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Introduction: Why MDBs & forests?

When it comes to fighting climate change, clean energy and transport get most of the attention. But in the developing world, as the IPCC has recently highlighted, land use change and the loss of forests is often the most significant source of greenhouse gases. And it is a double hit: as forests are burned or land is disturbed, significant carbon is released; and the carbon-absorbing trees that took 50 or 100 years to grow, absorbing carbon all the time, are gone—forever, unless we act to re-plant them.1

Forests have multiple other values as well and play a critical role in contributing to the planet and people as sources of livelihoods—providing food, fiber, medicine, fuel, and building material, cleaning the air, regulating the water cycle, contributing to soil growth, retention and nutrient cycles, and providing health and recreation opportunities,2 and as home to millions in communities for whom spiritual and traditional links to the territory is fundamental to their survival.

Multilateral development banks (MDBs) have a key role to play in promoting forests’ values, since they may have greater capacity to assess the benefits from these multiple facets and the regional and global aspects of the public goods they provide. MDBs contribute to the advancement of standards to protect forests through their safeguards policies and safeguards supervision and implementation and promoting public responses to protect forests around the world. The World Bank, for instance, has stated that “the thoughtful management of the world’s remaining forests and trees is critical to achieving these goals”—referring to its mission “to end extreme poverty and boost shared prosperity in a sustainable manner.”4

BUILDING THE SCORECARD: WHAT WE REVIEWED & HOW WE DISTILLED THE LIST

To assess MDBs role with respect to forests commitments, we reviewed both overall strategies or action plans and sector-specific documents that covered the MDBs’ engagement in the forest sector and in sectors that impact forests, such as agriculture. Specifically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDB</th>
<th>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>ADB Strategy 2030 (July 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>Delivering A Climate Agenda for LAC: IDB Group Actions to 2020 (2017); Role of MDBs in financing of countries’ NDCs (Feb. 2016); Environment and Biodiversity: priorities for protecting natural capital and competitiveness in Latin America and the Caribbean (May 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the same time, we looked at global policy frameworks containing forest-related commitments that have been broadly accepted. These are the:

- UN Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-30 (Apr. 2017);
- Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Sept. 2015);
- New York Declaration of Forests (NYDF) (Sept. 2014);
- Consumer Goods Forum Zero Net Deforestation Commitment (2010); and

We created a scorecard by organizing these commitments by themes that reflected the main actions which the MDBs had pledged, so that we could see how the commitments compared to one another. We then selected from these the ones that represented the best practice or highest standard in terms of ensuring the MDBs’ contribution to both the Paris Agreement’s climate goals and the SDGs overall. The themes are:

1. **Investment in Forests**: Investments in/financing for forest conservation and sustainable forest management, at both project and policy levels

2. **Inclusion (Rights & Participation)**: Provides or supports local forest stewards, forest-dwelling and forest-dependent peoples, and their tenure, access, and rights to forests & forest resources; increases sharing of forest benefits, especially for the vulnerable & marginalized and for women and other groups who have traditionally been denied benefits or access or offers skills development, or knowledge preservation or acquisition.

3. **Forest-Smart Interventions/Avoided deforestation**: Promotes or provides for action in other sectors to avoid deforestation and forest degradation, i.e. “forest-smart” policies and programs

4. **Planning/Institutions**: Provides or supports forest planning, research, monitoring, information, awareness, and/or capacity affecting the forest sector to prepare, inform, motivate, and promote investment, inclusion, and avoided deforestation.

5. **Cross-cutting**: Fulfills two or more of the commitment categories above.

Using this framework, we produced an original consolidated list of 37 standards/practices. In the selection process, we sought to ensure that the standards would measure benefits to both people and the planet. This includes, for example, under Investment in Forests: “Increase forest area brought under participatory sustainable management plans.” We then framed the standards as yes/no questions to facilitate assessment, e.g. “Have Bank projects brought forest area under participatory sustainable management plans?” Recognizing that a binary answer will not always be possible, we developed a 0-4 scoring scale, as follows:

0. Not tracked or no disclosed data
1. Info is tracked, but progress is poor, or tracking is limited/insufficient for full assessment
2. Info is tracked, and progress is being made, but below rate needed
3. Good progress, on track to meet target
4. Meets or exceeds proposed target

We then developed targets for each, if not set in the standards themselves. Thus, from the example above, we propose: “Double forest area under participatory & sustainable management plans by 2030.” This aligns with the SDG timeframe, as well as the strategic plans of some MDBs.

