



## Key issues: making zero deforestation commitments work better

NICK PASIECZNIK, HERMAN SAVENIJE,  
CHRISTOPHE VAN ORSHOVEN, JAN BOCK  
and PABLO PACHECO

### Key issues

Conversion of tropical forests to industrial production of agricultural commodities is a main driver of climate change and biodiversity loss. In response, ambitious zero-deforestation pledges have been made by a growing number of global consumer manufacturer companies, international agricultural traders, agro-industrial companies, and governments, to establish deforestation-free supply chains. These commitments are seen as crucial in eliminating tropical deforestation through public and private action, but also in making progress to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. And what is new is that the private sector is firmly on board and part of the solution, compared to past approaches that were largely publicly supported initiatives.

Much has been achieved and in a very short space of time. But more is needed. So how can private and public commitments work better? The 40 contributions in this edition of *ETFRN News* reflect the strong interest in zero deforestation commitments and show how lively and rapidly evolving the debate is. There are many different experiences and views of what to do from different quarters and not everyone agrees to everything, but the following eight ways to enhance the implementation, effectiveness and impact of pledges have been drawn from lessons learned and views expressed.

1. Agree on clear definitions and standards — what is a forest; what is deforestation, and what are acceptable credible and coherent standards for use across different commodities.
2. National and local governments to become more involved — since failure to address broader governance challenges may reduce the positive impact of private-sector zero-deforestation initiatives.
3. More corporate transparency and accountability — must become the norm for monitoring and reporting progress, and not just regarding zero deforestation commitments.

---

**Nick Pasiecznik** is an agroforestry and communications consultant in Lyon, France; **Herman Savenije** is Programme Coordinator, Tropenbos International, the Netherlands; **Christophe Van Orshoven** is REDD+ Expert at the European Forest Institute's EU REDD Facility, Spain; **Jan Bock** is Private Sector and Forest Finance Expert, GIZ, Germany; and **Pablo Pacheco** is Team Leader, Value Chains, Finance and Investments, CIFOR, Indonesia.

4. Support for smallholder empowerment — through capacity building and technical assistance, so that millions of small producers can become effective participants.
5. Civil society to continue to advocate for change — as consumers and global citizens, for corporations to take effective action.
6. Advocate for jurisdictional action in support of national goals — required to complement corporate supply chain initiatives, and helps to fulfil more inclusive, sustainable development criteria.
7. Include alternative business and financing models — that better take into account existing realities, and local systems of governance and tenure.
8. Invite broad stakeholder involvement — in the inclusive platforms that are clearly needed for progress, as no single solution can achieve the desired impact.

By taking on board and acting on at least some of these key issues, zero-deforestation commitments can be made more meaningful and easier to monitor, and they will have a great chance of being implemented in ways that effectively eliminate deforestation while also contributing to social inclusion and smallholder integration.

## Introducing the trends

### *Deforestation through time*

Deforestation has increased over time, with forests in many parts of the tropics now reduced to isolated and often degraded fragments. In addition, weak forest and land-use governance in commodity producing countries is further contributing to environmental degradation and forest loss. The result is that large swaths of forest have been, and still are being, converted to fields of soy, cattle pasture, oil palm, tree plantations, coffee, cocoa, sugar, maize, banana, shrimp farms and much more. Agricultural expansion and commodification are without doubt key drivers of deforestation and land-use change in the modern era, as short-term financial interests supersede the long-term interests of environmental sustainability, resource security and human well-being. Strongly involved in the negative impacts and associated risks, the same corporations can also, however, significantly influence turning the tide and implementing solutions, especially if they work in partnership with public institutions.

### *The rise of forests in the global agenda*

Deforestation — and conservation of tropical rainforests — has become a defining issue of our age. And the outcome is still uncertain, although the importance of forests and the need to protect and sustainably manage them continues to rise in global climate change and development agendas. Their value for the global and local good is now recognized, for biodiversity and the local livelihoods they support, and for food and nutritional security, as well as numerous environment benefits for humanity and the world as a whole regarding their irreplaceable role in regulating water and weather cycles, carbon storage, and adapting to and mitigating long-term climate change.

