

GLOBAL FOREST GOVERNANCE: PAST ACHIEVEMENTS AND NEW PROSPECTIVES

Victor K. Teplyakov
Professor of Moscow State Forest University,
Visiting Professor of Seoul National University

Department of Forest Sciences, CALS, SNU
#7201, Bld.200, San 56-1, Shillim dong, Gwanak-gu
Seoul, 152-921, South Korea
Tel.: 02-880-4760; Fax: 02-874-4706
E-mail: teplyakovv@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

On the Earth there are few natural entities of global significance: air, water and land that enjoy the axiom of spatial continuity and temporal infinity. One more substance is forest that could be linked semantically with aforementioned geographical matters: we cannot count them as “one, two, three or four”, because the quantity should be always added – one cubic meter, bucket or hectare.

Surprisingly, being common almost everywhere, forest is unique entity for each place; hence, described by many ways and accounting hundreds of definitions in acts, dictionaries, books, manuals and other sources (Lund, 2009). Complexity of forest definition is in the nature of forest as one of major global ecosystems: a habitat for many plant and animal species, a commodity and vital source for everyday life of many people, natural heritage, cultural and recreational sanctuary for human beings. Forest is important part of biosphere as a whole, because, for example, deforestation in one place could dramatically influence other ecosystems and people. Deforestation in the mountains of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, for instance, could leave without water almost all Central Asia, because major rivers’ sources of that territory are located in the these small mountainous countries (Lillis, 2008).

Trustworthy estimate suggests that 1.6 billion or 90% of the rural poor people depend on forests (“wild income”) by receiving at least a portion of their earnings or subsistence (WRI, 2005), that in many cases leads to forest overuse or illegal logging and trade of forest products (World Bank, 2006).

Past experience shows how much trouble deforestation and forest degradation brought to national economies as well as affecting not only people, but vast territories used to be inhabited by diverse wildlife and plant species. Many species became rare or even disappeared from these exhausted areas. Consequences of deforestation are soil erosion, acidification or salinization, dust storms, climate change, biodiversity loss, and others. This warning situation brought many questions to the global agenda, and international community is enforced to find solutions for these issues by introduction of forest wise use and sustainable management, forest protection and conservation, forest landscapes restoration, forest legislation and regulations and other improvements under stronger coordination at regional and global levels. Thus, there the need in global forest governance emerged (Speth & Haas, 2006; Global Governance, 2007).

Although, mentioned that forest itself does not need any governance. Forest is self-sufficient if there is no impact from accelerated demand of growing population. It is rather society needs in proper governance of its view on and demand from forests. In this respect, GFG has no sense if there is no forest related activities at national or local level that assumes many societal aspects, such as social justice, equal rights on access to forest resources and products, etc. On the other hand, it seems that GFG has no direct implications for treeless countries; although indirectly, these countries are involved because for them also global forest produce oxygen, absorb carbon dioxide, keep water flow, provide shelter for migratory wildlife species, etc. Thus, without global forest governance, national and local forest administration loose the sense of belonging to global humankind community.

1.1. Forest utilization and deforestation

At early stages of civilization development, forest was the first source of energy, food, clothes and homes; later on it was abundant for agricultural production and growing in numbers and size settlements; many nations built their economies on timber intensive use and trade.

Clearing forests for agricultural production is a main reason of deforestation at local level. For example, slash-and-burn system was widely introduced in Europe and still exists in many areas in Africa and Asia; while in Asia, land denudation and intensive irrigation for rice production began much earlier. Lately,

development as a cause of forest decline occurred everywhere in the world largely due to industrialization and urbanization (Rothen, 1998; Williams, 2006).

The Russian Empire, for example, during more than 250 years from mid 16th till end of 19th century was a source of miscellaneous products derived straight from the forest, such as timber, tar, fur, and in a roundabout way for different manufactures that required substantial amount of fuel wood and charcoal as a major source of energy. Production of potassium that was used for wool washing and softening to raise the quality (and price, of course) of final product has resulted in the deforestation on vast areas of oak and other broad-leaved forest in Russia (Teplyakov, 1992).

Only in the European Russia within less than 220 years (1696-1914), about 67 million ha of forests were completely destroyed, and forest land as a percent of total land territory of the European Russia has decreased from 52.7% in 1696 to 35.2% in 1914. The overall deforestation rate for this territory was as follows (in thousand hectares per year): 203 (during 1696-1741), 233 (1742-1762), 216 (1763-1796), 164 (1797-1861), 902 (1862-1888) and 440 (1888-1914), consequently. The area of arable lands has increased by 127 million ha from 7.9% in 1696 to 27.3% in 1888 (Tsvetkov, 1957). These figures can also be explained by the change in timber harvesting method: from 1859 onwards almost all heavily forested provinces introduced clear-cut instead of selective harvesting. Especially, it was more disastrous in private forestlands. The most harmful period occurred after the reform of 1861 that abolished serfdom in Russia (Teplyakov et.al, 1998).

Similar forests abundance and land use change occurred from England, where oak and other forests were harvested for shipbuilding and divergent manufactures to Japan, which territory was logged due to permanent wars between feudal lords (*daimyo*) demanded more and more timber to build fortifications, watchtowers, barracks, etc. From 1650 to 1749, some 18.4-24.6 million ha of forests disappeared in Europe (Williams, 2006). This rate of 215 thousand ha per year at average is similar with one in Russia of that period.