International commitments to forest conservation and sustainable forest management are numerous, strong, and widely shared.
WHAT DID WE FIND? — THE GLOBAL COMMITMENTS TO FORESTS

International commitments to forest conservation and sustainable forest management (SFM) are numerous, strong, and widely shared. For example, among the Sustainable Development Goals, while it is not surprising that SDG 15 (to “protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems [and] sustainably manage forests [etc.]”) has at least six targets that directly support forests, several others support additional aspects and attributes of forests.1

Similarly, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets under the Convention on Biological Diversity include many that support forest conservation/SFM. Considering that forests contain 80% of terrestrial biodiversity, this overlap is not surprising, but still noteworthy. For example, Target 5 states: “By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.”

Unsurprisingly, both the New York Declaration on Forests (NYDF) and the UN Strategic Plan for Forests have ambitious goals for forests. It is surprising, though, how comprehensive these are. The NYDF commitments cover 10 different areas, from stopping forest loss and agricultural deforestation, to reducing emissions, to providing for forest finance and governance. The UNSPF groups commitments in six areas, but these are no less comprehensive or ambitious.

More surprisingly, and ambitiously, the Consumer Goods Forum committed in 2010 “to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020 through the responsible sourcing of key commodities – soy, palm oil, paper and pulp, and cattle – so that their sourcing will not deplete tropical rainforests.” According to the CGF, this “has played a key role in galvanizing business commitments to zero deforestation amongst CGF member companies and beyond.”

A notable distinction among these is that while the CGF and Aichi Targets are to be achieved by 2020, the SDGs and UNSPF are to be achieved by 2030. The NYDF straddles these dates, with its goal “to cut natural forest loss in half by 2020, and strive to end it by 2030.” This seems to reflect mostly the different starting points. For the scorecard, most targets are framed for 2030, given we are in 2019, but we do propose earlier or intermediate targets where appropriate.

WHAT DO THE BANKS SAY? — MDBs’ COMMITMENTS TO FORESTS

The forest-related commitments of the MDBs are significant, but more diffuse, given their broader development missions compared to the instruments examined above. Among the four banks examined, the World Bank had the most commitments to forest action, as it is the only one with a formal Forest Action Plan. We have reviewed the World Bank’s performance on its commitments separately. For the regional MDBs, we nonetheless identified a broad range of commitments for each.

African Development Bank

Reviewing AfDB’s 2nd Climate Change Action Plan and Congo Basin Forest Fund Operational Procedures, we identified 36 commitments, of which 15 directly target forests, and the remainder indirectly support forests (e.g., support for clean cook-stoves, reducing demand for fuel wood, or to projects to improve cereal yields, reducing pressure to turn forests into farmland). Of those directly targeting forests, significant ones are:

- increase countries’ capacities to develop and implement policies and legal measures for sustainable forest management;
- implement [...] REDD+, conservation, and sustainable forest management activities...to avoid about 50 million tonnes of CO2[eq.] emissions;
- promote sustainable land-use, forest management, and agro-forestry practices that enhance carbon sequestration through reducing deforestation and land degradation;
- promote appropriate livelihoods compatible with the preservation and protection of the forest ecosystems;
- support [...] development of forestry and land-use policies, such as PPP and benefit sharing.

Taken together, these and broader commitments on climate, such as “to channel 40% of approvals per year by 2020... for climate change activities,” seem to represent a fairly robust forest agenda. Thematically, the greatest focus is on Forest-Smart Interventions/Avoided Deforestation (13 commitments), followed by nine for Investment in Forests, eight for Planning/Institutions, five for Inclusion, and one Cross-Cutting. This distribution seems appropriate in the context of significant deforestation pressures coming from non-forest sectors in Africa.
Asian Development Bank

In ADB’s strategy, we identified 32 forest-relevant commitments or actions, all but two forest-specific (the other two are for increasing climate finance and tackling climate change/enhancing environmental sustainability). The greatest number of these, 15, are in Planning/Institutions; the next most is six, in Cross-cutting. This seems to reflect a deliberate strategy at ADB to focus on “upstream” interventions, at the policy level, rather than directly undertaking forest-related projects.

ADB also differed from the other MDBs in having its own policy commitments in its strategy, such as “The Bank will not support construction of roads in old-growth forests” and “The Bank will not finance any rural infrastructure or other public investment project that contributes significantly, directly or indirectly, to deforestation or to the degradation and depletion of forests.” If fulfilled, these ensure internal alignment of ADB’s efforts inside and outside the forest sector.

