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Image of failure...

- **Crisis** of global forest governance (Humphreys, 2006)
- **Non**-regime (Dimitrov, 2005, 2007)
- **(Non-)**governance (Pülzl, 2009)
- 13 mn / ha / yr
Non-Legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of all Types of Forests

Preamble

a. The subject of environmental protection and development, socio-economic and cultural development requires economic, financial, technical, institutional, political and human resources, as well as the allocation of appropriate resources to achieve the sustainable development of all types of forests.
b. The guiding principle of sustainable development is to ensure the right to the use of natural resources, the right to the development of communities, and the maintenance of their cultural and social identity.

c. This statement recognizes the importance of forests in providing ecological services, economic benefits, cultural and spiritual values, and the need for their sustainable management and conservation.

d. The objective of this statement is to promote the development of a global consensus on the principles and practices of sustainable forest management and conservation, as well as the recognition and value of forests for all people.

Signed:
[Signatures of representatives from various countries and organizations]
No LBI on Forests
Critique

- Methodology
- Theory
- Empirics
Methodology
Effectiveness
1. Output
2. Outcome
3. Impact
Underdal, Dunn

impacts
Cons ‘impact thinking’

1. Relative improvements?
2. Time lag
3. Intervening factors
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Multi-Criteria Analysis
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Theory
Do we need a LBI?
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From ‘lack of net aggregate impacts’ to ‘multiple practices of policy performance’
Empirics
Multiple practices of policy performance

1. Forest discourses
2. Forest governance
3. Forest protection
4. Forest certification
5. Forest transitions
Multiple practices of policy performance

1. Forest discourses ➔ ‘words matter’
2. Forest governance ➔ MCA
3. Forest protection ➔ outcome
4. Forest certification ➔ outcome
5. Forest transitions ➔ impact
Figure 2: Intensity of Forest discourses from 1960 to 2005
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Forests, discourses, institutions
A discursive-institutional analysis of global forest governance

Bas Arts *, Marleen Buizer 1
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Forest governance: CBFM

[Diagram showing forest governance in South America, with categories for public administration (1990 and 2005), private corporations and institutions (1990 and 2005), and communities (1990 and 2005).]
Figure 1: Pattern of handing over of community forests

- Dashed line: No. of CFUG (00)
- Solid line: Area Handed over (000ha)
Seeing the wood for the trees: an assessment of the impact of participatory forest management on forest condition in Tanzania

Tom Blomley, Kerstin Pflieghner, Jacomnia Isango, Eliakimu Zahabu
Antje Ahrends and Neil Burgess

Increase protected areas (100% in 25 yrs)

Growth in Nationally Designated Protected Areas (1872 - 2006)*

*Excludes 43,588 sites with no year of establishment.

Source: World Database on Protected Areas (WCPA), produced by UNEP-WCMC, World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) and the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, 31st January 2007.
Forests designated for conservation of biological diversity, 1990–2010 (million ha)

- Africa
- Asia
- Europe
- North and Central America
- Oceania
- South America

Comparison across years:
- 1990
- 2000
- 2010
FSC certified forest area growth

Source: FSC International 19/12/07
About 7.5% of the world’s forests

About 25% of global timber trade

> 300 mn. ha.
2000s:
- 13 mn / ha / yr.
- 2000s: 13 mn / ha / yr.
- 1990s: 16 mn / ha / yr.
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- Some positive trends in forest discourses, governance, protection, certification and transition
- Beyond
  - theoretical and methodological ‘monism’
  - ‘simple’ empirical aggregation
  - political ‘defeatism’