The Rio Summit in 1992 made a major impact in changing perceptions, and Rio+20 and the development of the Millennium Development Goals and subsequent Sustainable Development Goals all helped raise the issue still further. The need to conserve remaining forests was enshrined in key international and UN treaties and conventions — of which the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) are perhaps the most talked about, entering into force in 1993 and 1994, respectively. The social and cultural value of forests was also acknowledged in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007), and directly or indirectly in other treaties related to community and indigenous rights, tenure security, and the right to food and food security as a basic human right. Almost all countries in the world have signed up to at least some of these treaties, but although they are legally bound in one way or another, no sanctioning mechanisms are in place. And massive deforestation, caused by rampant agricultural expansion that breaks the rules, continues regardless.

### *What next?*

Ambitious goals such as the 2020 and 2030 targets set by the New York Declaration on Forests and TFA2020 are laudable, as are the initiatives, countries and companies that have signed up to them. After a decade of efforts and increasing corporate and government commitments to reduce deforestation, including REDD+, we can now share current experiences and opinions, and look forward. What has been achieved, and how can progress and impact be stepped up?

This edition of *ETFRN News* confirms the findings of a number of recent reports that address questions surrounding zero-deforestation initiatives. A very recent publication by Forest Trends in March 2017 (Donofrio, Rothrock and Leonard 2017) analyzed 760 commitments to reduce deforestation in oil palm, soy, cattle, timber and pulp supply chains, made by 447 different companies, finding “that meeting these goals is easier said than done.” Some progress was highlighted, but a lack of corporate transparency was noted, with information on progress made publicly available for only half of the tracked commitments. Also, between one-fifth and one-third of all commitments were either dormant or delayed.

Deforestation is continuing, driven ever more by clearance for agriculture and plantation crops, although rates may be declining in a few countries and provinces, notably in Brazil. Success has followed the implementation of supporting policies and practices, but in some places, deforestation rates have declined simply because there is so little forest left to be cut. The good work, will and trust generated may be lost if at least some of the current momentum is not maintained. This compilation of articles looks at a wide range of issues and experiences. The following summary highlights key areas, to be acted on if we are to maintain and transform the progress made so far into greater and longer-lasting impacts.

## A decade of dedicated developments

In May 2008, the **World Wide Fund for Nature** (WWF) was the first organization to lead a major campaign that called for zero net deforestation by 2020, signed by delegates of 67 countries at the ninth Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Bonn, Germany (WWF 2008).

In December 2009, the **Consumer Goods Forum** arose from the merging of industry-led associations. In 2010, it committed to zero net deforestation by 2020 for palm oil, soy, beef, and paper and pulp supply chains. It brings together senior management from more than 400 retailers, manufacturers, service providers and other stakeholders, including some of the world's biggest companies, across 70 countries. Members encourage each other to adopt practices and standards that commit to reducing deforestation, and companies share standards and best practices for other to follow. Success is driven by the active participation of members who together develop and lead implementation.

In June 2012, the **Tropical Forest Alliance 2020** (TFA2020) was founded at Rio+20, as a global partnership of public and private partners taking voluntary actions to reduce tropical deforestation, reduce greenhouse emissions, improve small-holder livelihoods, conserve natural habitats and protect landscapes. In support of this, seven African governments signed the TFA2020 Marrakesh Declaration for Sustainable Development of the Oil Palm Sector in Africa in 2016. TFA2020 initiatives also support collaborative efforts in Brazil, Colombia and Indonesia. In addition, the Financial Sector Engagement Initiative and Better Growth without Deforestation promote deforestation-free growth and increase practical understanding of how to align private-sector commitments and public policy goals.



