



The Forests Dialogue

ENGAGE! EXPLORE! CHANGE!

Field Dialogue on Tree Plantations in the Landscape (TPL) in Chile

31 May – 3 June 2016 | Temuco, Chile

Compilation of Stakeholder Opinions on the Definition of Forest and Tree Plantations, and Associated Data and Reporting Issues

For more information on the TFD Chile TPL Field Dialogue: <http://theforestdialogue.org/dialogue/field-dialogue-tree-plantations-landscape-tpl-chile>

INTRODUCTION

Tree plantations currently provide a more than a third of the world's industrial wood, a proportion expected to increase significantly in coming decades. They also have great potential to deliver environmental services and social benefits. However, many aspects of tree plantations have been and remain controversial, with concerns that associated environmental and social costs often outweigh economic and other benefits. From May 31-June 3, 2016, with support of the FAO, The Forests Dialogue organized a four-day multi-stakeholder expert consultation on the topic of Tree Plantations in the Landscape (TPL). The dialogue brought together more than 67 participants (Annex 1) representing civil society organizations, local communities, local government agencies, indigenous peoples, forestry companies, workers' associations, NGOs and research organizations. Co-convened with the Chilean Forest Dialogue (DFN in Spanish), the field dialogue was supported by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). It was co-chaired by Cecilia Alcoreza (WWF Chile), Alicia Díaz (International Labour Organization), Ivone Namikawa (Klabin), and Maurício Talebi (Universidade Federal da Universidade de São Paulo).

TFD's Tree Plantations in the Landscape (TPL) Initiative explores the evolving state of issues related to tree plantations and planted forests within the larger landscape context through engaging key stakeholder groups at the international, national, and local levels. The TPL Initiative builds upon TFD's previous Intensively Managed Planted Forests (IMPF) Initiative, conducted from 2005-2008. The Chile Dialogue is the first in a series of field dialogues that apply the learnings from an initial Scoping Dialogue - held in September 2015 in Durban, South Africa - to particular geographic

TFD STEERING COMMITTEE 2016

Lennart Ackzell
Federation of Swedish Family Forest Owners - Sweden

Jennifer Baarn
SAGCOT - Tanzania

Chris Brown
OLAM - United Kingdom

Chris Buss, TFD Co-Leader
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) - Switzerland

Joji Cariño
Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) - United Kingdom

Amity Doolittle
Yale University - United States

Gary Dunning
The Forests Dialogue (TFD) - United States

Chris Knight
PricewaterhouseCoopers - United Kingdom

Werner Kornel
Profors - World Bank - United States

Skip Krasny, TFD Co-Leader
Kimberly-Clark - United States

Victor Lopez
Ut'z Che' - Guatemala

Antti Marjokorpi
Stora Enso - Finland

Chris Meyer
Environmental Defense Fund - United States

Eva Muller
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) - Italy

Ivone Namikawa
Klabin - Brazil

Cécile Ndjebet
African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests (REFACOF) - Cameroon

Isilda Nhandumbo
International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) - United Kingdom

Milagre Nuvunga
MICAlA Foundation - Mozambique

Miriam Prochnow
Apremavi - Brazil

Matthew Reddy
World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) - Switzerland

Augusto Robert
CMPC - Chile

Tint Lwin Thuang
The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) - Thailand

contexts. It addressed the following key priority topic areas identified during the TPL Initiative Scoping Dialogue within the Chilean context:

- ➔ Plantation forests in the context of the global development agenda and megatrends, and in the contexts of development at multiple scales, from global to local.
- ➔ The design and implementation of plantation forests in the context of a landscape approach, and at different scales and geographies.
- ➔ Approaches to enable good governance and inclusive development.
- ➔ Identifying key externalities associated with the development and management of plantation forests, from the perspectives of multiple stakeholders; identifying gaps in knowledge; and considering the net impacts and externalities of plantation forestry as key decision criteria.
- ➔ The diversification of the forms and species composition of plantation forests, the sustainability of plantation forestry systems, and access to and use of new technologies.