The USA forest history is similar with that of Europe including rate of deforestation and forest degradation. Clearing forestlands began in the East coast from the very beginning of European colonization of that territory and starting preservation of vast forest territories as national forests and national parks in the middle of 19th century. Although, during 20th century abundant earlier forestlands have covered with trees again, quality of secondary forests was not the same because coniferous species were replaced by the hardwoods (Foster, 1999).

In Germany, deforestation was seen harmful for game species, because people have had a great concern about hunting. Meanwhile, their worries were most of all about possible future scarcity of timber as a fuel wood and a construction material (Arnold, 1895). This concern has resulted in appearance of a new paradigm of steady wood supply or sustainable forest use, introduced in 1713 in Germany by Saxon mining officer H.C. von Carlowitz in his book "Sylvicultura Oeconomica". "Sustainability" in that context meant a safeguarding of timber raw material in terms of replenishment of wood harvested with at least the same amount to be grown in the same period of time that is resulted in sustain-yield or even flow forest management (Sustainable Forest Management, 2000; Hausler & Scherer-Lorenzen, 2002).

Civilization of mid 20th – beginning 21st century is built upon a globalization of food and commodity production, including such forest and agricultural products as timber, pulp and paper, palm oil, soybeans, and others. Recently, a new issue was brought to the agenda: the essence of biofuel production from different renewable sources. Discussion is not ended yet, but the ethics issues came up front concerning raw materials that could be used as food for people and cattle. Meanwhile, the land use change occurs for new palm oil plantations in Indonesia, cleared for soybean production in Brazil, for mining and fuel wood in Africa. A projection has shown that bio-fuel production could increase food prices up to 15% (FAO, 2008).

Agricultural production became one of major or yet the main cause of deforestation in agriculture oriented countries. In Brazil during last 30 years some 60 million hectares of forestlands have been cleared in Amazon region for timber, mining, settlement, roads and commercial agricultural businesses at a large scale. Soybean production for cattle growing is also one of the largest deforestation causes (Steinfeld H., et al., 2006; Butler, 2008). Indonesia, Malaysia, Madagascar, Congo and many other countries could give more examples attributed to modern world deforestation (FAO, 2005). Another major cause of deforestation is fuel-wood consumption. For example, fuel-wood share in total energy spent for food cooking comprises 60-100% in Africa, about 40-60% in Asia and about 40% in Central and South America (Solarcooking, 2009).

Many tropical countries are often blamed for deforestation and forest degradation; however, harvesting trees is the inevitable source of income for local communities and employment there as well as substantial national income from international trade of forest and agricultural production. Twenty years ago Sting (Gordon), the famous English rock singer and songwriter articulated this more emotionally: "If I were

a Brazilian without land or money or the means to feed my children, I would be burning the rain forest too" (Speaking of Science, 2000, p.141).

The results obtained during the research undertaken by the World Resources Institute (WRI) in cooperation with WCMC, WWF and a group of about 90 experts has shown that from initial forest area on the planet decreased by 46% of the world's average, and by 22% in North America, 30% in South America, 66% in Africa and 72% in Asia. The last "frontier" forests area comprised from 46% in South America to 0.3% in Europe with 22% for global average (Bryant, Nielsen & Tensley, 1997).

Forest, being in the past one of the most significant assets of economy, is considered in modern world also as inevitable source of global environmental services and peoples' cultural and spiritual life, and healthcare. Thus, huge reduction and degradation of forestlands that influence global environment (atmosphere, water, carbon and nutrient cycling, biodiversity, etc.) brought forest issues to the global agenda (UNCED, 1992).

1.2. Global efforts for improvement

The industrial development over last few centuries as a response to the decrease of natural resources availability to growing population has led to a consequence of geographical, scientific and technical discoveries and dramatic increase of utilizations of different substances and energy. Humankind development via harder exploitation of the Earth's resources brought numerous environmental problems initiated locally, but resulted globally. From another point of view, it is risky to see globalization in every international or cross-cultural relations starting from the beginning of modern age; otherwise the term "globalization" could cover everything and nothing.

Looking at humankind history one could see it as a sequence of progressive inventions and discoveries, which involve more natural resources and their derivatives into consumption of growing nations and economies. Stochastic development of each country through revolutions, wars, aggressions or peaceful assimilation, unification or centralization became less controlled even at regional level, taking into account also the role of neighboring countries. Local overuse of water flow, soils, forests coupled with industrial development have steadily impacted nature and created regional problems such as dust storms, soil erosion, floods or water deficiency. Regional problems soon have been reflected at global level, including problems of land desertification, biological diversity loss and global climate change. The first step to find an exit from such warning situation was the 1972 Stockholm United Nations Conference on Human Environment combined representatives of 113 states (UNEP, 2009).

In 1980, the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) jointly elaborated and presented the "World Conservation Strategy" that made visible contribution to the discussion of future of humankind and environment. That was the first nature conservation strategy proposed for the whole world linking nature conservation and development. The second one "Caring for the Earth: a Strategy for Sustainable Living" came in 1991 and underlined that world bodies both intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations could and should work through others (Holgate, 1996).