In September 2014, the **New York Declaration on Forests** (NYDF) was released at the UN Climate Summit, with the principal aim of halving natural forest loss by 2020 and ending it entirely by 2030. By September 2016 there were 190 endorsers: 40 governments, 20 sub-national governments, 57 multinational companies, 16 groups representing indigenous communities, and 57 NGOs; it has become a global benchmark. Two years after it was signed, 415 companies had made public commitments, but the very different pledges make analysis of progress difficult (Climate Focus 2016). Of the four commodities studied, most commitments address palm oil (59%) and wood products (53%), with soy (21%) and cattle (12%) lagging behind, and whereas most involve manufacturers and retailers, more producers are also committing.

In December 2015, the **Amsterdam Declaration** towards eliminating deforestation from agricultural commodity chains with European countries set a yet more ambitious objective. It aims to eliminate all deforestation by no later than 2020, with a stronger focus on more responsible private-sector management of supply chains and trade. It was

endorsed by the governments of Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK, and sets out eight main goals. In parallel, the same governments also released a second sector-specific declaration in support of a fully sustainable palm oil supply chain by 2020, followed up by a supporting EU resolution on oil palm in April 2017.

This summary describes a few of the main commitments, but not all of them; nor does it judge by exclusion that any are less important than others. There are numerous sustainability standards (e.g., FSC, RSPO, SPOM, IPOP), some of which predate even the earliest of the declarations above. They include governmental initiatives such as the Governors' Climate and Forests Task Force, and financial and trade guidelines such as the Equator Principles, Banking Environment Initiative (BEI), OECD Guidelines for Multi-National Enterprises, IFC Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability, and Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests. And there is an ever-increasing number of new platforms with various inter-related objectives, some of which are described in this issue of *ETFRN News*.

## Lessons learned

### *Corporate experiences*

Nine corporations chose to share their experiences directly, with five contributing a full article, covering Oceania, Asia and Africa, and four accepting an invitation to be interviewed. Corporate issues were also raised in many other contributions throughout this edition. The sample is illustrative only, but it gives an indication of corporate views and efforts, which is balanced by more critical NGO opinions in later sections of this issue.

New Britain Palm Oil shares the challenges to involve smallholders in Papua New Guinea, and examples of what it has achieved and how (2.1). Asia Pulp & Paper Group explains the road it has been on (2.2) to reducing negative impacts from its activities in Indonesia. It recognizes that the responsibility lies with companies to lead the way in creating models



of best practices. The company's commitment has helped it rebuild trust with stakeholders and customers. In Liberia (2.3), Golden Veroleum shows how it too has made great strides towards protecting forests through partnering with the government, an NGO/service provider; and that local communities must also be involved at all stages. Protection will occur effectively only if the community takes a key leadership role and if it has the right incentives to implement this responsibly. A well-managed approach is needed to bring communities and the company together,

alongside regulators, civil society, funders and those with technical skills (conservationists, coaches for alternative livelihoods, etc.).

Ferrero tells how deforestation has been eliminated from areas in Malaysia (2.4) where it sources palm oil. And whereas certification has been useful, traceability to the farm level has proved to be an even more valuable measure; in this regard, satellite data has proved essential. Also in Indonesia, we hear of similar advances made by Musim Mas (particularly with smallholder inclusion), which have been facilitated through partnering with Rainforest Alliance and a consortium of NGOs and consultants and putting in place a transparent traceability system (2.5).

Such experiences are supported in different ways through four interviews with senior staff from Mondelez, Olam, Marks and Spencer and BNP Paribas, offering some excellent take-home messages, such as “creating islands of green won’t save us” and “we must now move from a do-no-harm to a do-good approach.” The section closes with an article from The Forest Trust (2.6), showing that only through strong civil society reactions will we see positive corporate actions, and offering notable examples. Overall, it is clear from corporate experiences that they bear much of the responsibility, but that they cannot go it alone. Achieving higher goals will require government support for transformation and new models for involving smallholders and local stakeholders. One conclusion was that a failure to work with governments will reduce the possible impacts of corporate actions on achieving deforestation-free supply chains.