Among the MDBs, ADB’s commitments are the most specific. For example, one commitment states that “The Bank’s primary task will be to persuade and help DMC governments to (i) set aside old-growth forests for conservation and watershed protection— in such forests the Bank will not support any commercial logging; and (ii) replace wasteful and destructive logging practices in second-growth forests with those that are sustainable and environmentally sound.” ADB’s commitments also seemed appropriately targeted to the present status of forests in its region.

The one aspect in which ADB’s commitments are lacking is quantitative goals. All goals are relative or qualitative, such as “increased finance,” without reference to specific indicators to track improvement.

Inter-American Development Bank

Surprisingly, given that the Amazon region’s forests are touted as “lungs of our planet,” our review of IDB documents came up with the fewest relevant commitments (20) and the fewest specifically forest-related (8). Even the latter relate more broadly to ecosystems or watersheds; “forests” are not actually specified as an action target. This may be less consequential than one might fear, since forests are so important in the region’s ecosystems and watersheds (thus included by default), but it does invite closer scrutiny on where and how these commitments are implemented.

More positively, IDB’s commitments include actions to

- Increase the financing of climate change-related projects in LAC to 30% by 12/31/20;
- Create co-management regimes for priority ecosystems, recognizing the role of indigenous people as land owners and managers;
- Have valuations of biodiversity and ecosystem services in feasibility analyses, and standardized biodiversity and ecosystem services indicators for project results matrices;
- Design and implement ecosystem-level tools (e.g., spatial or financial) to provide information for management of priority ecosystems; and
- Use positive reinforcement along with law enforcement to encourage effective watershed stewardship.

The absence of any numerical targets except in the first, portfolio-wide one leaves open the question of how effectively these will be implemented and how the IDB will track and measure progress against them. With no data for forest-related outcomes, it is difficult to assess the Bank’s real impact on forests and forest peoples.

Moreover, most of the references to “biodiversity and ecosystem services” assume a role for IDB’s Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Initiative, which is no longer active. This makes it worth asking, what is the institutional channel available to deliver and mainstream all the work related to biodiversity and ecosystems services? That we also drew from IDB’s Office of Evaluation and Oversight (OVE) 2017 Report on “Climate Change and the IDB” is a further indicator that IDB Management has been mostly reactive in adapting the IDB portfolio to serve its members in the face of climate change, and has done what is needed in light of the region’s special responsibility with respect to forest resources both for sustainable development within
the region, and for global sustainability of the climate. The "IDBG Framework for Planning, Preparing, and Financing Sustainable Infrastructure Projects: IDB Sustainable Infrastructure Platform" (May 2018) represents a good framework to ensure sustainable infrastructure projects, but to have a real impact IDB should commit to achieve specific targets for sustainable infrastructure projects to promote and mainstream these in its work.

MDBs’ ALIGNMENT WITH GLOBAL FOREST POLICY

As we sought to identify best practices and highest standards among the MDBs and the global commitments on forests, we found that the source for the greatest proportion of these—about half—was in fact the World Bank.

We find several reasons for this. First, as we are looking at commitments relevant to development finance, it is logical that development finance institutions would have the most relevant commitments. Second, among the MDBs, the World Bank is the largest, and the only one with a current forest action plan. Third, some of the sources we reviewed were broader (e.g., SDGs) and focused elsewhere as their primary target (Aichi/biodiversity, CGF/agricultural commodities). Finally, we were looking for measurable targets, and the World Bank ones fit this criterion to a greater extent than some others.

As to other sources, the UN Strategic Plan for Forests was the next most common, accounting for 20%, and the SDGs and the NY Declaration on Forests about 10% each, with others together accounting for the remaining 10%.

Overall, we did find alignment of the World Bank with other global forest policy commitments.

Among the regional MDBs, ADB had the closest alignment with the global goals; it was the only regional MDB with commitments selected as a best practice/highest standard.

WHAT DO THE DATA SHORTFALLS SHOW? HOW HAVE MDBs PERFORMED?

- **Large gap between MDBs’ commitments and real implementation:** It is likely no surprise that going from commitments on paper to real achievement appears to be the biggest challenge in all the MDBs analyzed. This is true even for the World Bank, the source of roughly half of the global forest policy commitments identified. While we lack most data from the banks, we have reports of the IPCC, SDGs, and NYDF—as well as raging forest fires in Brazil, Indonesia, and elsewhere—as evidence that global goals are not being met. As the institutions best-suited to support regional and global public goods, MDBs share responsibility to lead in this area. At a minimum, they should be implementing and reporting on all of their own forest-related commitments, actions plans, and strategies.