In 1983, the United Nations organization established the World Commission on Environment and Development, headed by Mrs. G.H.Brundtland. Four years later the Commission has presented a report "Our Common Future", in which the best known and easy understandable definition of sustainable development appeared as "*development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*" (Our Common Future, 1987). This could be considered as a starting point of modern global environmental, including forest, governance, while the idea of sustainability linked with nature conservation was first articulated in the goals of WCS as: "*to help advance in achievement of sustainable development through the conservation of living resources*" (WCS, 1980, p. iv).

During past decades, in response to growing threats of environmental/forest degradation, the states have elaborated, and signed many international treaties on environmental issues, agreed upon numerous instruments and systems to guide and monitor global policy developments and practical activities. Among these global treaties are: the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Convention on Biological Diversity, Convention to Combat Desertification, Forest Principles and others (UNCED, 1992). Along with diplomatic processes on forest sector concerns, many issues are raised in parallel and global discussions initiated on economic growth and development, poverty reduction, global security, tenure and human rights, law enforcement, eradication of corruption, etc. Therefore, forest sector issues made an essential impact on the theory and the practice of global governance as a whole.

The state of global forest governance shows important problems on how countries as Society build relationship with Nature, i.e. how to link demands of people with natural resources availability and

environmental capacities they depend on. Current global debate on forests utilizes a range of approaches such as human regulation of nature from both market-based and non-market points of view; a transfer from “hard” to “soft” regulatory instruments; a range of forest resources, which developed, developing and “transition” countries unequally produce, distribute and consume; a way to reach social wellbeing and to reduce unnecessary impacts on forests; an improved governance and law enforcement. Forest policies and governance should be built upon global common view on our forest treasure; include thorough analysis of past experience for inspiring look into the future, because our future depends on wise use of natural resources. Hence, forests, as a one of most important assets, should be under good governance.

2. OBJECTIVES

Major questions are: 1) Does global forest governance exist? 2) Who represents GFG? 3) What has been achieved in GFG? 4) What GFG should be further working on? Also, one of the ideas was to understand and to formulate an approach for the notion of “global forest governance” (GFG). This concept requires an analysis of different categories from wide spectrum of knowledge in political, environmental, economical, social sciences as well as international processes on forests and forest related issues.

3. BRIEF STATEMENT OF METHODS

A combination of analysis and synthesis is a major method used in this paper. Analysis is needed for structural disintegration of the forest related processes and their environment in terms of global forest governance. Synthesis strives to make a defragmentation of this vast field of concepts, terms and expressions.

Political, economical, environmental, social and cultural history and development are different from place to place and changes over time. A historical analysis method is also used to compare what was “before and after”. Since the beginning of 1990-s, there were many changes in the global political landscape, such as a breakdown of the Soviet Union that occupied 1/6 of the world’s territory and obtained almost ¼ of the global forest resources, freeing global trade, 1992 Summit in Rio de Janeiro, etc.

4. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

4.1. Descriptors of global forest governance

Globalization is a brand name appeared at the end of the last century and became central paradigm of social, economic and environmental picture of the modern world. It should be noted here that globalization is also a unification of concepts, definitions and terminology. If we cannot agree on terminology or, that is more essential at the very beginning, a concept, it is not easy to agree on associated with this philosophy matters. There is a good summary dealing with this distinction between concept, definition and terminology (Randrup et al., 2005). A concept is somewhat we have in mind and would like to express, and that could get a form of appellation, definition, term or other linguistic form; definition is what and how we try to explain our concept to other people with words and that distinguish this concept from others; a term is a word or phrase from a particular field of knowledge that became part of specialized language that used in legal, technical or other similar documents.

Sometimes, each of these notions is not easy to formulate at national level, but internationally it is even more difficult due to historical, cultural, linguistic and other problems. Thus, globalization requires “harmonization, unification, standardization, etc.” of national regulations, regimes and principles (Drezner, 2001), as, for example, UNECE Globally Harmonized System (GHS) of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (UNECE, 2009).

In general, concepts are staying as concepts for a certain time, and a term is used as “conventional definition” that, after a number of iterations aimed at its improvement, becomes more or less regular to a specific audience and then penetrates in glossaries of national and international documents, legislation, etc.

There are three words in a concept of “global forest governance” – “global”, “forest” and “governance”, and three combinations made out of them – “global forest”, “global governance” and “forest governance”. Each of these words and their combinations represent a concept, which is very complex itself, but named here as a descriptor meaning part of the whole notion “global forest governance”.

As it is mentioned above, “forest” concept has too many definitions and terms (Lund, 2009). It is worth to note that in the first global forest resources assessment of 1948 there was no definition of forest at all, because at that time, forest was quite understandable notion that did not need to be articulated (FAO,

1948). Meanwhile, there is nobody and nothing to blame, because environment, science and language, of cause, are dynamic in modern world and only underline the difficulties in approach to “global” definitions.

In FAO forest resources assessments (FRA) of 1958 and 1963 there was one definition of “forest land” with nine inclusions and five exclusions (FAO, 2006a). In FRA-1990 and 1995 assessments, the following description was used for forest: “*Land with tree crown cover (stand density) of more than about 20 percent of the area. Continuous forest with trees usually growing to more than about 7 m in height and able to produce wood. This includes both closed forest formations where trees of various storeys and undergrowth cover a high proportion of the ground, and open forest formations with a continuous grass layer in which tree synusia cover at least 10 percent of the ground*” (FAO, 1997).