### *Smallholder experiences*

It is clear that there are many actual benefits to smallholders from zero-deforestation initiatives. There are also many more potential benefits, i.e., those not yet realized. And, there is a risk that zero deforestation commitments could exclude smallholders that do not comply with emerging criteria. Five articles reveal how such risks are dealt with, outline the conditions under which smallholder have benefitted, and how they could benefit more. In general, smallholder engagement is a lengthy process that requires investment, planning and long-term involvement. It is important to remember that often, smallholders are integrated into commodity markets only several years after they have cleared forest to plant crops. Engagement is needed early enough to pre-empt deforestation, but there is no one-size-fits-all approach.

Two articles look specifically at the kind of support that smallholder farmers need to prevent them from cutting down forests, and show the success of that approach with palm oil production in West Africa and coffee in Central America, respectively (3.1, 3.2). The positive impacts of zero-deforestation commitments are also challenged. An assessment from West Africa (3.3) observed that “zero deforestation cocoa only exists where forests have already disappeared”; and where REDD+ was once seen as a viable solution – at least regarding cocoa — this has not proved to be the case (3.4). Looking at cotton in southern Africa (Zambia), it was concluded that law enforcement and monitoring led by the public sector should complement private-sector initiatives to reduce risks that deforestation leaks into other commodities, supply chains and areas (3.5).



These articles are complemented by two interviews that capture smallholder perspectives, hopes and aspirations, and emphasize what is needed. Both agree with the potential, but emphasize that there are many considerations still to be addressed. Based on the views of a global diversity of producer organizations, the first interview calls for a wholesale reconsideration of how we assess global economic systems and says that we should move away from single-product value chains to multi-product “baskets” that are more appropriate to smallholder realities. Speaking for many forest-dependent groups in Southeast Asia, the second interview asks for no more “empty statements,” but real action from companies and governments regarding respect for tenure and indigenous rights, and law enforcement.

### *Government experiences*

Many articles call for increased government involvement and regulation (see “Voluntary vs. mandatory,” below), or for learning from the experiences of other government initiatives. These include the EU FLEGT Action Plan (Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade) (4.3), the role of REDD+ (3.4) and other incentive mechanisms, and ways in which government policy could help lead the way to more effective and more rapid progress (5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.6). Experiences from the EU FLEGT Action Plan, for example, show that increased trade and EU market access for legal timber gave commodity producers strong incentives to comply with national legal frameworks in order to meet demand-side criteria related to environmental, social and governance issues. These can trigger reforms in forest and land-use governance (4.3), and in regulation of the sector. The clear impacts of positive governmental action were especially highlighted regarding the marked contrast where governments are active; for example, Brazil (4.5, 4.6), compared to those where they are less active or do not fulfil their mandated responsibility, such as zero-deforestation agreements in Indonesia (5.3).

### *Challenges ahead*

#### *Definitions and standards*

What do zero deforestation and its related terms mean? This edition opens with a presentation of the different terms and their definitions (1.1), and while this article notes the fine line between too much rigidity and cherry-picking convenient definitions, it concludes that although appealing in concept, there is no single universal definition of deforestation. Governments and local stakeholders can proactively clarify what deforestation-free agriculture means in their jurisdiction. Interpreting global standards in the context of local socio-political circumstances is a key opportunity for national stakeholders to determine and follow the criteria for legal, deforestation-free commodity production in their jurisdictions through a participatory process. Mainstreaming such discussions in major commodity producing countries would help responsible trade partners to understand how and where to source legal, deforestation-free commodities from specific jurisdictions according to local realities and priorities (5.6).

There is no agreement on what a forest actually is, and this is of crucial concern. Furthermore, whereas a global standard was not considered possible (1.2), many more articles note that a firm agreement on the definitions of key terms is essential in order to guarantee accountability and transparency (1.2, 4.1, 4.3, 4.7, 5.7). Clear definitions are also equally required for clarity in standards and guidelines.

