main stems, branches and other parts of trees and wood that will be used for charcoal production (e.g., in pit kilns and portable ovens). It also includes wood chips to be used for fuel that are made directly (i.e. in the forest) from roundwood.

GHG: greenhouse gas

Growing stock: volume of wood in all living trees in a given area that have more than a specified diameter at breast height (or above buttress if these are higher). Includes the stem from ground level or stump height up to a specified top diameter, and may also include branches above a specified minimum diameter.

High Conservation Value (HCV): an exceptional or critical ecological attribute, ecosystem service or social function of forests and other biomes, defined by the FSC as follows:

HCV1 – Species diversity: Concentrations of biological diversity including endemic species, and rare, threatened or endangered species, that are significant at global, regional or national levels.

GLOSSARY, NOTES AND ACRONYMS

HCV 2 – Landscape-level ecosystems and mosaics: Large landscape-level ecosystems and ecosystem mosaics that are significant at global, regional or national levels, and that contain viable populations of the great majority of the naturally occurring species in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.

HCV 3 – Ecosystems and habitats: Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems, habitats or refugia.

HCV 4 – Critical ecosystem services: Basic ecosystem services in critical situations, including protection of water catchments and control of erosion of vulnerable soils and slopes.

HCV 5 – Community needs: Sites and resources fundamental for satisfying the basic necessities of local communities or indigenous peoples (for example for livelihoods, health, nutrition, water), identified through engagement with these communities or indigenous peoples.

HCV 6 - Cultural values: Sites, resources, habitats and landscapes of global or national cultural, archaeological or historical significance, and/or of critical cultural, ecological, economic or religious/sacred importance for the traditional cultures of local communities or indigenous peoples, identified through engagement with these local communities or indigenous peoples.

Industrial roundwood: all harvested wood (saw logs, veneer logs and pulpwood) suitable for processing into wood products, and excluding wood used directly as fuelwood.

Intensively managed plantations: plantations of introduced and/or native tree species established through planting or seeding for rapid production of biomass (5 to 25 years).

Living Forests Model: developed for WWF by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) the model draws on G4M and GLOBIOM models to show geographically explicit land-use change under different scenarios. The G4M model projects future deforestation and land-use change by extrapolating from historical trends and taking into account future projections for population, GDP and infrastructure. GLOBIOM is an economic model that allocates land and resources optimally based on projected commodity and ecosystem service demands under future GDP, population and policy scenarios.

Market pulp: pulp that is produced in one location, from virgin or recycled fibre, dried and shipped to another location for further processing to make paper and paperboard.

Non-timber forest product (NTFP): a product of biological origin other than wood derived from forests, other wooded land and trees outside forests. NTFP refers to all the resources/products (other than industrial roundwood and derived sawn timber, wood chips, wood-based panels and pulp) that may be extracted from forest ecosystems and are used within the household or are marketed or have social, cultural or religious significance. These include plants and plant materials used for food, fuel, storage and fodder, medicine, wrapping materials and bio-chemicals, as well as animals.

Non-wood fibre: cellulose-filled cells that are extracted from biological material other than wood (e.g., bamboo, agricultural residues) and used to manufacture a variety of products including paper.

Panels and panel product: a range of materials (e.g., plywood, particleboard or fibreboard) typically formed into sheets from particles, fibres or veneers, made from industrial roundwood or recovered fibre/wood.

Paper: material mainly used for writing or printing upon or for packaging, as well as for tissue products, that is produced by pressing together moist fibres, typically derived from pulpwood, fibre crops or recovered paper, and drying them into flexible sheets.

Paperboard: a relatively stiff, heavy material, thicker than paper, that is produced by pressing together moist fibres, typically derived from pulpwood, fibre crops or recovered paper, and drying them into thick sheets.

PEFC: Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification, a major certification organization.

Production forest: forest area designated primarily for production of wood, fibre, bioenergy and/or non-timber forest products.

Pro-Nature scenarios: scenarios (Pro-Nature and Pro-Nature Plus) of the Living Forests Model which project that the remaining natural ecosystems are conserved (i.e., no further conversion of these ecosystems to cropland, grazing land, plantations or urban settlement) in areas identified as important for biodiversity by three separate conservation mapping processes using a UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) dataset. These scenarios assume that current land uses (e.g., cropland or forestry) in these areas remain constant and continue to produce food or wood.