Later, this definition has been expanded by recognizing that forest is an “*ecosystem with a minimum of 10 percent crown cover of trees and/or bamboos, generally associated with wild flora and fauna and natural soil conditions, and not subject to agricultural practices. The term forest is further subdivided, according to its origin, into two categories: *) Natural forests: a subset of forests composed of tree species known to be indigenous to the area. **) Plantation forests: established artificially by afforestation on lands which previously did not carry forest within living memory, or established artificially by reforestation of land which carried forest before, with replacement of the indigenous species by a new and essentially different species or genetic variety*” (FAO, 1999).

The latest version is: forest is “*land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 metres and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use*” (FAO, 2006b, p.169). This is a conventional definition because it was more or less accepted by 229 countries included into FAO FRA-2005.

A word “global” means something is on the planet Earth, around the world. It is also varies from one dictionary to another, but in general it is “*a synonym of worldwide and means of, or relating to, or involving the entire world, in the general sense or as the planet Earth*” (Oxford English Dictionary, 1989).

“Global forest” is easier to imaging – all forests in the world – than to formulate. A hidden trap is how to define type of this global forest, because each country has a set of criteria to attribute certain forest type to a group. Even within one country might be several classification systems in use depending on region, nation state or province in the country. For example, in Russia there are at least three major schemes of forest typology commonly accepted and many regional ones, like for European part of Russia or the Russian Far East (Melekhov, 1989). Meanwhile, at global level, there are only three major biomes recognized as forests: boreal or taiga forests, temperate deciduous forests and tropical rainforest (Woodward, 2003). Using other approaches (ecozones, ecoregions, geographic zones, etc.), forests could be also classified as mangrove, mountain, cloud, etc., according to their vertical dispersion from aquatic to high mountains areas (UNEP-WCMC, 2009). So, global forest is all types of forests on the globe.

In general terms, “governance” [from the Greek verb κυβερνάω – kuberna’o] means the system by which states, organizations or their associations are directed and controlled. One of the shortest notions: “*Governance is the art of steering societies and organizations*” (Plumptre & Graham, 1999, p.3). The UN definition is as follows: “*Governance - the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority in the management of a country’s affairs at all levels. Governance is a neutral concept comprising the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences*” (UNDP, 1997).

From liberal point of view, governance deals with steering and facilitating rather than directing and controlling as in authoritarian system. In this respect, it should be noted that most of democratic states have in their Constitution or Basic Law the words that somehow underline the concept that “power belongs to people (nation) and can be delegated or granted to the president or government or parliament”, etc. Governance in many instances means power, and government is nothing else as an institution empowered by the nation (people) to manage the country. “Governance” is a fundamental thing that is attributed to the power, while “management” is a job executed by the personnel hired to do it right. For corporative governance the meaning is the same. Robert Tricker distinguished this as following: “*The role of management is to run the enterprise and that of the board is to see that it is being run well and in the right direction*” (Tricker, 1998, p.8).

The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) has elaborated widely used concept of “forest governance”: “*Forest governance pertains to how decisions related to forests and forest-dependent people are made, who is responsible, how they wield their power, and how they are held accountable. It encompasses decision-making processes and institutions at local, national, regional and global level. In the context of an increasingly globalized forest sector yet also increasingly decentralized system of management, policy makers, forest managers and stakeholders face competing pressures emanating from both local and global processes*” (CIFOR, 2009)

The development of “global governance” concept was initiated, perhaps, in April 1991 when the “Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance” began forming of an international commission. A year later, in April 1992, the Commission’s co-chairs met with UN Secretary, and by September 1992, the Commission was established with twenty-eight international members, who all served in their personal capacities, independent from governments or organizations (Global Policy Forum, 2009). The Commission has defined global governance as follows: “*At global level, governance has been viewed primarily as intergovernmental relationship, but must now be understood as also involving non-governmental organizations (NGOs), citizens’ movements, multinational corporations, and the global capital market. Interacting with these are global mass media of dramatically enlarge influence*” (Speth & Haas, 2006, p.3), meanwhile, it also mentioned that “*global governance is not global government. No misunderstanding should arise from the similarity of the terms. We are not proposing movement towards a world government...*” (Commission on Global Governance, 1995).

“Global governance” in modern society is often linked with another complicated concept “globalization” that is still under the process of its defining through many confusions (Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006). According to Daniel W. Drezner, global governance, besides codified adjustments of national regulations and rules, is a set of authority relationships and arrangements to monitor, to enforce and to amend transnational rules and regulations (Drezner, 2007). He defined globalization as a group of political, economical and technological processes that help to reduce political, economical and cultural exchange barriers (Drezner, 2001). This point of view on global governance as a mean to remove barriers is shared by other scholars and practitioners (Mayers et al, 2006). One more vision is presented in the following concept: “*Global governance, as opposed to global government, means a networked approach to global problems that involves governments, business and non-governmental organisations...*” (COMECE, 2001, p.3). As mentioned above, all of these are attributed to the empowered body be it a person, or government, or anybody/anything alike.

Having all these complexities, “global forest governance” is not easy to formulate, although the concept or notion might be as: “*Global forest governance is a network of decision-making and decision-taking procedures, institutions and legal commitments that includes world-wide political, economical, socio-cultural, technological and historical processes associated with relationship between forests and people, in which governments, civil society and businesses work together at all levels to meet requirements of modern humanity without jeopardizing the well-being and sustainability of environmental conditions for future generations*”.