- **Lack of data available to assess MDBs’ own forest performance is a common denominator:** Tracking performance on any commitments, strategies, or action plans on forests appears to challenge the four MDBs analyzed. Aggregated data (above project level) are generally not available. After multiple requests for a quantitative self-assessment from the MDBs, only one attempted to find data, and none provided a completed response.

- **Disconnect between forest teams and Bank leadership:** The absence of data (or of willingness to share it) indicates that there is a disconnect between those leading forest programs and MDBs’ overall leadership and the strategies and action plans they developed to elevate forests in their lending activity. While the World Bank Forest Action Plan makes the case very clearly that forests are a key element of sustainable development, and are especially important for the rural poor, this fact has not swayed the overall direction of the World Bank, and less so its regional counterparts. We found that while the
World Bank has increased forest funding, it has also grown in other sectors, including those likely to cause deforestation such as agriculture, extractives, non-renewable energy, and transport.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

• Despite ambitious global forest commitments, forest investment is falling short, particularly given complexity of managing them in countries with weak institutional capacity: Forests typically cover large geographic areas, are remote from administrative centers, may be interspersed with areas dedicated to other uses, and may cover land that possesses other values, e.g. for mining, grazing, or agriculture. Ensuring the multiple values of forests are respected and balanced against other possible uses requires spatial planning and analysis at early stages of engagement, steps that often are lacking in MDB client countries. Also, any approach that involves conserving and managing forests needs to be addressed from a multi-stakeholder process, i.e. engaging with multiple actors at multiple levels.

• Loans for forest programs tend to be small relative to those for built infrastructure or for those other activities that lead to deforestation: If size matters, the deck is stacked against forests. This is a likely reason that forests have remained relatively neglected despite the strong arguments for their conservation and sustainable management.

WHAT ARE THE SOLUTIONS?

• Apply forest monitoring tools: Along with almost all other sectors, forests are part of the digital revolution. As BIC has reported, forest monitoring tools have multiplied, and are available whether as top-down (satellite), bottom-up (hand-held mobile), or integrated applications. New science and technology have enabled operational forest cover change monitoring almost anywhere. Tools for this provide rigorously validated, methodically consistent, and routine monitoring products that can be relied upon by end-users.

• Integrate forests more in development planning: This is seven recognized in the global policy commitments, roughly a quarter of which address planning and institutions needed for forests to be integrated into sustainable development efforts. Among the regional MDBs, this is most clearly reflected in ADB’s forest-related commitments, of which more than half (15 of 29) fall in the Planning/Institutions category.

A key commitment among the global policies (from SDG 15.9 and the UN Strategic Plan for Forests) that encapsulates this is: “By 2020, integrate forests and related ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts.”

• Redirect climate finance to efforts that integrate forests: All major international organizations as well as countries have clear and measurable commitments and actions to cope with climate change. As Christine Lagarde, then-Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, recently stated “If you don’t have a plan for the environment, you do not have a plan for the economy.”17 Forests should be a key component of the environment plans at the national, regional, and international levels. MDBs need to increase financial incentives for climate change solutions that integrate forests.

• Mainstreaming of forests - consideration of forest impacts by other sectors—is equally critical. As noted in our recent report, World Bank finance for sectors that promote deforestation increased by 70% in 2016-19 compared to 2013-16, the same rate as the growth in “pro-forest” projects. Infrastructure, extractive or agriculture projects that do not protect the environment and the needs of forest-dependent peoples and local communities risk cancelling out the benefits brought by the increased work to protect or sustainably manage forests.

Our vision is that sharing the individual MDB commitments and the global forest policy commitments with each institution will raise awareness of them and desire to fulfill them.

So this planning tool, if the World Bank is using it at all, appears to be deferred for use in countries with development planning happening in 2020.16
HOW FOREST SCORECARDS CAN HELP

If what gets measured gets done, then the absence of aggregated forest data among the MDBs is not a good sign. But this absence is not complete, and one goal of BIC’s “scorecard” exercise is to collect and bring attention to data that exists and stimulate collection of what is missing.

A hopeful sign is the fact that so many of the global best practice standards come from the World Bank. Also hopeful is that at each of the MDBs, there are significant forest-related commitments, and that these are mostly measurable, whether “share of population with access to clean cooking services” in Africa, setting aside of “old-growth forests for conservation and watershed protection” in Asia, or “standardized biodiversity and ecosystem services indicators for project results” in Latin America & the Caribbean.