GLOSSARY, NOTES AND ACRONYMS

Protected area: a clearly defined geographical space that is recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means in order to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values .

Pulp: a material prepared by chemically or mechanically extracting cellulose fibres from pulpwood, fibre crops or recovered paper.

Pulpwood: industrial roundwood that will be used for the production of pulp, particleboard or fibreboard. It includes roundwood (with or without bark) that will be used for these purposes in its round form or as split wood or wood chips made directly (i.e. in the forest) from roundwood. It does not include by-products from the sawmill.

Recovered paper/wood: fibre, paper and wood from unused material, collected waste and manufacturing waste. It can be divided into pre-consumer and post-consumer recovered paper/wood.

Recovery rate: percentage of usable recycled materials that have been removed from waste generated in a specific area or by a specific industry.

Recycled fibre: fibre made from processing recovered paper or wood.

REDD+: A package of actions aimed at (1) reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) in developing countries; (2) conservation and sustainable management of forests; and (3) enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

Roundwood: All wood felled or otherwise harvested and removed.

Saw logs: Roundwood that will be sawn (or chipped) lengthways for the manufacture of sawn wood.

Sawn wood: planks or boards mechanically sawn from saw logs.

Target scenario: a scenario of the Living Forests Model where ZNDD (with near zero gross rate of loss of natural and semi-natural forest) is achieved by 2020 and maintained at that level indefinitely .

Veneer logs: roundwood that will be used for the production of veneer (a thin facing layer of wood) mainly by peeling or slicing.

Virgin wood fibres: wood fibre used for the first time in the manufacture of paper or other products.

WBCSD: the World Business Council for Sustainable Development .

Well-managed natural forests: natural and semi-natural forests managed in an economically viable, socially equitable and environmentally sustainable way that maintains biodiversity and ecosystem services. The FSC elaborates this further with 10 principles .

Wood: the hard fibrous material that forms the main substance of the trunk or branches of a tree or shrub.

Wood-based biomaterials: materials synthesized from wood fibre.

Wood fibre: cellulose-filled cells that are extracted from wood and used to manufacture a variety of products including paper. It covers both virgin wood fibre and fibre from recovered paper or wood.

Wood pulp: pulp made from virgin wood fibres.

Wood products: the wide range of products that are manufactured from industrial roundwood.

Zero Net Deforestation and Forest Degradation (ZNDD): WWF defines ZNDD as no net forest loss through deforestation and no net decline in forest quality through degradation. ZNDD provides some flexibility: it is not quite the same as no forest clearing anywhere, under any circumstances. For instance, it recognizes people's right to clear some forests for agriculture, or the value in occasionally "trading off" degraded forests to free up other land to restore important biological corridors, provided that biodiversity values and net quantity and quality of forests are maintained. In advocating ZNDD by 2020, WWF stresses that:

(a) most natural forest should be retained — the annual rate of loss of natural or semi-natural forests should be reduced to near zero; and (b) any gross loss or degradation of pristine natural forests would need to be offset by an equivalent area of socially and environmentally sound forest restoration. In this accounting, plantations are not equated with natural forests as many values are diminished when a plantation replaces a natural forest.