Thus, “global forest governance” is an institution dedicated to conducting global forest sector affairs. From this point of view, the governance could be structural (direct) with use of different institutions (political, economical or social) or non-structural (indirect) with use of activities induced discursively.

4.2. The GFG institutions and actors

Global forest governance is neutral, although it is executed mainly by governments or intergovernmental organizations (IGO); thus, direct governance is credited as a rule to bureaucratic management because the result are beneficial first of all to the nation states. As well, direct governance is relevant to international bodies regulating global events with global-level instruments, such as Global Environmental Facility (GEF), World Trade Organization (WTO), or Kyoto Protocol. This is also a case of many well known international conventions, treaties and protocols.

Global forest governance as any managerial activities could be seen from different points of view, for example, through “technical” and “societal” aspects. “Technical” aspect is dealing with forest as a terrestrial ecosystem described by certain quantitative and qualitative characteristics, while “societal” aspect is mostly ascribed to cross-cultural relations and people’s perception towards forests.

Meanwhile, in some cases it is difficult to distinguish between these two standpoints. For instance, the beginning of global forest governance could be attributed to the establishing in 1892 of International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO) as a mean for creation of universal forest terminology suitable for international communications on forest theory and practice, exchange of information and knowledge (IUFRO, 2009). Now IUFRO is among leading forest associations and a member of International Council for Science (ICSU) and Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) – global forest institution that was launched in 2001 and includes 14 organizations (CPF, 2009), which are also players in the field of GFG.

Another CPF member is the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) established in 1945. FAO could be seen as a central UN body dealing with forest issues including a number of activities such as World Forest Congresses, Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF), Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF), UN Forum on Forests (UNFF), Global Forest Information System (GFIS) in cooperation with other

institutions, *Unasylver* publishing, etc. Furthermore, having six Regional Commissions operating in Asia-Pacific, Africa, Latin America, North America, Europe and Near East, FAO decentralizes its activities at global level, but pays more attention to concentration and coordination of activities at regional or sub-regional levels. The Commissions consider policy and technical issues playing key role in the international arrangement on forests, serving as a link between global dialogue at the Committee on Forestry (COFO), the UNFF and national implementation (FAO, 2009a). There are many other prominent institutions working on forest issues listed above and will be named below in this paper.

The World Summit in Rio-de-Janeiro (1992) became a turning point in the systematic approach to the peoples', countries' and states' concerns towards global environment, of which forests are essential part. Rio Declaration, especially sections on resources, economics and research, Agenda 21, especially Part 2 on resources including Chapter 11 on combating deforestation, global conventions on biodiversity and climate change, and a document on forest principles accepted at the Summit became a consolidated response to global challenges and created a basis for coordination of global efforts in forest biodiversity conservation, carbon deposition in forests, forest rehabilitation, restoration and afforestation, and other forest processes that creating a basis to somewhat could be named as global forest governance (UN, 1992).

Forests and their significance for the World's sustainable development were considered among major topics. Meanwhile, polarization in discussion and decisions resulted in desire to have a legally binding document as Forest Convention (several developed countries) while most developing countries were opposite. So, "Non-legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests," better known under a brief title "Forest Principles" was adopted (IISD, 2009).

Following the decision of Rio-1992, the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (UN CSD) at its 3d session has established the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF). During 1995-1997, the IPF continued intergovernmental deliberations on forests. The IPF worked on the implementation of the UN CSD forest-related decisions at the national and international levels, international cooperation in financial assistance and technology transfer, research, forest assessment and criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, trade and environment in relation to forest products and services, international organizations and multilateral institutions and instruments, including legal mechanisms (UN, 2009).

The Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) had only four meetings from October 1997 to January 2000, but within its existence of only 28 months it has produced about 120 proposals for action on implementation and monitoring progress of the IPF's proposals for action, forest conservation and protected areas, underlying causes of deforestation, valuation of forest goods and services, future supply of and demand for timber and NTFPs, forest research, financial resources and the transfer of environmentally sound technologies, traditional forest-related knowledge and others. The IFF has proposed to continue the work on the legally binding document by a creation of a United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and to invite respective international and UN organizations to participate in a Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), which was established in April 2001 (IISD, 2009).

The UNFF activities began in 2000. One of the major achievements is a "Non-legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests" was adopted on April 28, 2007 at UNFF Seventh Session, and the High-Level Special Event on the UNGASS adopted it on December 17, 2007. So, it took 15 years from UNCED to negotiate and finalize the "non-legally binding" document as a global instrument (UN, 2007).¹ The purpose of this instrument is a) to strengthen political commitment and action at all levels to implement effectively sustainable management of all types of forests and to achieve the shared global objectives on forests; b) to enhance the contribution of forests to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), in particular with respect to poverty eradication and environmental sustainability; and c) to provide a framework for national action and international cooperation (UN, 2009).

Comparatively with direct governance, indirect one is less formalized. Through effective domestic policies and practice, it tries to moderate regional and local drawbacks that originated globally. Indirect governance is not so visible, although it creates pressures on different institutions via adaptation of education system to modern challenges and needs, financial pressures in domestic timber processing by introduction of higher export tax on logs, like it was made by Russian government (EU, 2007), etc. These issues can be illustrated by many cases from the history. For example, in 14th century English kings in addition to direct parliamentary taxation have been working on the increase of their control over indirect duty paid for import/export operations with such goods as wool, wool fells, wine, and others. This activity increased

¹ To compare: 13 years passed between the adoption of the Convention on Climate Change and the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol after its ratification by the Russian Federation in 2005.

revenue generation from £12,000 in 1330s to £110,000 in 1440s, although it collapsed later in that century (Thackerey & Findling, 2006). Similar decline or temporal withdrawn of such measure occurred in Russia at the face of global crisis (Smolenskaya, 2008).