Building upon the learnings and suggestions from the Durban Scoping Dialogue, the TPL Field Dialogue in Chile had the following objectives:

- ➔ Incorporate experiences from Chile in the international arena to add to discussions on key themes, such as landscapes, land use, local development and impact mitigation.
- ➔ Understand a participatory methodology for discussion and collaborative work that allows groups with distinct interests and objectives advance toward a common vision, while also representing their diverse interests.
- ➔ Have the opportunity to share visions of how the tree plantation sector contributes to the development of sustainability challenges.
- ➔ Explore diverse forms of coexistence for diverse, productive, recreational and cultural activities and land uses.
- ➔ Share experiences on the prevention, mitigation, and management of impacts from the tree plantation sector.

The deliverables from this Field Dialogue and stakeholder consultation include a comprehensive background paper on the status-quo and future perspectives of tree/forest plantations in the landscape to support knowledge transfer and capacity building in Chile and internationally; a summary report of the event; a video film documenting the expert consultation and including the field trip and stakeholder interviews; and the compilation of stakeholder opinions presented here on the definition and scope of tree/forest plantations, associated data and reporting issues and an articulation of a shared future vision on the roles of tree/forest plantations. TFD's TPL Dialogue in Chile contributed to FAO's Strategic Objective 2: Increase and improve the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner. The dialogue agenda, a background paper, presentations made during the dialogue, and other related materials are posted on the [TFD website](#).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The TPL Chile Field Dialogue was conducted over four days, with the first two days dedicated to field visits and the second to dialogue among participants. Over the first two days, a large number of the 67 participants visited six sites throughout the Araucanía and Bío Bío regions. Learnings from the field directly informed the subsequent two days of formal dialogue, which included a plenary discussion through which participants discussed the key challenges and fracture lines related to Tree Plantations in the Landscape in Chile and the definitions of forests and plantations. The content of this compilation report is based off of the notes from that session on the FAO definition of forest and plantation conducted on June 2, 2016.

Definitions of forests and plantations are important because they affect how we interpret transitions in land use. Definitions of forest will vary widely depending on the management objectives from which each definition is conceptualized.¹ At the Dialogue on Tree Plantations in the Landscape in Chile, a diverse set of definitions of forests were presented in addition to the FAO definition, including those summarized below. These spanned etymological, historical, indigenous, ecological, legal and internationally-agreed definitions:

- An etymological definition of forest from the Latin ‘foris’ meaning ‘outside’ rather than ‘wood’ or ‘woodland’. This definition relates to the concept, derived from the Romans, that a forest (and its associated peoples) has historically meant a place outside of the law, to be brought under lawful rule and exploited or colonized;
- A historical definition referring to the early European reserves for the royal hunt of deer, but not necessarily an area of trees, but could include grasslands and scrublands;
- The concept of estovers, areas that gave widows rights, and played a role in preventing poverty and unrest;
- The Guatemalan indigenous forest definition based on local vocabulary for forests that considers the forest a fundamental part of life, local subsistence and exchange economies, and provider of global ecosystemic benefits;
- The Mapuche definition of a forest that combines a forest’s spiritual and economic aspects, and emphasizes its role as the origin of the Mapuche cosmovision;
- An ecological definition of forest that has evolved to mean an area of trees and/or natural woodlands;
- A legal definition of forest as a jurisdiction with restrictions on resource use and land tenure;
- The concept of forest presented in the Río Declaration and the associated Statement of Forest Principles;
- The definition of forest within the FSC Principles.