REFERENCES AND ENDNOTES

- 1 For details of the Living Forests Model, see Taylor, R. (ed). 2011a. Chapter 1: Forests for a Living Planet in *Living Forests Report*. WWF, Gland, Switzerland. wwf.panda.org/livingforests
- 2 FAO. 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010: Main Report*. FAO Forestry Paper 163, FAO, Rome
- 3 WWF. 2012. *Living Planet Report 2012: Biodiversity, biocapacity and better choices*. WWF, Gland, Switzerland
- 4 Poyry. 2012. *Future from Fibre. From Forest to Finished Product*. Technical report for WBCSD/WWF, Gland, Switzerland
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Bribián, I.Z., Capilla, A.V. and A.A. Usón. 2011. Life cycle assessment of building materials: Comparative analysis of energy and environmental impacts and evaluation of the eco-efficiency improvement potential. *Building and Environment*, 46(6):1133-1140
- 7 Thompson, R.C., Moore, C.J., vom Saal, F.S. and S.H. Swan. 2009. Plastics, the environment and human health: current consensus and future trends. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 364(1526):2153-2166
- 8 Poyry, op. cit.
- 9 Von Falkenstein, E., Wellenreuther, F. and A. Detzel. 2010. LCA studies comparing beverage cartons and alternative packaging: can overall conclusions be drawn? *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, DOI 10.1007/s11367-010-0218-x
- 10 *Quercus suber* L
- 11 PricewaterhouseCoopers/ECOBILAN 2008. *Evaluation of the environmental impacts of Cork Stoppers versus Aluminium and Plastic Closures*. www.corkfacts.com/pdffiles/Amorim_LCA_Presentation.pdf
- 12 Pereira, C. and Gil, L. 2006. The Problem of Cork Taint in Cork Stoppers and the Process for their Elimination/Reduction. *Silva Lus.* [online] 14(1):101-111. ISSN 0870-6352.
- 13 www.woodrecyclers.org/recycleintro.php
- 14 www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/municipal/index.htm
- 15 See: faostat.fao.org/site/626/DesktopDefault.aspx?PageID=626#ancor
- 16 FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests 2011*.
- 17 Taylor, R. (ed). 2011b. Chapter 2: Forests & Energy in *Living Forests Report*. WWF, Gland, Switzerland. wwf.panda.org/livingforests
- 18 Obersteiner, M. et al. 2001. Managing climate risk [3]. *Science* 294:766-787
- 19 The Living Forest Model does not attempt to project volumes of "other industrial roundwood". This table uses reported volumes of "other industrial roundwood" for 2010 (source: FAO 2011). *State of the World's Forests 2011*. FAO, Rome) as a constant for 2030 and 2050 projections.
- 20 See: faostat.fao.org/site/626/default.aspx#ancor
- 21 Along with pulpwood, the 40 per cent figure includes offcuts and sawdust from saw logs used in pulp production. FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests 2011* (Chapter 2), and statistic of FAO 2010, faostat.fao.org
- 22 FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests 2011*.
- 23 Zhao, H. 2012. *Outlook for Global Recovered Paper – March 2012*. RISI
- 24 Poyry, op. cit.
- 25 FAO. 2011. *Highlights on paper and paperboard: 1999-2009*. FAO, Rome
- 26 Poyry, op. cit.
- 27 FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests 2011* (Chapter 2)
- 28 FAO statistics: faostat.fao.org/site/626/default.aspx#ancor
- 29 FAO. 2010. Forest statistic: faostat.fao.org/site/626/default.aspx#ancor
- 30 FAO. 2011. *Highlights on wood pulp and other fibre furnish: 1999-2009*. FAO, Rome
- 31 Dr Hans-Peter Sollinger, Voith Paper, personal communication, 17 February 2010
- 32 tissueworldmagazine.com/11_ocrnov/market_issues.php
- 33 See: faostat.fao.org/site/626/default.aspx#ancor
- 34 Dr Hans-Peter Sollinger, Voith Paper, personal communication, 17 February 2010
- 35 FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests 2011* (table 1 and table 5)
- 36 Environmental Paper Network. 2011. *The State of the Paper Industry 2011: Steps Toward an Environmental Vision*. Asheville, USA. www.environmentalpaper.org/state-of-the-paper-industry-2011.php
- 37 Entiers, T. 2001. *Trash or treasure? Logging and mill residues in Asia and the Pacific*. FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok. www.iao.org/DOCREP/003/X6966E/X6966E02.htm
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 FAO. 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment*, p.37.
- 40 Ibid., pp 11 and 35
- 41 Ibid., p.35
- 42 Data calculated from: FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests and FAO*. 2009. *State of the World's Forests 2009*, FAO, Rome; see table 3 at: [ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/017/03506e/03506e04c.pdf](http://ftp.fao.org/docrep/017/03506e/03506e04c.pdf) Calculation based on total growing stock per country which is reported as "commercial". Note that not all countries reported data, hence 165 billion is a minimum figure.
- 43 FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests*, Table 5.10., p.101
- 44 FAO. 2003. *World Agriculture: Towards 2015/2030. An FAO perspective*. FAO, Rome
- 45 www.fao.org/forestry/itra/62219/en
- 46 Taylor, R. (ed) 2011a. Op. cit., p.23.
- 47 FAO. 2010. *Managing forests for climate change*, pp 10-11. FAO, Rome. www.fao.org/docrep/013/1960e/1960e00.pdf
- 48 Putz, F.E., Zuidema, P.A., Synnott, T., Peña-Claros, M., Pinard, M.A., Sheil, D., Vanday, J.K., Sist, P., Gourlet-Fleury, S., Griscom, B., Palmer, J. and R. Zagt. 2012. Sustaining conservation values in selectively logged tropical forests: the attained and the attainable. *Conservation Letters*. DOI: 10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00242.x
- 49 Zimmermann, B.L. and Kormos, C.F. 2012. Prospects for sustainable logging in tropical forests. *Bioscience* 62(5):479-487
- 50 Ibid.