Indirect governance is also a question of direct or indirect democracy (Teplyakov et al., 2000, Konisky & Beierle, 2001). This is mostly attributed to the civil society involvement in and influence on decision making processes. The first non-state actors' participation in a parallel to intergovernmental negotiations was organized in 1972 at UNCHE, where about 200 NGOs participated, while in 1992 UNCED over 1,400 were counted.

International non-governmental organizations (INGO) became an active part of global governance recognized as transnational power (UNCED, 1992). During 1990-2000 a number and membership in INGO significantly increased. For instance, in 1990 there were 148,501 permanent members in 31,246 INGOs², and in 2000, consequently, 255,432 in 37,281 INGOs. Major part of INGOs are in economic development and infrastructure (9,614 in 2000), research (8,467), social services (4,215), law, policy and advocacy (3,864), while in environment only 1,170 organizations (Civil Society Yearbook, 2001). Meanwhile, later on the number of NGOs grew very fast at national level that have outcome in increasing at international level. According to a research of Internal Revenue Service (IRS) data for 26,000 environmental and conservation organizations in the United States – 8,000 of which had revenues of \$25,000 or more during 1995-2007 – the number of environmental and conservation organizations registered with the IRS increased annually by 4.6%, which shows faster increase than the total number of registered nonprofit organizations (about 2.8% per year) during the same period or time (Straughan & Pollak, 2008).

In early stages, the main focus of INGOs was governments, while now they concentrate on the activities of transnational companies and other organizations and structures that establish benefiting to them rules in neo-liberal vector of globalization, such as International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organizations, summits of economical and political elites: G8, European Economic Summit, World Economic Forum in Davos, etc. (Global Governance, 2007). It was recognized that the NGO participation became more structural and constructive, and they became an important and influential participant in international negotiation process. David Humphreys, for example, noted in his overview that “*on the forests issue NGOs have had considerable success over the long term in challenging mainstream discourse and in shifting the ideological terrain of negotiations*” (Humphreys, 2004, p.71).

The situation is dynamically changing with private sector involvement as well. Since multinational corporations as representatives of business community have participated in UNCED for the first time, governments with civil society and private sector have been steadily developing so-called “tripartite approach”. Tripartite approach is a process about access to the same set of information, finding common ground, delivering concerns of civil society and private sector to the negotiation table (Saint-Laurent, 2007). Meanwhile, “*it is too early in the game to say how any ‘tripartite process’ will play out. Early signs show that by bringing together state, civil society, and industry actors, new local partnerships form with a voice and influence greater than the sum of their parts*” (Maginnis & Broekhoven, 2006, p.15).

Similar process in forest issues discussion, known as the multi-stakeholder dialogue consultations (MSD), is organized at UNFF meetings, where representatives of different national and international NGOs, academia and private sector could deliver their concerns about global forest policy making and other forest related issues (UNFF, 2009b). Meanwhile, “*in general, while delegates appreciated the organization of the Dialogue, there was disappointment that there was little actual discussion and that it had revolved around panel presentations and statements from delegations*” (UNFF-3, 2003). This supports an opinion of Peter Haas, who argued the effectiveness of the UN environmental treaties and conferences, and who pointed out that goals are ambiguous, while the records are mixed, ability to monitor the progress is weak and incomplete, difficulties exist in verifying the state compliance, etc. (Haas, 2002).

4.3. Major achievements in global forest affairs

Over last few decades the global forest sector faced a number of challenges: public concerns on forest resources availability, forestlands tenure rights, equal access to forest resources and services, increasing rate of deforestation, lost of forest biodiversity, forest issues and climate change, illegal logging and poverty reduction, etc. Global consumption of timber and forest products created a problem of resources availability in different parts of the world, especially in forest deficient territories. These all resulted in global forest cover decline, but not evenly and not everywhere.

² To compare: in 1909 there were only 176 NGOs active at international level (International organizations by year and by type: 1909-1996. In: Yearbook of International Organizations 1996/97. Union of International Associations)

The UN FAO data on annual net change in forest cover by region during 1990-2005 shows that global entire net loss of forest area was 8.9 million ha/year during the period 1990-2000 and 7.3 million ha/year during the period 2000-2005. European forests perform well, because their area is increasing within last 15 years with about 0.7-0.8 million ha/year; in Asia the trend has changed from negative (about 0.8 million ha/year) in 1990-2000 to positive (about 1 million ha/year) in 2000-2005; while in North and Central America, in Oceania – the negative trend is on place over these years (less about 0.4 million ha/year). The most significant forest area change occurred in South America and Africa – about 4 million ha/year with shift in higher deforestation rate from Africa to South America. The overall rate for the World is lowering, but still very high (FAO, 2006b). The trend of forestlands increase in Europe (1990-2005) could also be a result of changing forest values in Europe (Angelstam et al, 2005), including sharp reduction of timber harvesting here and increased timber import from other continents, moving wood processing facilities closer to timber producing countries, etc. In Asia (2000-2005) it is wide scale forest planting, and also could be a result of logging ban in China since 1998 (Forests out of Bounds, 2001).