¹ Chazdon, Robin, Pedro H.S. Brancalion, Lars Laestadius, Aoife Bennett-Curry, Kathleen Buckingham, Chetan Kumar, Julian Moll-Rocek, Ima Célia Guimarães Vieira, Sarah Jane Wilson. 2016. When is a forest a forest? Forest concepts and definitions in the era of forest and landscape restoration. *Ambio* 45: 538-550

To many participants in the Field Dialogue, the FAO definitions of forest and plantation were tangential to the discussions of the issues explored through the Field Dialogue. Some suggested that a questioning of established FAO definitions was redundant or counterproductive to the direction of the Dialogue, or that by the very fact that language is constantly evolving, the forestry community will continue to discuss definitions on some regular cycle, perhaps every 20-30 years. Other participants felt that, in the context of Chile, the definitional issue should be brought to the Chilean Forests Dialogue to be discussed further at the national level, that definitions should be aligned with national contexts, and that FAO has the responsibility to regularly open this debate within the context of current discussion and thought in the field. We note that, while participants in Field Dialogue represented a diversity of stakeholders (see Annex 1), the representation of stakeholder groups varied, and the participants present determined the scope of the conversation.

Regarding the differentiation of ‘forests’ and ‘plantations’, some stakeholders felt that it was important to differentiate between these two concepts because of the represented two different forms of land use and because of policy confusion related to the differences in ecosystem services provided by forests and plantations. When discussing native forests, stakeholders mentioned that further specificity (such as managed, regenerated, etc.) is needed to determine their value. However, other stakeholders emphasized the danger in excluding exotic plantations from forest definitions as, if plantations are not considered forests, they may not be subject to forestry laws and this omission can facilitate their expansion and conversion to other land uses.

The discussions at TPL Chile raise issues relevant to a wider discussion of the FAO definition of forests and plantations. Participants identified a diversity of forest definitions, encompassing those drawn from etymological, historical, indigenous, ecological, legal and internationally-agreed bases. Participants debated the relevance of forest and plantation definitions to the current state of discussions on Tree Plantations in the Landscape, and how to most effectively distinguish between ‘forests’ and ‘plantations’. One participant suggested that five points of consensus emerged from the discussions:

1. Definitions must not be an excuse for the loss of natural forest;
2. A more nuanced Forest Resource Assessment is needed to distinguish the state of natural forest from the state of plantations, and associated trends;
3. The rights and visions of indigenous peoples must be respected;
4. The multiple functions of forests and woodlands must be respected; and
5. Regardless of name, de-regulation of ‘plantations’ would not be desirable.

These points a helpful representation of key themes discussed in the session. The discussion did not seek to reach a single definition or consensus on the definitional issues associated with forests and plantations, but rather to give voice to the understanding and perspectives of participants.

ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANTS LIST

Cecilia Alcoreza Lora	WWF Chile
César Ancalaf	Escritor y facilitador
Oscar Artaza	Forum Florestal do Sul e Extremo Sul de Bahia
Henry Azurnendi	Pymemad Los Ríos
Heinrich Burschel	Agrupación de Ingenieros Forestales por el Bosque Nativo
Claudia Bustamante	Agenda Local 21
Noelia Carrasco	Universidad de Concepción
Sonia Carrasco	Agrupación Recolectores PFMN Deshidratados Cuyimpalihue
Ivonne Carrillo	Cooperativa Restauradoras de Nahuelbuta
Jessica Casaza	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Margarita Celis	MASISA
Ernesto Cienfuegos	Empresario Turístico
Marcus Colchester	Forest Peoples Programme
Rodolfo Contreras Moncada	Corporación Nacional Forestal
Hernán Cortés	COMINTECC
Eliana Cruces	Comunidad Mapuche Antonio Leviqueo
Alicia Diaz	International Labour Organization
Erika Drazen	The Forests Dialogue
Gary Dunning	The Forests Dialogue
Jaime Espejo Cardemil	Universidad de Concepción
Hector Espinoza	Colegio de Ingenieros Forestales
Sergio Gatica Ortíz	Confederación Nacional de Trabajadores Forestales de Chile
Nathalia Granato	Indústria brasileira de árvores
Ivan Grela	UPM Forestal Oriental
Hans Grosse	Instituto Forestal de Chile
Fernando Hales	Pymemad Los Ríos
Nazir Hechem	CMPC - Forestal Mininco
Patricio Herranz	CMPC - Forestal Mininco
Pablo Huaiquilao	FSC Permanent Indigenous Peoples Committee
Skip Krasny	Kimberly-Clark
André Laroze	Sistema Chileno de Certificación de Manejo Forestal Sustentable
Cristian Little	Instituto Forestal de Chile
Imerio Vicente Lobo Caniche	Asociación de Forestería Comunitaria de Guatemala Ut'z Che'