REFERENCES AND ENDNOTES

- 51 Olsson, R. 2011. *To Manage or Protect? Air Pollution and Climate Series number 26*. Air Pollution and Climate Secretariat, Göteborg, Sweden
- 52 Sampson, N. 2003. Timber, Fuel, and Fiber (Chapter 9), in Bystrakova, N., Brown, S., Gonzalez, P., Irfand, L.C., Kauppi, P., Sedjo, R. and L.D. Thompson. *Ecosystems and human well-being: Current states and trends*. www.maweb.org/documents/document.278.aspx.pdf
- 53 www.unep.org/bpsp/Forestry/Forestry%20Case%20Studies/Cameroun.pdf
- 54 See for example: www.globalwitness.org/campaigns/environment/forests/forests-and-climate-change/reducing-emissions-deforestation-and-forest-degradation-redd
- 55 Blaser, J., Sarre, A., Poore, D. and S. Johnson. 2011. *Status of tropical forest management 2011*. ITTO Technical Series No 38, The International Tropical Timber Organization. www.itto.int/direct/topics/topics_pdf_download/topics_id=2660&no=0&disp=inline
- 56 RRI. 2012. *What Rights? A Comparative Analysis of Developing Countries' National Legislation on Community and Indigenous Peoples' Forest Tenure Rights*. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington DC. www.rightsandresources.org/publication_details.php?publicationID=4924; and RRI. 2012. *Respecting Rights, Delivering Development: Forest Tenure Reform since Rio 1992*. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington DC. www.rightsandresources.org/publication_details.php?publicationID=4935
- 57 Chhatre, A. and Aganwal, A. 2009. Trade-offs and synergies between carbon storage and livelihood benefits from forest commons. *PNAS* 106(42):17667-17670. www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0905308106
- 58 Taylor, R. (ed) 2011a. Op. cit., p. 23
- 59 Jagels, R. 2006. *Management of wood properties in planted forests: a paradigm for global forest production*. FAO working paper. ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/j8289e/j8289e.pdf
- 60 Kanowski, P. and Murray, H. 2008. *Intensively Managed Planted Forests. Toward best practice*. TFD Review, The Forests Dialogue, New Haven, USA
- 61 Bracelpa. 2011. *Brazilian Pulp And Paper Industry*. Brazilian Pulp and Paper Association (Bracelpa). www.bracelpa.org.br/eng/estatisticas/pdf/booklet/booklet.pdf
- 62 Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=78&articleid=1163
- 63 Due to uncertainty over potential gains from new technology, the model assumes zero growth in input-neutral productivity. In other words, it assumes current best technologies and practices (e.g. better use of fertilizer, irrigation, pest control, quality seed etc.) will become more widely practised but does not try to predict new technology (e.g. genetic modification or other future technologies deployed to boost yields).
- 64 Gamborg, C. and Sandøe, P. 2010. Ethical considerations regarding genetically modified trees. In: El-Kassaby, Y. (ed) *Forests and genetically modified trees*, pp 163–176. IUFRO and FAO. www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1699e/i1699e00.htm
- 65 Doering, D.S. 2004. Will the marketplace see the sustainable forest for the transgenic trees?. In: Strauss, S.H. and Bradshaw, H.D. (eds) *The bioengineered forest*, pp 112–140. Resources for the Future, Washington DC