### *Monitoring, accountability and disclosure*

Being assured of the origin of commodities is essential to assessing forest-related risks and opportunities. To meet this need, new platforms for gathering and analyzing trade, customs and production data are revealing more accurate information about global flows of commodities that present risks to forests (5.6). Credible monitoring and reporting systems based on public and private transparency increase accountability and limit opportunities for corruption, and assist markets to understand supply chains and their impacts (4.3). Companies can help develop the monitoring and incentive systems that are essential elements of regional strategies for slowing deforestation (5.5) and many are doing so, as we see in this edition. But many other corporations continue to hide behind corporate confidentiality, with an observation (4.1) that a fundamental flaw to zero deforestation commitments is that they cannot be meaningfully monitored given existing levels of transparency, and even if transparency were adequate, NGOs lack the resources to do so effectively. Given the scale of illegalities, more resources would make a positive impact.

Those companies who are making efforts to eliminate deforestation in their supply chains are the same ones who are disclosing more information about product sourcing. Perhaps the next stage is to bring others to the same level? And if this cannot be achieved by voluntary action, then regulatory actions may provide additional incentives, so that the “laggards” do not have a market advantage over the “leaders,” who bear the extra costs of sustainability. Demands for disclosure and transparency are not limited to deforestation and environmental concerns — they are also a cross-cutting issue that includes respect for land rights, human rights, and other social and governance criteria.

### *Voluntary vs. mandatory*

Voluntary agreements are beginning to make impacts on the global environmental challenges being faced, but more action is needed. Voluntary action must be complemented by regulatory frameworks at the level of the value chain, sector or jurisdiction. Section 4's opening article (4.1) analyzes why, and notes several important technical and fundamental flaws in the focus on voluntary corporate zero-deforestation commitments. These include a failure to appreciate the scale of illegality in tropical deforestation. In addition, commitments will never encompass all production and trade of relevant commodities, and cannot be meaningfully monitored given existing levels of transparency. Finally, governments should not choose to ignore past illegalities, as this would effectively provide an amnesty for past behaviour and for which they have no mandate.



The need for stronger government action comes through again and again in many articles (4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.6, 5.7), and supports the conclusion that one thing that can halt deforestation is action by governments, of both producer and importer countries (4.1). Perhaps controversially, one article adds that there is some evidence that the voluntary zero-deforestation agenda may even be distracting attention and resources from needed efforts to encourage the government action that is ultimately required (4.1). However, much evidence also shows that neither governments nor the private sector can work alone, and that significant impacts will be achieved only by public-private partnerships working through multi-stakeholder platforms. Voluntary actions by front-runners have shown what is possible, but regulation of “free riders” is needed to avoid leakage from within and without producer and trader corporations and investors, and to leverage the sustainability impacts to the scale needed.

### *Value chains vs. jurisdictions*

The scope and limitations of certification are also integrally linked to voluntary vs. regulatory issues. It is noted that corporate zero-deforestation pledges will be most effective if they support, integrate with or align with legality approaches such as FLEGT and sustainability certification systems (e.g., FSC or RSPO) instead of trying to replace them (4.3, 4.4, 5.3, 5.5). Each of these articles also highlights the lessons learned in the specific sectors covered, which prove valuable in improving the efficiency of approaches and systems related to other commodities.

However, other articles note that whereas certification has achieved much, there is now a need to move on to a different level through effective governance solutions (5.7). Measuring the impacts of deforestation-free supply chains is context-dependent, and ultimately, success is linked to the implementation of sustainable land-use planning in jurisdictions where commodities originate. Producer countries seeking preferential access to emerging deforestation-free markets should also take a proactive role in clarifying the standards for deforestation-free commodity production within their jurisdictions (5.6).

Jurisdictional-level multi-stakeholder processes led by a government entity are needed, along with private-sector actors, who need to proactively engage in the discussions. Donor governments need to support the processes, not just financially, and CSOs need to provide the community and local development perspective, offer technical assistance and act as watchdogs. The Produce, Conserve, Include (PCI) initiative in Mato Grosso, Brazil is an excellent example of what a state government can do to decrease deforestation while increasing agricultural production (5.7). In addition, a further three-step approach is proposed (5.6), but to succeed it notes that significant incentives are needed for jurisdictions that are taking action to improve land-use governance and phase out deforestation, with a coherent combination of supportive policies and incentives, fiscal cooperation between trading partners, and renewed efforts against tax avoidance in international commodity trade.