The decline of annual deforestation could be a result of introduction by many countries of a set of different regulatory instruments to help forest governance, such as National Forest Programme (NFP) (FAO, 2006c), National Forest Action Plan (NFAP) and its predecessor – Tropical Forest Action Plans (TFAP) (Park, 1992), modified versions such as NAP on Biodiversity, NAP on climate change, NAP to combat illegal logging, etc., National Forest Monitoring and Assessment (NFMA) (FAO, 2009b), Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) (SFMN, 2009), Criteria and Indicators (C&I) (IUFRO, 2001), forest certification, and other instruments dealing with forest use, protection, conservation and expansion (Unasylva, 1996).

Forest diversity, regional economic situation, political preferences, maturity of civil society and readiness of private sector and other factors comprise a diversity of regulatory instruments to support SFM and development. For instance, such specific instrument as C&I includes nine processes and initiatives that interlinked and have common basis.

There are about 150 countries joined these processes, in which from 7 to 55 countries and their unions are members (FAO, 2001). It should be mentioned that many countries participate in more than one process. For example, China is a member of ITTO and Montreal processes and Dry Forests Asia initiative; the Russian Federation is a member of Helsinki and Montreal processes; South Korea is a member of ITTO and Montreal processes; in the African Timber Organization (ATO) Process there are 9 countries, which also belong to ITTO producing member countries as well as 3 countries belonging to Dry-Zone African Process. Such participation in a few processes gives an opportunity to share the country's concerns, knowledge and experience in wider consultation course and try to find a globally harmonized or, at least, commonly accepted vision on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management.

To find a common denominator and to strengthen coordination among C&I processes, different conferences, seminars and workshops are organized cooperatively by the interested intergovernmental and international organizations, such as the UN FAO, ITTO, MCPFE, the UNECE, the Montreal Process and others (FAO, 2003, MCPFE, 2006).

C&I are used for a development of national and regional forest strategies and programs and to assess their achievements; for further research and adjustment at lower level of implementation; for forest certification and audit that is essential in modern international timber trade; for making different reports, including international ones to compare country's progress towards SFM and use. Meanwhile, C&I processes are under a pressure of the willpower of a government to use them as a tool in common practice, and, what is more important, the governments use C&I to evaluate their own forest management effectiveness. In some cases, like in Russia, it is very difficult to aggregate data for its huge territory or to fit a few geographical zones under one indicator. There is little local people and companies involvement in C&I development and use; the indicators do not require specific goals to be achieved, i.e. in figures and numbers; and etc. To clarify these discrepancies, the UN FAO underlined that "*criteria and indicators provide a means to measure, assess, monitor and demonstrate progress towards achieving the sustainability of forests in a given country or in a specified forest area, over a period of time. On the other hand certification is a means to certify the achievement of certain, pre-defined standards of forest management in a given forest area, at a given point in time, agreed upon between producers and consumers*" (FAO, 2000).

Forest certification is another valuable instrument to measure and to monitor a sustainability of forest management. Currently, under the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification schemes (PEFC), which is a membership of 35 independent national forest certification systems, about 223 million ha of forestlands are certified and 4,930 PEFC chain-of-custody (CoC) certificates issued in 45 countries. The PEFC scheme also includes national and regional systems under other names, such as Canada Standard Association (CSA, 82.2 million ha), North American Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI, 37.0 million ha in Canada and 32.4 million ha in the USA) and American Tree Farm System (ATFS, 10.0 million ha in the

USA) (PEFC, 2009). The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has developed a set of standards for environmental management that is in many cases overlapping with other certification schemes (ISO, 2009). Some 109.3 million ha of forests are certified, and 12.3 thousands chain-of-custody (CoC) Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certificates are issued in 81 countries (FSC, 2009). It is worthy to note that the first historical evidence of wood products labeling with a mark of quality can be found in French royal decree of 1637, which fixed that cabinet makers as members of the guild should mark the furniture they made (Pradere 1989, cited from: Elliott & Schlaepfer, 2001).

Market driven economy has brought careless use of forest resources: in many developing countries and countries with economy in transition illegal logging and illegal timber trade dramatically grew up over last decade. The underlying courses of this issue are known, described and evaluated (World Bank, 2006). Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) ministerial processes have been launched in Asia (2001), Africa (2003) and Europe and North Asia (2005) to combat illegal logging and timber trade. Discussions on this issue brought together representatives from governments, private sector and civil society. Such tripartite approach is found timely and effective (Teplyakov et al, 2005). From practical point of view, bilateral FLEG(T) Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) initiated in 2008 is useful instrument of governments to reduce illegal logging and timber trade (VPA, 2008). Other initiatives of global significance emerged recently and received a new sound support from governments and people are Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) that grew up into a FLR collaborative partnership (IUCN, 2005; UNEP-WCMC, 2006), and Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) as a joint effort of UNDP, UNEP and FAO (UN-REDD Programme, 2008). In many instances, goals, priorities, programs, public participation in forest governance are in hands of nation states and their forest administration bodies.

Hence, during last decades, forests received certain attention at all levels of decision making. Civil society at global level could raise the voice at different international fora, although, major work is done at local level through participatory process in forest management decision making, mostly via creating a pressure on authorities or corporations. In this case, only a few countries can show a document that regulates adoption of public opinion in forest governance or forest management decision making. Many “consultative” bodies are doing a great job, but it does not bring significant change into forest governance due to highly authoritarian behavior of forest administrations.