- 66 Boyd, E. 2010. Societal Choice for Climate Change Futures: Trees, Biotechnology, and Clean Development. *BioScience* 60:742–750
- 67 Kanowski, P. 2011. *Genetically-Modified Trees: Opportunities For Dialogue*. The Forests Dialogue, p. 7. environment.yale.edu/itd/uploads/TFD%20ScopingPaper%20GMtrees(1).pdf
- 68 See the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfi/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf) and also The Forests Dialogue (undated) *Initiative on Free, Prior and Informed Consent*. environment.yale.edu/itd/uploads/TFD_FPIC_Concept_note.pdf
- 69 Taylor, R. (ed) 2011a. Op. cit., p. 22.
- 70 The global Land Cover 2000 map (bioval.jrc.ec.europa.eu/products/glc2000/glc2000.php) was used to identify existing forests. The IIASA G4M biophysical model was used to identify areas where forests could occur. This was based on climate variables (temperature and precipitation) from www.worldclim.org and soil characteristics from the Harmonised World Soil database (www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/LUC/External-World-soil-database/HTML/index.html). This data was used to estimate the potential above-ground net primary production (NPP) of a given area, i.e. the net accumulation of carbon in above-ground biomass per hectare per year. The range of potential forms of vegetation (from desert through grassland, shrubland, to forest) that a given area could potentially support was based on conservative estimates of NPP thresholds for each vegetation type.
- 71 Lawson, S. and MacFaul, L. 2010. *Illegal Logging and Related Trade Indicators of the Global Response*. Chatham House, London
- 72 UNECE/FAO. 2011. *Forest Products Annual Market Review, 2010-2011*. Geneva Timber and Forest Study Paper 27. ECE/TIM/ISP/27. www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/publications/timber/FPAMR_2010-2011_HQ.pdf
- 73 Lawson, S. and MacFaul, L. Op. cit.; and White, G. 2010. *Exporting in a Shifting Legal Landscape*. Global Forest & Trade Network, WWF, Gland, Switzerland
- 74 ec.europa.eu/environment/forests/timber_regulation.htm
- 75 Lawson, S. and MacFaul, L. Op. cit.
- 76 ITTO. 2012. *Draft Report – Timber Tracking Technologies – Review of Electronic and Semi-Electronic Timber Tracking Technologies and Case Studies*. www.itto.int/files/user/pdf/Meeting%20related%20documents/Timber%20Tracking%20Review.pdf
- 77 Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe. 2002. *Improved Pan-European Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management as adopted by the MCPFE Expert Level Meeting, 7-8 October 2002*. MCPFE Liaison Unit, Vienna
- 78 www.itto.int/sustainable_forest_management
- 79 Purbawiyatna, A. and Simula, A. 2008. Developing Forest Certification; Towards increasing the comparability and acceptance of forest certification systems worldwide. ITTO Technical Series No 29, ITTO. www.itto.int/direct/topics/topics_pdf_download/topics_id=40920000&no=1&disp=inline
- 80 UNECE/FAO. Op. cit., p. 99
- 81 Cashore, B., Egan, E., Auld, G. and D. Newsom. 2007. Revising Theories of Non-State Market-Driven (NSMD) Governance: Lessons from the Finnish Forest Certification Experience. *Global Environmental Politics* 7(1)