Heriberto Lopez	Federación de Trabajadores Forestales
Manuel Maribur Cheuquelao	Red Conservacionista del Patrimonio Natural de Contulmo
Regina Massai	MASISA
Carolina Matta Araya	Forestal Arauco
Macarena Medina	Forest Stewardship Council Chile
Eduardo Melo	Forestal Arauco
Guillermo Mendoza	Forestal Arauco
Ruth Metzel	The Forests Dialogue
Desiderio Millanao Antilef	Comunidad Indígena Profesional Consultor
Ivone Namikawa	Klabin
Luis Neves Silva	New Generation Plantations (WWF)
Luis Otero	Universidad Austral de Chile
Paulo Palma Burgos	Departamento de Acción Social Temuco
Martin Pascual	Subsecretaría del Trabajo
Pedro Peña Rubilar	Comité Iniciativa Nahuelbuta
Juan Pimentel	Agenda Local 21
Miriam Prochnow	Apremavi
Fernando Raga Castellanos	Corporación Chilena de la Madera
Bernardo Reyes	Ética en los Bosques
Mario Rivas	Departamento de Acción Social Temuco
Augusto Robert	CMPC - Forestal Mininco
Carlos Roxo	Fibria
Wigold Schaeffer	Apremavi
Albina Sepúlveda	Agrupación Hormigas Recolectoras Nahuelbuta
Raúl Soto Mardones	Ministerio del Trabajo
Ximena Soto Rosales	Agrupación Recolectoras Domo Peuma, Paillaco
Andrew St. Ledger	The Woodland League
Mauricio Talebi	Universidade Federal da Universidade de São Paulo
Maria Teresa Arana	CORMA
Tint Lwin Thuang	The Center for People and Forests
Marcos Tricallotis	Australian National University
Quinaida Valdebenito	Coordinadora Regional de Recolectores del Bío Bío
Carlos Vergara	WWF Chile
Hernán Verscheure	Comité Pro Defensa De La Fauna Y Flora

ANNEX 2: NOTES FROM FAO FOREST DEFINITIONS SESSION

Field Dialogue on Tree Plantations in the Landscape (TPL) in Chile

2 June 2016 | 2:00 pm

31 May 2016 – 3 June, 2016 – Temuco, Chile

For more information on the TFD Chile TPL Field Dialogue: <http://theforestdialogue.org/dialogue/field-dialogue-tree-plantations-landscape-tpl-chile>

Stakeholder Perspective 1:

- Historic forest definition was an early reserve for the royal hunt of deer, was introduced to the English language after the Norman conquest, and a forest in those times was not only an area of trees, but could be grasslands or scrublands. The point is that it was an area for hunting.
- Legally, this history resulted in that a forest is actually a jurisdiction, an area subject to state resources. That's still the main meaning in a country's law. Ecologically, and much more recently, the word forest evolved to mean an area dominated by trees, and for some ecologists a forest has come to mean a natural woodland or natural forests. By some, it is taken to exclude plantations or exotic species.
- When we redefine something we have to remember that it has a legal and ecological meaning at the same time. Efforts to exclude plantations of exotics from forests should be considered very carefully, as there is a risk that if plantations are not forest, they are not subject to forestry laws.