Our vision is that sharing the individual MDB commitments and the global forest policy commitments with each institution will raise awareness of them and desire to fulfill them, or at least to track those that fit in their larger strategies—as we believe they do, since they are derived mostly from globally agreed goals. As in a forest, these seedlings may take time to mature, but when they do, will offer multiple benefits, just like the forest.

Annex 1:
The Global Forest Policy Commitments Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Standard/Best Practice</th>
<th>Baseline (Initial Assessment) as of 6/30/16</th>
<th>Current &amp; Future (as of 6/30/18 or most recent data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTMENT IN FORESTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase commitments to forests. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased its amount of new commitments to forests?</td>
<td>Has the Bank further increased its amount of new commitments to forests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase # of countries which have implemented forest financing strategies and have a variety of forest financing. (UN)</td>
<td>Does the Bank support countries to implement forest financing strategies and gain a variety of forest financing?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased its support to countries to implement forest financing strategies and gain a variety of forest financing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide adequate incentives to developing countries to advance sustainable forest management, including for conservation &amp; reforestation. (SDG15)</td>
<td>Has the Bank provided adequate incentives to client countries to advance sustainable forest management, including for conservation &amp; reforestation?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased incentives to client countries to achieve sustainable forest management, including conservation &amp; reforestation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase forest area brought under participatory sustainable management plans. (WB)</td>
<td>Have Bank projects brought forest area under participatory sustainable management plans?</td>
<td>Have Bank projects increased forest area under participatory sustainable management plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase forest area restored or re/afforested. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank financed restored or re/afforested degraded areas?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased finance for forest areas restored or re/afforested?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase reforms in forest policy, legislation, or other regulations to enhance transparency and the rule of law, including w/r/t forest ownership. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported reforms in forest policy, legislation, or other regulations to enhance transparency and the rule of law, including w/r/t forest rights?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased support of reforms in forest policy, legislation, or other regulations to enhance transparency and the rule of law, including w/r/t forest rights?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INCLUSION (RIGHTS & PARTICIPATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Forest projects reduce gender inequity and track beneficiaries by gender. (UN, WB)</td>
<td>Have Bank forest projects tracked beneficiaries by gender?</td>
<td>Have Bank forest projects reduced gender inequity among beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Forest projects benefit and track vulnerable and marginalized people, including those in extreme poverty. (UN, WB)</td>
<td>Have forest projects tracked vulnerable and marginalized people, including those in extreme poverty?</td>
<td>Have forest projects benefited vulnerable and marginalized people, including those in extreme poverty, in a targeted manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Increase share of populations w/use or ownership rights recorded, including land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities. (WB, Aichi)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported recording of use or ownership rights, including land tenure, in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities?</td>
<td>Has Bank support increased the recording of use or ownership rights, including land tenure, in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Increase in the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in national plans affecting their territories. (Aichi)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in national plans affecting their territories?</td>
<td>Has Bank support increased the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in national plans affecting their territories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Increase the contribution of forest ecosystem services to social, economic and environmental development, among others. (UN)</td>
<td>Does Bank support contributions of forest ecosystem services to social, economic and environmental development?</td>
<td>Has Bank support increased contributions of forest ecosystem services to social, economic and environmental development?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AVOIDED DEFORESTATION/ FOREST-SMART INTERVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Take urgent and significant action to reduce de-forestation and degradation of natural habitats, halt biodiversity loss and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species. (SDG 15.5)</td>
<td>Has the Bank acted to reduce de-forestation and degradation of natural habitats, halt biodiversity loss and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species?</td>
<td>Has Bank-supported action significantly reduced de-forestation and degradation of natural habitats, halted biodiversity loss and, by 2020, protected and prevented extinction of threatened species?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Support forest solutions at scale through 1) a landscape-based, forest-smart programmatic approach;</td>
<td>Has the Bank undertaken a landscape-based, forest-smart programmatic approach?</td>
<td>Has the Bank required a landscape-based, forest-smart programmatic approach across its portfolio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2) Upstream collaboration across sectors; and 3) ensuring interventions in all sectors (esp. agriculture, transport, mining, and energy) are &quot;forest-smart.&quot; (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank instilled upstream collaboration across sectors, so that interventions in agriculture, infrastructure, and extractives are, or are becoming, “forest-smart?”</td>
