

GLOBAL FOREST GOAL 2 AND ITS TARGETS 2.1 AND 2.3: SOME ISSUES

Mahendra Joshi
15 November 2018

Outline

1. Introduction

- GFG2
- Target 2.1:
- Target 2.3:

2. Conceptual and data issues

3. Further actions to be considered

Global Forest Goal 2 (GFG2)

- ▣ **GFG2:** Enhance forest-based economic, social and environmental benefits, including by improving the livelihoods of *forest-dependent people*.
 - **Target 2.1:** Extreme poverty for all forest-dependent people is eradicated.
 - **Target 2.3:** The contribution of forests and trees to food security is significantly increased.
- ▣ We all know forests and trees provide a wide range of goods and services to society. However, the nature of linkage between forests and poverty is complex.

Target 2.1 issues

- ▣ Forest-dependent people (FDP)
 - Who are they
 - Where to find data
- ▣ Extreme poverty
 - What does it mean
 - How is it measured
 - Where to find data

Forest-dependent people

- Broadly two types of literature
 - INGOs/IP Groups: focusing on developing countries, indigenous people, customary rights, rural and small farmers issues
 - Forest industry related: mostly dealing with timber- or resource-dependency, timber-dependent communities, company towns, jobs, incomes, economic growth opportunities, community development, local government revenue, public services (e.g., schools). Several academic research in Canada and the US.

Who are forest dependent people (FDP)?

- Interesting literature: Newton et al. 2016; Chao 2012; SOFO 2014; Stedman 2004; Norton, et al. 2003; Marchak 1990; Kusel and Fortmann 1991; etc.
- Several meaning, no clear definition
 - **Indigenous People**
 - **Forest People**
 - **Forest-dwelling population**
 - **Rural People, living in or at the margins of forests**
 - **Small farmers who grow farm trees or manage remnant forests for subsistence and income**
 - **Owners and workers in forest-based enterprises, whose livelihoods are dependent on supply of forest goods and services**
 - **Downstream beneficiaries, including urban population**
- Indicator used in timber-dependency studies: in US - proportion of employment in timber-based industries. Areas (counties) that had high levels of forest-based employment are characterized as timber dependent.

Data on FDP

- ❑ Wild guess or authentic data?
- ❑ **WB 1991**: 500 million, perhaps the earliest estimate (policy paper)
- ❑ DFID study by Calibre Consultants and SSC , U of Reading (2000):
 - ... *there are currently no reliable regional or global sources of data on FDP.*
 - Not much has changed in this regards after almost 2 decades
- ❑ Examples from **Chao's 2012 report** – national and global figures
 - WCFSD 1997: 350 million
 - WB 2002: 1,600 million, rural people
 - WB 2003: 240 million people in forested ecosystems

 - Chao 2012 estimate: 1,229 million – 1,420 million. The estimate is based on estimates from various sources for over 91 countries.
- ❑ **FAO 2014** optimistic estimates: 1,250 million (SOFO 2014 Box 1)

Examples of data on FDP

- Chao's compilation (2012) of estimated country data on "Forest People" vary widely. Thus, such data are hardly reliable or usable as a basis.

Country	Forest people
Ecuador	150,000 – 450,000
Bolivia	500,000 – 3,326,000
Philippines	25,000,000 – 30,000,000
Indonesia	80,000,000 – 95,000,000
Thailand	20,000,000 – 25,000,000
Nigeria	71,576,000 – 110,896,000
South Africa	9,000,000 – 12,000,000

Poverty and forests

- ❑ Poverty is commonly defined based on income or consumption.
- ❑ However, poverty is a multi-dimensional concept. WB describes poverty as the pronounced deprivation of well-being related to lack of material income or consumption, low level of education and health, vulnerability and exposure to risk, voicelessness, and powerlessness (WDR 2001).
- ❑ Extreme poverty: \$1.90/day at 2011 PPP (purchasing power parity).
- ❑ Forests role on addressing poverty issues mainly in three ways:
 - subsistence
 - safety nets
 - pathways to prosperity or pathways out of poverty to the poor
- ❑ Opposing view - Forests breed poverty!