Stakeholder Perspective 2:

- In his book *Landscape and Memory*, Simon Schama describes forest as meaning outside of the law, and connecting with the law, from Roman times. The Romans viewed the wildwoods as a place to be brought into their law, as a place to be exploited and the people in the woods as to be exploited as well. They would use the wood to build their towns and the people would be enslaved to build their towns. They were often used as a mechanism for colonization, as the largest territories for kings and hunting. The estovers were for widows, and gave widows rights, so access to the forest is essential to prevent poverty and unrest.
- As the year 1992 approaches, we realize the pressure on resources, on community, and become aware that 93% of the world's resources are held jointly by less than 10% of world population.
- When the Rio Declaration was created, there was an understanding that the forest is vital for autonomy and respect, for survival of the people, so they attached the forest principles to the declaration. Similar to the Charter of the Forest, the Forest Principles seem to have been

forgotten. Agenda 21 is the blueprint for achieving sustainable development, although its meaning has been forgotten. I would invite communities and indigenous people to reexamine what it means. You can say that these principles come from the Charter of the Forest way back. FSC principles were designed to protect natural forest, not plantations. The Rio model is the replacement model for sustainable development. What Rio introduced is a new way of working in harmony with nature, and not against it. Again, today, there are still many people dependent on forests for their livelihoods. In the 1950s, in a book *Tree, Nature and Economy*, John Stewart Collis emphasized the importance of trees in an age where there were the beginnings of widespread ecological devastation. It's important to look at the multiple benefits. I'm not offering a definition; I'm offering more context. Natural forest is a society of cooperative organisms, that when managed sustainably is a renewable resource, providing services for all living ecosystems. Principally, water is protected by forests. Again, I think we might look at the idea of timber production being separated from multifunctional sustainable forest management, part of it, but not of the same, and separate the ecosystem services, community benefits, etc. A fear has been expressed regarding separating plantations into agriculture because they lose the possibility of regulation. We've already gone down a road of eco-labelling so trees can't go into agriculture at this point. I don't accept this fear; there needs to be an important redefinition of this important concept for all of the dialogues.

Stakeholder Perspective 3, regarding the FAO definition:

- Given that we are talking about definitions; FAO has a definition based on consultation of experts. For the FAO, 'forest' includes natural forests and plantations. There is no differentiation, as long as the area has a canopy cover greater than 10% and an area greater than 1.5 ha. It can be any canopy (native or exotic). Fundamentally, these areas, or forests, are differentiated by the presence of trees and the absence of other land uses. Natural forests are composed of local trees and are not defined as forest plantations. Plantations can be afforestation or reforestation (zones that were forest and that have been reforested with more species). These are basically the definitions that FRA (FAO) uses. There is clear evidence that forest cover is increasing at the global level but it is plantation cover that is increasing, not native forest. Sustainable forest management is not a theme that is being discussed enough. The FAO is developing analyses on these aspects of forest management – there is an increase in cover, but not necessarily in terms of biodiversity. We hope to discuss this theme further and that themes come out of this TFD meeting that can be discussed more broadly.

Stakeholder Perspective 4:

- From the Chilean perspective on the definition of forest in Chile, we have a weakness in that many definitions are inferior to the FAO definition, which is very difficult because of land use change. Even today there are land use substitutions, and when a standard is used, there are problems with how it is interpreted. For more than two years now, there is a working group that

discusses how to prevent land use change. There are some companies working to ensure that there is no land use change, and others that do not. It is important that we take this theme to the Chilean Forests Dialogue to have a broader discussion.

Stakeholder Perspective 5:

- If we want to have a constructive dialogue, it is not very productive to question the FAO definition. Trying to match the forest definition to my own agenda do not seem very productive because we are questioning a definition that has already been established.

Stakeholder Perspective 6:

- I don't agree. I think that we should develop definitions that are a bit broader and aligned with the country context. Guatemala has spent years working on a forest definition among indigenous groups. We have defined concepts such as the concept of 'montaña' (mountain), such as 'yuc', such as the roots, essential to life. Five years ago we began to understand that forest, or 'montaña'; 1) Is a fundamental part of life for every human being, along with the interactions that they can have in forests/ 'montañas' – they give fruits for life; 2) Much of local economies depend on forests, not through exploitation but through subsistence and exchange; 3) Most importantly, we consider that the forest is the giver of life and ecosystem benefits that not only benefit local communities but the rest of the universe.

