



# Forest Peoples Programme

1c Fosseyway Business Centre, Stratford Road, Moreton-in-Marsh GL56 9NQ, UK  
tel: +44 (0)1608 652893 fax: +44 (0)1608 652878 info@forestpeoples.org www.forestpeoples.org

## **Comments from Forest Peoples Programme on the proposed Logic Model for the World Bank's Forest Investment Program (FIP)**

June 2010

The upcoming meeting of the Forest Investment Program (FIP) subcommittee (Washington, DC, 24 June 2010) will among others discuss the Logic model that is expected to be used as the basis for developing the FIP results framework.

We understand that the Logic model paper will not be approved in the upcoming meeting and hence would like to point to some critical elements that need to be addressed and resolved as a matter of urgency.

A compared analysis of the proposed Investment Strategy of the FIP, the FIP design document and the Logic model paper shows a series of shortcomings and inconsistencies that risk undermining the commitments towards the rights of indigenous peoples and their possible role in protecting forests and their resources.

It should be noted that the Investment Strategy, as defined in the document that will be discussed in the upcoming meeting, should aim at supporting countries to contribute, among others, to the "protection of the rights of indigenous peoples".

The draft Logic model paper also stresses that it is consistent with the FIP design document. It should be noted that the FIP design document, among others, states as follows:

*The main purpose of the FIP is to support developing countries' REDD-efforts, providing up-front bridge financing for readiness reforms and public and private investments identified through national REDD readiness strategy building efforts, while taking into account opportunities to help them adapt to the impacts of climate change on forests and to contribute to multiple benefits such as **biodiversity conservation, protection of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities** (emphasis added)*

Moreover the FIP Design document also specifies among FIP activities:

*Proposals set out how program will catalyze, support and measure and monitor the delivery of, inter alia, the following (as appropriate):*

*i. Demonstrable improvement in social and economic well-being of forest dependent communities, including poverty reduction, equitable benefit sharing, and acknowledgement of the rights and role of indigenous peoples and local communities*

Another key element contained in Investment Strategy proposal is the fact that the Investment Strategy should contain a description of governance issues, (such as legislation, land rights tenure systems, participation of Indigenous peoples).

It would be expected that such references to rights and key governance issues would then inform also the evaluation criteria to be used to assess FIP induced outcomes and outputs, considering that the logical framework will provide the blueprint to develop the more specific “results” framework.

On the contrary, and worryingly, the Logic model does not have ANY reference to the above.

Even worse, it contains language suggesting that indigenous peoples and their habits are among the key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

*The intervention outcomes include changes to the behaviour of those active in the forest sector and those sectors affecting the integrity of forest ecosystems including state and private companies, forest-relevant local communities and indigenous peoples*

This is the only reference to indigenous peoples related outcomes for FIP activities. In reality there should be a clear recognition that the key drivers of deforestation in fact are industrial agriculture, large-scale plantations, logging activities and infrastructure development as well as extractive industries. It should also be noted that indigenous peoples traditional forest management and conservation methods are often the most efficient and cost-effective way to ensure the integrity of forest ecosystems. The role of indigenous peoples’ protected areas in mitigation and adaptation, and the relevance of indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge, in capturing and nurturing the full spectrum of forest values, from cultural to biodiversity values, has been recognized also recently at the meetings of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advise (SBSTTA ) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) recently held in Nairobi. Retaining the currently proposed language in the FIP logic paper would exclude the consideration of the possible role and contribution of Indigenous traditional knowledge and traditional practices in forest conservation and management, while “penalizing” traditional indigenous practices outright.

We therefore suggest that the Logic paper be re-discussed and amended to

- a. *include criteria and indicators to evaluate FIP outputs and outcomes that specify the contribution of FIP and FIP investments in catalyze, support, and measure and monitor the delivery of (among others) equitable sharing of benefits, acknowledgement of the rights and role of indigenous peoples;*
- b. *Revise the current text related to the possible FIP outcomes and specify the potentially positive role of indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge and practices in supporting forest eco system integrity*

The new text would read as follows:

*The intervention outcomes include changes to the behaviour of those active in the forest sector and those sectors affecting the integrity of forest ecosystems including state and private companies, while supporting livelihoods, values, worldviews, knowledge systems and initiatives which promote the integrity of forest ecosystems.*

One of the reasons for this shortcoming might be found in the pattern followed in the definition of the FIP logic notably that of building up on and harmonize with similar frameworks used in the logical models of the Clean Technology Fund (CTF), the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) and the Program for Scaling-Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP). The serious consequences of such shortcomings in terms of undermining the rights of indigenous peoples might require a full review of the broader Climate Investment Fund’s (CIF) evaluation frameworks in order to integrate indigenous peoples’ rights criteria as key criteria for evaluation assessment and monitoring of results for the overall CIF activities.

For questions please contact Francesco Martone: francesco@forestpeoples.org