<td>Has the Bank achieved upstream collaboration across sectors, so that interventions in all sectors (esp. agriculture, infrastructure, and extractives) are “forest-smart?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Increase GHG emissions avoided; maintain or enhance the world’s forest carbon stocks (or forest carbon sequestered). (WB, UN)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported GHG emissions avoidance by maintaining or enhancing forest carbon stocks/ forest carbon sequestered?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased GHG emissions avoidance by maintaining or enhancing forest carbon stocks/ forest carbon sequestered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Achieve zero net deforestation by 2020; by 2030, end natural forest loss, increase global forest area by 3%, and achieve sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources. (CGF, NYDF, UN, SDG 12.2)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported efforts to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020, reduce natural forest loss, and increase forest area?</td>
<td>Have Bank clients achieved zero net deforestation by 2020, and by 2030, will they end natural forest loss, and increase their forest area by 3%?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Restore 150 million hectares of degraded landscapes and forestlands by 2020 and significantly increase the rate of global restoration thereafter, which would restore at least an additional 200 million hectares by 2030. (NYDF)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported significant restoration of degraded landscapes and forestlands?</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported global restoration of 150 Mln ha. of degraded landscapes &amp; forest-lands by 2020? Has it significantly increased support of global restoration thereafter, to collectively restore an additional 200M ha. by 2030?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Increase the area of forests worldwide designated as protected areas, conserved through other effective area-based conservation, or with reduced fragmentation or degradation. (UN, Aichi)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported forests to be designated as protected areas, be conserved through other effective area-based conservation, or be less fragmented or degraded?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased support for forests to be designated as protected areas, be conserved through other effective area-based conservation, or be less fragmented or degraded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, so as to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development. (SDG 15.4)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, so as to enhance their capacity to provide benefits essential for sustainable development?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased support to conserve mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, and enhanced their capacity to provide benefits essential for sustainable development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Increase proportion of agricultural and aquaculture area under sustainable practices. (WB, Aichi)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported greater agricultural and aquaculture area under sustainable practices?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased support for greater proportion of agricultural and aquaculture area under sustainable practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Strengthen worldwide resilience and adaptive capacity of all types of forests to natural disasters and the impacts of climate change. (UN)</td>
<td>Has the Bank helped strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity of clients’ forests to natural disasters and climate change impacts?</td>
<td>Has the Bank further strengthened resilience and adaptive capacity of clients’ forests to natural disasters and climate change impacts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Increase land area where sustainable land management practices have been adopted. (WB; SDG 15.2, Aichi)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported an Increase in land area where sustainable land management practices have been adopted?</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported a greater Increase in land area where sustainable land management practices have been adopted?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING/INSTITUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>By 2020, integrate forests and related ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts. (SDG 15.9; UN)</td>
<td>Has the Bank helped integrate forests and related ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts?</td>
<td>Has the Bank actively promoted full integration of forests and related ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Systematically collect &amp; track results, generate socio-economic data on forests’ value, and make it accessible. (WB, UN)</td>
<td>Does the Bank collect &amp; track results, generate socio-economic data on forests’ value, and make it accessible?</td>
<td>Does the Bank systematically collect &amp; track results, generate timely socio-economic data on forests’ value, and make it all accessible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Coherent, consistent, and coordinated national and subnational forest-related policies and programs, that engage relevant stakeholders &amp; IPLCs, fully recognize the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. (UN 5.3)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported forest-related policies and programs that have engaged relevant stakeholders &amp; IPLCs and fully recognized the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased support for forest-related policies and programs that engage relevant stakeholders &amp; IPLCs and fully recognize the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Results monitoring at two levels: (i) improving capacity to monitor, report, and evaluate impacts of forest-relevant interventions and (ii) supporting client countries to build forest monitoring/reporting systems. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank helped clients with (i) capacity to monitor, report, and evaluate impacts of forest-relevant interventions, and (ii) forest monitoring/reporting systems?</td>