Stakeholder Perspective 7:

- We have to remember that the planet has more than 7.5 billion people, and so producing enough wood is a spectacular challenge. In 2030, it is estimated that we will need much more wood. Plantations can satisfy global demand. It is important to conserve and promote biodiversity. In reality, I believe that a definition of forest should be broader than that each square meter must provide everything. On the contrary, we should develop more of a landscape view where there are specialized forests. It is perfectly understandable that each forest will have a different contribution.

Stakeholder Perspective 8:

- This is clearly an old discussion, and we will keep discussing the same because we are missing something. Language creates reality, and because the debate goes on, there is something that is not totally true, and language is constantly evolving. Clearly a definition will not come out of this discussion. Someone says 'montaña' (mountain). Here the people say 'montaña' (mountain) and 'bosque' (forest). People say that God made the forest and plantations were made by man, and we will continue spinning our wheels, because language is crafted based in the reality of each person. Every 20-30 years we will continue to have this discussion.

Stakeholder Perspective 9:

- At the end of the day we are here precisely to invite everyone to converse and advance and not stay stuck in the past. We need to incorporate more variables and vision into the discussion, and this discussion of forest definitions feels like an imposition. We all have the right to participate in this discussion, and not have a vision of development that we do not share imposed upon us. We need to have this discussion directly and responsibly to reach a consensus that everyone can agree on.

Stakeholder Perspective 10:

- I think that these are old discussions, but I feel that it is important to take two concepts into account:
 - i. Enormous population growth;
 - ii. A plantation is a transition moment between two phases, and in that context it is important to differentiate it.

Stakeholder Perspective 11:

- ‘Tree plantations’ is more than a title. It is a message that when we discussed this topic in Durban we wanted to bring this discussion into the space of integrating land uses in different ways, in accordance with different countries and cultures. TPL looks at plantations within a mosaic of different land uses, and this goes very much in line with new thinking of many research institutions, universities, conservation organizations, and the landscape approach. I think that the FAO does have the responsibility to open this debate within the context where the discussion and thinking is moving. Otherwise, we tend to be captured into narrowing these definitions into ping-ponging between forests and plantations. How can we reconcile plantations with conservation? We need tree plantations to help us protect the natural forests, otherwise we will have deforestation because the drivers are too powerful to stop.

Stakeholder Perspective 12:

- I am not going to remain quiet on what has brought me to this place. I would like everyone to pay attention and not make fun of what I am going to say. Although I am not a ‘machi’ I have dreams. I dreamt about the forest companies, and if we do not do something now about the themes of water and wetland protection, there will be a big distortion of the environment in our country. I see many pines that are beginning to dry out from lack of humidity. I have two Mapuche organizations, and it is time to make the money today work to solve the problems that you have ahead of you. The drought and contamination that is in store for the country is very large if we do not start to solve these problems. Look at what God causes in our country, so I urge you to organize to protect this country, because afterward it may be too late.

Stakeholder Perspective 13:

- Briefly, I think a point was made about something that is recurring in Chilean society. We have made an effort to create answers, but we generate answers to questions, while at the same time it is very difficult to see the other side, and because of this we are not responding to what the plantations may want to respond to. We understand that there is a lot of science behind the plantations, but sometimes that science gives us tunnel vision and does not allow us to see 360 degrees and see other visions. From the technical point of view, I'm an ecologist, and we know that there are root systems that interact for kilometers. Why not distinguish in words between systems that have very radical distinctions?

Stakeholder Perspective 14:

- We don't have to lose our short term memory. Yesterday, we were in the field and we had the chance to see this distinct visions between communities, companies and NGOs. Classifying two systems that are so different under the same definition can create policy problems, given the differences in biology and biodiversity.

Stakeholder Perspective 15:

- The truth is that today we are blaming forest for a problem that has another origin. The pine or any other species is not at fault. Forest plantations have their use and function, and so does natural forest. I recently visited Korea, where they have four million ha of Quercus forest. They told me that after the second world war, they were left without any forest and they planted oak. When you see it from a distance, you could think that it is forest – it provides water, etc. – so we have to be careful with that distinction.