## Financing

Last, but by no means least, responsible finance is a key issue, and one that permeates upstream. There are many sources of capital, and such money does not always care about deforestation or social and environmental issues, but only profit. This being so, attention to finance and their major players could also lead to more significant results.

This edition also introduces examples of practical tools and instruments designed to connect investments to commitments (AXIIS) and those connecting buyers to producers (TOOL), as well as means to better monitoring progress (SPOTT), and equity valuation, revenue-at-risk and divestment tools (Chain Reaction Research).

One overarching study deserves special mention (4.2). It found that much investment in agriculture and forest-commodity operations is in violation of even the most basic environmental and social standards, with devastating impacts on people and forests. However, this and other articles note that whereas efforts to develop voluntary safeguard policies to prevent such impacts are welcome, it is far from clear that this approach is sufficient. It is noted that even financiers that have established voluntary safeguard policies routinely retain clients in breach of their own standards. This supports a move towards regulation, including the design of binding regulations at the national and international levels to direct finance away from harmful investments. This will be most effective when accompanied by detailed implementation guidance and standardised disclosure and due diligence frameworks.



## Cross-cutting issues

One article analyzes the specific differences among zero deforestation initiatives (4.7), while another presents five risks and seven opportunities (5.5), followed by a summary that highlighted ten elements. Corporate zero deforestation pledges were considered to be most successful if they were implemented with full appreciation of the risks that they pose (5.5), such as splitting the market, deepening rural food insecurity and poverty, penalizing farmers and businesses striving to comply with the law, and antagonizing farmers and governments in target regions. In addition, commitments are most effective if they are developed and implemented collaboratively instead of unilaterally, with this observation, not surprisingly, being a common finding by many articles.

An article on “business unusual” (5.2) proposes example of how the public, private and financial sectors should work together, and suggests models to follow. Another article also succinctly proposes what various sectors could do (5.1), suggesting that companies can improve governance and risk assessments, work more closely and effectively with suppliers, ensure transparency throughout the supply chain, work together to address market-wide issues, and tackle deforestation through landscape or jurisdictional

approaches. It suggests that financial institutions can increase scrutiny of companies' management of deforestation risk and use investments and lending to improve supply chain sustainability. Governments can commit to zero deforestation at local jurisdictional levels, address governance challenges through bilateral agreements, use REDD+ and nationally determined contributions (NDCs) as an opportunity to incentives policies and measures in line the Paris Agreement on climate change and the SDGs, embrace innovative public-private partnerships, and explore jurisdictional landscape approaches.

### Raising the bar

Several hundred companies have committed to zero deforestation initiatives, and now make up a significant percentage of all those at the global level. These front-runners have made and are still making a difference. They may not have fully realized the enormity and complexity of the challenge in committing to zero deforestation, and it appears that some did not know exactly what they stepped into. What is clear is though, is that zero-deforestation commitments are very much at the initial stage of development, and early work and experimentation are showing the way to putting in place what is needed.

Related international agreements, declarations and guidelines point in one direction. Highlighted actions include the urgency to act, the need to raise the bar towards increased sustainability and equality, and the importance of both governments and the private sector to assume their responsibilities and join forces in making positive impacts on the environment and human well-being at the local and global level. Many recent developments have also taken place in the broader context of the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals, the 2016 Paris Agreement and the 2015 Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development, to name but a few.

There is also a need for a more systemic approach to the problem, to be embraced by both public and private stakeholders and CSOs on both the demand and supply sides of commodity markets. We also need more clarity about the key issues in building the required approaches and systems. So here, from the various contributions in this issue, common threads are drawn, woven into the following eight key issues. If implemented, these can raise the bar, enhance the implementation, effectiveness and impact of pledges, and increase the likelihood of existing and future zero deforestation commitments being met.