REFERENCES AND ENDNOTES

- 82 WWF. 2011. WWF statement on the PEFC international standards launched in November 2010. awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf_statement_on_pefc_standards_march_2011.pdf and WWF. 2010. Forest certification. awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf_forest_certification_pp_oct07.pdf.
- and Ford, J. and Jenkins, A. 2011. On the Ground – the controversies of PEFC and SFI. Climate for Ideas. Forests of the World. Dogwood Alliance. Hnutí DUHA (Friends of the Earth Czech Republic), Les Amis de la Terre (Friends of the Earth France), Greenpeace, Sierra Club of British Columbia, Suomen Luonnonsuojeluliitto, Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples. www.greenpeace.org/international/global/international/publications/forests/On%20The%20Ground%2017_10_11.pdf
- 83 FSC figures from www.fsc.org/facts-figures. 19.htm accessed, October 2012, and PEFC figures from www.pefc.org/about-pefc/who-we-are/facts-a-figures, accessed October 2012. Note the PEFC figures include areas certified under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) and Canadian Standards Association (CSA).
- 84 *ibid.*
- 85 *ibid.*
- 86 UNECE/FAO 2011. Op. cit., p.101.
- 87 *ibid.*
- 88 Romero, C. (in review). Taking Stock of the Impacts of Forest Management Certification. PROFOR-World Bank
- 89 Peña-Claros, M. et al. 2009. *Assessing the progress made: An evaluation of forest management certification in the tropics*. Wageningen UR, Netherlands. www.illegal-logging.info/uploads/March10Assessingtheprogresforestingintropics.pdf
- 90 Imai, N., Samejima, H., Langner, A., Ong, R.C., Kita, S. et al. 2009. Co-Benefits of Sustainable Forest Management in Biodiversity Conservation and Carbon Sequestration. *PLoS ONE* 4(12): 8267. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0008267
- 91 Azlan, M. et al. 2009. Records of five Bornean cat species from Deramakot Forest Reserve in Sabah, Malaysia. *CATnews* 51. www.cloudedleopard.org/Documents/Mohamed_et_al_CAT_News_51.pdf
- 92 Seino, T., Takyu, M., Aiba, S.-I., Kitayama, K. and R.C. Ong. 2006. Landscape-level evaluation of carbon and biodiversity in the tropical rain forests of Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah, Malaysia. *Second Workshop on Synergy between carbon management and biodiversity conservation in tropical rain forests*, 5-1. www.mendeley.com/research/landscapelevel-evaluation-carbon-biodiversity-tropical-rain-forests-deramakot-forest-reserve-sabah-malaysia
- 93 Rayden, R. et al. 2010. *Evaluation of the management of wildlife in the forestry concessions around the national parks of Lope, Waka and Iwindo, Gabon*. WCS. wcs-gabon.org/index.php?option=com_remository&Itemid=27&tunc=startdown&id=28&lang=fr
- 94 Noveas Keppe, A.L. et al. 2008. *Impact assessment of FSC certification on forest companies in southern Brazil*. Imaflorea. ww2.imaflora.org/arquivos/Impact%20assessment%20of%20FSC%20certification%20on%20forest%20enterprises%20in%20southern%20BR1.pdf
- 95 WWF. 2012. *Living Planet Report 2012: Biodiversity, biocapacity and better choices*.
- 96 www.fao.org/forestry/lof/506667/en
- 97 For more information on the Living Forests Model scenarios see www.fao.org/livingforests and in particular Chapter 2 on Forests & Energy. The FOLIS model is a global sectoral simulation model for the development of energy scenarios until 2050. See EC. 2011. A Roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050. Staff Working Document SEC 288. European Commission, Brussels. (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32011DC0112:EN:NOT>)
- 98 www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/101633/cellulose
- 99 Eurostat/FAO/ITTO/UNECE. 2011. *Joint Forest Sector Questionnaire definitions 2011*. www.fao.org/forestry/7800-0db7b13ec9581687e7852a1d85e5b8b6.pdf
- 100 Adapted from FAO definition. See FAO. 2010. *Forest Resource Assessment*, Annex 2. FAO, Rome. www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1757e/i1757e13.pdf
- 101 FSC. 2011. Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship. votefsc.org/md.static/FSC-STD-01-001_V5-0_D5-0_EN_Explanatory_Notes+Rationales.pdf
- 102 www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/FOR/globaliom/forestry.html
- 103 Kindermann, G.E., Obersteiner, M., Rametsteiner, E. and I. McCallum. 2006. Predicting the deforestation-trend under different carbon-prices. *Carbon Balance and Management* 1(1). www.scopus.com; and Kindermann, G., M. Obersteiner, Schöngen, B. et al. 2008. Global cost estimates of reducing carbon emissions through avoided deforestation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 105(30):10302-10307 and Havlik, P., Uwe, A., Schneider, E.S. et al. 2010. Global land-use implications of first and second generation biofuel targets. *Energy Policy* 4
- 104 www.fao.org/forestry/site/6388/en
- 105 Wickets, G.E. 1992. Management issues for development of non-timber forest products. Unasylva, 42:165
- 106 FAO. 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment*, Annex 2. www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1757e/i1757e13.pdf
- 107 Taylor, R. (ed). 2011a. Op. cit., pp. 10-11.
- 108 Dudley, N. (ed). 2008. *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland
- 109 Eurostat/FAO/ITTO/UNECE. Op. cit.
- 110 Taylor, R. (ed.) 2011a. Op. cit., p.7
- 111 www.wbcsd.org
- 112 See www.fsc.org/principles-and-criteria.34.htm for details