4.4. Trends and needs

New perspectives in global forest governance depend on a number of uncertainties or not clearly defined issues. Major work should be done on clarification of current positions at global level with more concentration on national and local concerns. Among priority issues might be:

- *Further development of concept and theoretical approaches dealing with global forest governance.* Although some work was done by academicians, researchers and learning groups, the actual implications at decision-making level is low (Kaimowitz, 2003). The governments, civil society, including various NGOs, private sector, donor community, aboriginal people, etc. are not well informed and involved in this discourse (Mayers et al, 2006).
- *Definition of good forest governance.* Although, major characteristics of good governance are discussed and accepted by most of interested groups the problem is still in implementation of its approaches at country and local level (CBNRMNet, 2002).
- *Elaboration of legal instruments to violators of international regimes on forests,* because “few international treaties contain strong sanctions or compliance mechanisms” (Speth & Haas, 2006, p.129-130).
- *Social justice, accountability and equity in forest related activities.* The warning situation in global forest governance is relevant to its national peculiarities: when state government loses ability in proper management of forest sector concentrating more on political arrangements including negotiation process at national and international level and pressing economic benefits to bigger companies. In this case, one of the tools to enhance social justice is independent forest monitoring (Young, 2005; Kazoora & Karvalho, 2005).
- *Further elaboration on decentralization of forest governance at national level.* This is mainly an issue for low-value forests that are still play a vital role to hundreds of millions of people in developing countries. This also gives an opportunity for local forest dwellers to participate in forest governance (Agrawal, Chhatre & Hardin, 2008). From another point of view there is a significant role of the nation state in forest administration, especially in countries with federal system of

governance (Gregersen et al, 2004), where decentralization of forest governance also requires liberalization of economic relations in forest sector because it involves federal government, provincial governments and private sector (Petrov, 2007).

- *Removing double standards from forest governance.* The FLEG issues have shown that punishment is applied to a man with chain-saw, while big man with thick purse is usually outside of the deal (Global Witness, 2005).
- *Tripartite approach or multi-stakeholder dialogue in forest governance.* It helps to further promotion of holistic approach to forests and people relationship with emphasis on collaborative efforts is needed because creating forest policy networks empower civil society and business and establish better coordination of divergent interests (Saint-Laurent, 2007).
- *Elaboration of good forest governance guidelines.* Such guidelines could be a powerful medium to promote democracy, law imperative, higher transparency, respect to civil society concerns, institutional capacity building, reduce corruption and increase overall performance of forest governance. Also, this should be also linked with interests of donors, charities, trust funds and other benefactors (Slutsky & Wheeler, 2007).
- *Better statistics from countries to be delivered to global level and disclosed to public.* This is also concerning forest degradation and rehabilitation (FAO, 2006a). Forest degradation is more visible due to deforestation and less obvious due to unseen decrease of species composition, biological diversity and richness, size, volume and quality of trees left after selective harvesting, decline of income of forest-dependent people and communities, etc.

And last but not least issue - *careful selection of new initiatives at global level.* It is not too difficult to find new attractive initiatives for global forest sector and, as well, it is rather problematic to foresee what they really can bring to change the situation. The need itself is also questionable due to uncertain yet visualization of real progress in previous initiatives due to short period to observe their effectiveness comparatively with much longer time of forest growing. To simplify, proper implementation, for example, well developed and scientifically proven in many countries sustainable forest management principles can resolve many problems in practice, if national forest policies are strictly followed them. Anyhow, if new initiatives are of need, they should be introduced thoroughly.

CONCLUSIONS

Modern global forest governance is a very complicated concept. It deals with overarching global challenges, with an extent and in some places an extinction of forest resources, with productive, social, economic, environmental functions of forests, with human wellbeing interconnected with forest vitality and divergent frameworks (legal, political, institutional, etc.).

During last three decades some changes are seen in global forest governance. First of all, the concept itself has appeared and was not rejected, while better articulation is needed. Major actors at global level are still the same: the United Nations Organization and its bodies responsible for certain affairs (FAO, UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, etc.). Creation of the World Trade Organization has brought new perspectives in forest sector due to enhancing global trade procedures and relationships as well as multi-national corporations. Under a pressure of forest certification, transnational corporations working in forest sector began introducing sustainable forest management in their practice and working as more socially responsible business. Global civil society still does not exist, but the voice of people at all levels became louder, more constructive and better heard including various international meetings. Perhaps, FSC is the only market driven instrument or monitoring system on SFM elaborated from bottom up by civil society, while many other good initiatives without state support were not implemented; sometimes, having negative attitude from forest authorities they were not even considered intentionally.

Although, all these achievements have brought a certain order to global forest sector via improvement a set of instruments in forest legislation, administration and management, timber inventory, operation and trade, forest biodiversity conservation, protection and maintenance, local people are still unsatisfied. Forest dwellers want to get more power to manage their forestlands and resources, to have equal distribution of benefits derived from forests by big companies, to follow their traditional way of forest use, etc. Any catastrophic event induced by unwise human activities is boomeranging future generations, but often it hits the present one. People want to see real changes in their everyday life.

With problems deepening, the reaction now should be quicker and more efficient comparatively with previous times.

REFERENCES

Send a message to the author