<td>Has the Bank’s help resulted in clients with (i) capacity to monitor, report, and evaluate impacts of forest-relevant interventions, and (ii) functional forest monitoring/reporting systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Increase and sustain innovative solutions for forest-based low-carbon development; forests become an integral part of national development agendas. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported innovative solutions for forest-based low-carbon development with forests as part of national development agendas?</td>
<td>Has Bank support resulted in forest-based low-carbon development with forests as an integral part of national development agendas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Develop at least 10 climate-smart agriculture investment plans. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported climate-smart agriculture investment plans?</td>
<td>Has the Bank support for climate-smart agriculture investment plans resulted in them being adopted &amp; implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Measure climate outcomes from projects. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank measured and reported climate outcomes from projects?</td>
<td>Is Bank measurement and reporting of climate outcomes from projects required, where applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Support countries to translate their NDCs into climate actions, and to mainstream climate considerations into policies and budgets. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank supported countries to develop their NDCs and translate them into climate actions, and to mainstream climate considerations into policies and budgets?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased support for countries to translate NDCs into climate actions, and to mainstream climate considerations into policies and budgets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Government institutions provided with capacity building support to improve management of forest resources. (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank provided governments with capacity building support to improve management of forest resources?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased capacity building support to improve governments’ management of forest resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROSS-CUTTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Support / help meet the private-sector goal of eliminating deforestation from the production of agricultural commodities such as palm oil, soy, paper and beef products by no later than 2020. Also support NDC priority actions linked to AFOLU. (CGF, NYDF, WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank helped advance the private-sector goal of eliminating deforestation from the production of agricultural commodities, or supported NDC priority actions linked to AFOLU?</td>
<td>Has the Bank’s help significantly advanced the private-sector goal of eliminating deforestation from the production of agricultural commodities, or resulted in NDC priority actions linked to AFOLU being achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Enhance &amp; increase rewards for countries and jurisdictions that, in pursuing forest-smart development, reduce forest emissions—especially through public policies to scale up payments for verified emission reductions (VERs) and deforestation-free sourcing of commodities via long-term engagements. (NYDF, UN, WB)</td>
<td>Have Bank programs rewarded countries and jurisdictions that, in pursuing forest-smart development, effectively reduce forest emissions?</td>
<td>Have Bank programs increased rewards for countries and jurisdictions that, in pursuing forest-smart development, reduce forest emissions with sustainably financed payments for VERs and deforestation-free sourcing of commodities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Strengthen forest governance, transparency and the rule of law, while also empowering communities and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples, especially those pertaining to their lands and resources. (NYDF)</td>
<td>Have Bank programs strengthened forest governance, transparency and the rule of law, while also empowering communities and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples, especially those pertaining to their lands and resources?</td>
<td>Have Bank programs achieved good forest governance, transparency and the rule of law, while also empowering communities and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples, especially those pertaining to their lands and resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Strengthen input of stakeholders in implementing the UN Strategic Plan for Forests, or forest-related SDGs, Aichi Targets, or NDCs. (UN)</td>
<td>Has the Bank strengthened input of stakeholders in implementing NDCs or forest-related SDGs or other global forest targets?</td>
<td>Has the Bank ensured robust stakeholder input for all projects implementing NDCs or forest-related SDGs or other global forest targets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Priority actions are to A. (i) protect &amp; optimize the management of natural forests, (ii) encourage sustainable plantations and tree planting, and (iii) support sustainable forest value chains (for timber and NTFPs). (WB)</td>
<td>Has the Bank (i) protected &amp; optimized the management of natural forests, (ii) encouraged sustainable plantations and tree planting, and (iii) supported sustainable forest value chains (for timber and NTFPs)?</td>
<td>Has the Bank expanded efforts to (i) protected &amp; optimized the management of natural forests, (ii) encouraged sustainable plantations and tree planting, and (iii) supported sustainable forest value chains (for timber &amp; NTFPs)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Additional Priority actions are to B. promote forest-smart interventions in other sectors such as agriculture, transport, energy, and extractives. (WB/CCAP)</td>
<td>Has the Bank promoted forest-smart interventions in other sectors such as agriculture, transport, energy, and extractives?</td>
<td>Has the Bank increased clients’ forest-smart interventions in other sectors such as agriculture, transport, energy, and extractives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2:
PROPOSED FOREST TARGETS/INDICATORS