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS


WWF

WWF is one of the world's largest and most experienced independent conservation organizations, with more than 5 million supporters and a global network active in over 100 countries. WWF's mission is to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature, by conserving the world's biological diversity, ensuring that the use of renewable natural resources is sustainable, and promoting the reduction of pollution and wasteful consumption.

This report was produced in collaboration with:

IIASA

Founded in 1972, the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) is an international research organization that conducts policy-oriented research into problems that are too large or too complex to be solved by a single country or academic discipline. IIASA is sponsored by its National Member Organizations in Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas. It is independent and completely unconstrained by political or national self-interest. www.iiasa.ac.at



IIASA's modelling team:

Michael Obersteiner, team leader; with Petr Havlik and Kentaro Aoki, Juraj Balkovic, Hannes Boettcher, Stefan Frank, Steffen Fritz, Sabine Fuss, Mykola Gusti, Mario Herrero, Nikolay Khabarov, Georg Kindermann, Florian Kraxner, Sylvain Leduc, Ian McCallum, Aline Mosnier, Erwin Schmid, Uwe Schneider, Rastislav Skalsky, Linda See and Hugo Valin.

This report makes use of the work of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) and has not undergone a full academic peer review. Views or opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily represent those of the Institute, its National Member Organizations or other organizations sponsoring the work. IIASA and its contributing authors will not be liable for damages of any kind arising from the use of this report.

Designed by Miller Design

WWF International

Avenue du Mont Blanc
1196 Gland, Switzerland
www.panda.org

ISBN 978-2-940443-32-1

Publication details

Published in December 2012 by WWF – World Wide Fund for Nature (Formerly World Wildlife Fund), Gland, Switzerland.

Any reproductions in full or in part of this publication must mention the title and credit the above-mentioned publisher as the copyright owner.

© Text and graphics: 2012 WWF

All rights reserved

The material and geographical designations in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WWF concerning the legal status of any country.

Contributors

Editor in Chief: Rod Taylor

Technical Editors: Nigel Dudley, Emmanuelle Neyroumande,

Michael Obersteiner, Sue Stolton and George White

Thanks to colleagues at WWF including: Helma Brandlmaier, Rodrigo Catalan, Kerry Cesaro, Tim Cronin, Chiaki Furosawa, Keila Hand, Mutai Hashimoto, Nina Haase, Stefan Henningson, Per Larsson, László Máthé, Margareta Renstrom, Anke Schulmeister, Mustapha Seidu, Aurélie Shapiro, Luis Silva, Simone Stambach, Gerald Steindlegger, Martha Stevenson, Julia Young.

Editorial Team: Gretchen Lyons, Barney Jeffries

With special thanks for review and contributions from:

Mario Abreu (Tetra Pak); James Griffiths (WBCSD); Anders Hildebrand (IKEA); Riikka Joukio (Metsä Group); Walter Kollert (FAO); Augusta Molnar (Rights and Resources Initiative); José Luciano Penido (Fibria); Jukka Tissari (FAO); Petri Vasara and Hannele Lehtinen (Pöyry Management Consulting).

WWF IN BRIEF

+100

WWF is in over 100 countries, on 5 continents

+5000

WWF has over 5,000 staff worldwide

+5M

WWF has over 5 million supporters



1961

WWF was founded in 1961



Why we are here
To stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature.
www.panda.org

© 1986 Panda Symbol WWF-World Wide Fund For Nature (Formerly World Wildlife Fund) ® "WWF" is a WWF Registered Trademark. WWF International, Avenue du Mont-Blanc, 1196 Gland, Switzerland — Tel. +41 22 364 9111 Fax +41 22 364 0332. For contact details and further information, please visit our international website at www.panda.org

PHOTO: © MICHEL ROGGO / WWF-CANON
COVER PHOTO: © SIMON RAWLES / WWF-CANON