Data on poverty

- **Methodologies on poverty data**
 - Survey of households (not actual census)
 - Poverty data is always an estimate not actual head count
 - Big question is – how to get data on number of FDP in extreme poverty? FDP is not well defined thus even if data on general extreme poverty for a country exist, there may not be disaggregated data for FDP

- **Examples of data generation on poverty/income**
 - **Ireland:** Central Statistics Office (CSO) conducts annual Survey on HH Income and Living Conditions (SILC). SILC is a part of an EU-wide program.
 - **Philippines:** the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) derives data on national income and poverty from Family Income and Expenditure Surveys and Labor Force Surveys, every 3 years
 - **USA:** Census Bureau (CB) estimates poverty rates based upon data from several different surveys with sample size ranging from apprx. 50,000 to 3.5 mil.
 - **World Bank 2018 estimate:** data from more than 1500 HH surveys across 164 economies plus over 2 mil. randomly sampled households (PovcalNet)

- Surveys in most developing countries are not done annually

Target 2.3: Forests and food security

- Food Security = all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active healthy life (World Food Summit 1996).
- Forests contribute to livelihoods and food security in many ways, directly and indirectly:
 - Directly: food, fruits, medicinal plants, bush meat, fish, drinking water
 - Indirectly: soil fertility, soil and water conservation, pollination, etc.
- *Target 2.3– contribution of forests ... to food security... increased*
- It is unclear what kinds of data are needed. Will it be sufficient to provide data on how much (volume or weight) of wood and non-wood forest products, and eco-system services were produced and supplied to the society?

Some issues to consider

1. Not much value in trying to gather data on FDP based on unreliable and scattered guestimates
2. Therefore, the forestry agencies may need to coordinate with national institutions responsible for economy, law, census, statistics to:
 - i. Define FDP
 - ii. Conduct household surveys of FDP in systematic and periodic manner
 - iii. Report to UNFF and other IGOs
3. Implications:
 - i. Time and resources
 - ii. Capacity
 - iii. Added reporting burden on countries
 - iv. These implications apply mostly to developing countries
4. Forests & Food Security: need some specificity in indicators



Thank you

Some interesting literature

- Beckley, T., J. Parkins, and R. Stedman. 2002. Indicators of forest-dependent community sustainability: The evolution of research. *The Forestry Chronicle*. Vol. 78, No. 5.
- Chao, S. 2012. **Forest people: Numbers across the world.**
http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/default/files/publication/2012/05/forest-peoples-numbers-across-world-final_0.pdf
- FAO. 2018. The state of the world's forests: Forest pathways to sustainable development.
- FAO. 2016. The state of the world's forests 2016. Forests and agriculture: Land-use challenges and opportunities (<http://www.fao.org/publications/sofo/2016/en/>)
- FAO. 2014. The state of the world's forests: Enhancing the socioeconomic benefits from forests.
<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3710e.pdf>
- HLPE. 2017. Sustainable forestry for food security and nutrition. A report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security, Rome. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7395e.pdf>
- Kusel, J. and L. Fortmann 1991. Well-being in forest-dependent communities. Part 1: A new approach. Center for Water and Wildland Resources, University of California Davis.
- Nadeau, S., B. Shindler and C. Kakoyannis. 1999. Forest communities: New frameworks for assessing sustainability. *The Forestry Chronicle*. Vol. 75, No. 5.
- Newton, P., D.C. Miller, M.A.A. Byenkya and A. Agrawal. 2016. Who are forest-dependent people? A taxonomy to aid livelihood and land use decision-making in forested regions. *Land Use Policy* Vol. 57 (388-395).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.05.032>.
- Norton, J.F, G.R. Howze and L. J. Robinson. Regional comparison of timber dependency: The Northwest and Southeast. *Southern Rural Sociology*. Vol. 19, No. 2.
- Stedman, R. 1999. Sense of place as an indicator of community sustainability. *The Forestry Chronicle*. Vol. 75, No. 5.
- Stedman, R., et al. 2004. Resource dependence and community well-being in rural Canada. *Rural Sociology* 69(2).
- **World Bank Website - PovcalNet: an online analysis tool for global poverty monitoring.**
<http://iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/home.aspx>