1. Agree clear definitions and standards — definitions for the base terms (natural forest, plantation, deforestation, reforestation, net zero deforestation, gross zero deforestation, etc.) as well as defining what is “good enough” compensation for past deforestation, as an essential and urgently needed foundation for setting clear targets, monitoring progress and assessing and enforcing noncompliance. Clear, acceptable credible and coherent standards and guidelines across different commodities are another prerequisite.

2. National and local governments need to become more involved — in effective enforcement of social, environmental, trade and consumer protection laws, since the failure to address broader governance challenges may reduce the impact of private-sector zero-deforestation initiatives. For substantial and sustainable progress at jurisdictional levels, they need to intensify efforts to integrate land-use planning, enforcement, and other low-carbon development strategies.
3. More corporate transparency and accountability — must become the norm for monitoring and reporting progress, not just regarding zero deforestation commitments. Clearer targets and time frames would also help. National and international rules must require public disclosure on sourcing and financing by all, without exception.
4. Help for smallholder empowerment — through capacity building and technical assistance, so that millions of small producers can become effective participants. Support associations can provide a vehicle for incentives and economic development and give a voice to smallholders to advocate. Organized smallholders are easier for corporations and governments to engage with, and shared costs and risks, accompanied by equitable sharing of benefits, show promise as a new model for development.
5. Civil society to continue to advocate for change — as consumers and global citizens, for corporations to take effective action. It must investigate how existing national and international laws, agreements and treaties regarding social, environmental, trade and consumer issues can be better used, push for more government action, and hold governments and corporations accountable for their commitments and reforms.
6. Advocate for jurisdictional action in support of national goals — action at different local levels where land-use decisions are actually made, commodity production occurs, and livelihoods are immediately affected. Jurisdictional actions are required to complement corporate supply chain initiatives, and help to fulfil more inclusive sustainable development criteria.
7. Include alternative business and financing models — from the many that have been and are being developed. And if investments are to be turned from “brown” to “green,” then what is being invested in any given jurisdiction must be mapped and reported, before efforts can be made to better take into account existing realities, and local systems of governance and tenure.
8. Invite broad stakeholder involvement — in the inclusive platforms that are clearly needed for progress, since no single solution can achieve the desired impact. Holistic approaches must involve different actors and actions, and a range of stakeholders and scales. And they must go beyond forests and deforestation, as consent, corporate disclosure, responsible investment, rights, justice and human well-being are common, global issues.

This challenge is complex, and the response should be as detailed as needed, but as simple as possible to implement. The contributions in this volume allow us to share stories of what has been achieved, lessons learned, remaining issues, and ways forward. And we hope that these, and as summarized here, can help us advance along the road to a deforestation-free future.

## References

Climate Focus. 2016. *Progress on the New York Declaration on Forests: Eliminating Deforestation from the Production of Agricultural Commodities — Goal 2 Assessment Report*. Climate Focus, NYDF Assessment Coalition, Climate and Land Use Alliance, and Tropical Forest Alliance 2020.

Donofrio, S., P. Rothrock and J. Leonard. 2017. *Supply Change: Tracking Corporate Commitments to Deforestation-free Supply Chains*. Washington, DC, USA: Forest Trends.

Huijsman, A. and H. Savenije (eds.). 1991. *Making Haste Slowly: Strengthening Local Environmental Management in Agricultural Development*. Koninklijk Instituut Voor De Tropen, the Netherlands.

WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature). 2008. *Zero Net Deforestation by 2020 - A WWF Briefing Paper*. Gland, Switzerland: WWF.

## Photo credits, key issues

- p.ix Last remaining forest on a mountaintop in Colombia, surrounded by coffee and banana. Solidaridad
- p.xi Participatory land-use mapping, Liberia. Nienke Stam, GVL
- p.xii Cleared land. Nanang Sujana, CIFOR
- p.xvii Women turning sun-dried cocoa beans, Dunkwe-On-Offin, Ghana. Robert O'Sullivan