Stakeholder Perspective 16:

- If we define forest only as natural forest, Europe does not have any forest. Chile, instead of having many more hectares, only has four million, because there are many forest fires, just like in the United States, and because of that we cannot determine what is a natural forest and what is semi-natural. We have to think about the ecosystem services provided. There are natural forests that produce ecosystem services, but how can we create plantations so that they create more of these services? If we didn't have plantations in Chile, instead of cutting down 1,000 ha, we would be cutting down 500,000-1 million ha.

Stakeholder Perspective 17:

- I would like to know more about the definition in Mapuche. How do you define forest and plantation in your language? What does it mean to you?

Stakeholder Perspective 18 (Response):

- A forest is a space that has various processes, and this definition shares many aspects with that of Guatemala. The forest has many things with distinct forces. It is a ‘maguiza’, in that it has spiritual and economic aspects. It is not just a bunch of trees, but something much more powerful than that. It is the origin of our cosmovision, and life itself.

Stakeholder Perspective 3 (repeat):

- The concepts that generate definitions of forest, etc. should evolve.

Stakeholder Perspective 19:

- When we talk about an area with woody species, it seems that the real topic is how stable or sustainable it is. When I think about the people in the middle of Europe, they feel something spiritual with the forest. It is very difficult to agree with the word magic, because you have to give it a ‘last name’. It is easy to say native forest, but there are so many types of forest – intervened, regenerated. The specificity comes in the last names we give our forest.

Stakeholder Perspective 20:

- Water is a key issue: it’s possible to improve and I have a study here that I can show you.

Stakeholder Perspective 21:

- We won’t agree on one definition of forests, but I think we can agree on five points:
 - i. We do need to stop definitions excusing the loss of natural forests;
 - ii. We do need a more nuanced Forest Resource Assessment which distinguishes what is happening to natural forest from what’s happening to plantations;
 - iii. We need to respect the rights and visions of Indigenous Peoples;
 - iv. We need to value the multiple functions of forests and woodlands; and
 - v. We don’t want even less regulation of plantations – whatever we call them.

Stakeholder Perspective 22:

- This is a survey of the landscape. Different viewpoints exist and are evidence that we have different interests and perspectives, but we hope this vision can be channeled to close in on a methodological meaning. It is important to bring this up, prepare and organize the theme in terms of knowledge dialogues.

Stakeholder Perspective 23:

- I would like to say that the idea of this session was not that we were going to reach a definition, but rather that we had the opportunity to hear many visions related to this topic. From all of these things that we have listened to, the FAO, the Chilean Forests Dialogue and TFD have homework. Let's try to think of these five interesting points about the forest definition raised here. We need to consider these points when we consider these definitions of forest.

ANNEX 3. PRESENTATION REGARDING FOREST DEFINITIONS BY PARTICIPANT

There is no single, correct definition of the word 'forest' (which is an introduced word in the English language).

- ➔ **Etymologically**, the word 'forest' comes from the Latin 'foris' meaning 'outside'. (Romance languages tend to refer to woodlands with words derived from the Latin silva. The old English term was 'wudu', today we still say 'wood' or 'woodland').
- ➔ **Historically**, a 'forest' (originally 'foresta') was an area reserved for the Royal Hunt of deer, first recorded in the rule of Emperor Charlemagne and introduced into the English language after the Norman Conquest (11th century). Historically 'forests' were not necessarily woodlands but included grasslands and scrublands.
- ➔ **Legally**, a 'forest' is a jurisdiction subject to royal or State authority, where restrictions are imposed on resource use and land tenure. This remains the meaning in many national laws.
- ➔ **Ecologically**, the word 'forest' evolved to mean an area dominated by trees. As concern about biodiversity and ecosystem functions increased, for some ecologists a 'forest' came to mean natural woodlands and by some is taken to exclude plantations of exotic species.

Efforts to exclude plantations of exotics from 'forest' need careful consideration. There is a risk that if 'plantations' are not 'forests' then they are not subject to forestry laws and so may be subject to even less regulation. It might then be even easier for 'plantations' to expand and take over farmlands.