These targets and indicators are based on an assessment of what is needed to achieve or to be consistent with related global goals and targets, such as those of the Sustainable Development Goals (including poverty eradication) and UNFCCC (including limiting global warming to a maximum of 2 degrees Celsius). Given the SDGs’ and the UN Strategic Plan for Forests’ targets for achievement by 2030, we have used that as a default for longer term goals, and rates of growth to achieve doubling by that date if no other relevant benchmark is available.

Note: If not otherwise stated, change is relative to WBG FY 2016, or for a multi-year period, to the years before and including FY 2016 (e.g. a 5-yr average is relative to FY 2012-16). WBG FY 2016 is set as the baseline as it coincides with the launch of the WBG Forest Action Plan and of the SDGs.

INVESTMENT IN FORESTS

1. MDB [own] commitments to forests increase by 15% in value by FY2020 and by 45% by FY2030 relative to FY2016 (or FY15-17 avg.) baseline

2. 97% of borrower countries by 2030 [WB: avg. 10/year; RMDBs: avg. 7% of RMCs/year] have improved forest finance strategies & access.

3. Increase commitments to sustainable forest management, including for conservation & reforestation, by avg. 7%/year (nominal $; 5% real) to 2030, then maintain that level.

4. Double forest area under participatory & sustainable management plans by 2030. WB: at least 3 new participatory sustainable management plans/year supported [RMDBs: at least 1] OR at least 5% annual increase in Borrowers’ forest area under such plans.

5. Double forest area restored or re/afforested by 2030. WB: at least 3 new forest restoration/ re- or afforestation projects/year [RMDBs: at least 1] OR at least 5% annual increase in Borrowers’ forest area restored or re-/afforested.

6. Double forest area having policy, legislative, or regulatory reforms implemented by 2030. WB: at least 3 reforms/year [RMDBs: at least 1] OR at least 5% avg. annual increase in such area.

INCLUSION (RIGHTS & PARTICIPATION)

7. Forest projects benefit women proportionate to their a) dependence on forests for their livelihoods or households OR b) presence in the (project -targeted) community.

8. Forest projects target poor, vulnerable, and marginalized forest-dependent people to improve their livelihoods and/or tenure security, whenever they are in a project-affected area, in 50% of such cases by 2020 and 100% by 2030.

9. Double by 2030 the population and land area with secure land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities in at least six countries. WB: at least 3 countries; RMDBs: at least 1 each.

10. By 2030, 100% of indigenous and local communities have full and effective participation (including FPIC) in national plans affecting their territories. WB: support for this in at least 3 countries; RMDBs: at least 1 each.

11. By 2030, double the portfolio of projects in which forest ecosystem services are managed so as improve to social, economic, and environmental development, including for poor, vulnerable, indigenous, and local communities.

AVOIED DEFORESTATION/ FOREST-SMART INTERVENTIONS

12. By 2020, MDBs increase by 20% (relative to FY16) # and value of actions to reduce deforestation and degradation of all natural habitats, and ensure all high conservation value (HCV or equivalent) areas affected by projects have effective protection.

13. By 2030, area/population benefitting from landscape-based, forest-smart programmatic approaches [in WB/MDB programs] is doubled.

14. By 2030, 100% of WB/MDB financing is “forest-smart” [forest sustainability explicitly addressed in project].

15. By 2030, double GHG emissions avoided and forest carbon stocks enhanced by/in WB/MDB projects.

16. Zero net deforestation from WB/ MDB projects by 2020; by 2030, WB/MDB projects cause no natural forest loss, and increase global forest area by 3%.

17. By 2020, MDBs support restoration of 75 million hectares [WB: 30M; RMDBs: 15M ea.] of degraded landscapes and forestlands and at least an additional 100 million hectares [WB: 40M; RMDBs: 20M ea.] by 2030.

18. By 2030, double the area of forests in projects newly designated as protected areas, conserved through other effective area-based conservation, or with significantly reduced fragmentation or degradation.
19. By 2030, double [2026-30 vs. 2016-20] the project area of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, conserved.

20. By 2030, double [2026-30 vs. 2016-20] agricultural area under sustainable practices [e.g. (i) hybrid seeds; (ii) carbon capture for major crops; (iii) high-efficiency irrigation; (iv) livestock productivity increases / emission reductions; (v) resilient supply chains; (vi) renewable energy for agribusiness (e.g., solar and biogas); and (vii) early risk assessment & management, including using insurance products] supported by MDB projects.


**PLANNING/INSTITUTIONS**

23. By 2020, WB/MDBs integrate forests & related ecosystem and biodiversity values into national planning/ diagnostics and country partnership/ poverty reduction strategies [for all new relevant plans/strategies].

24. WB/MDBs report socio-economic data on forests’ value for each country w/forest sector intervention. By 2020, min. one-third Borrower countries; by 2030, all countries.

25. WB/MDBs support forest policies and programs that engage relevant stakeholders & IPLCs and fully recognize the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. By 2020, WB in 10 countries; RMDBs in 3 countries each. By 2030, WB in 30 countries; RMDBs in 9 countries each.

26. # of countries benefitting from support for forest monitoring/ reporting systems. By 2020, WB in 10 countries; RMDBs in 3 countries each. By 2030, WB in 30 countries; RMDBs in 9 countries each.

27. %/# of countries where WB/MDBs support forests as an integral part of national development agendas. By 2020, 20% of client countries have forests integrated (WB: 15 IDA/blend, 13 IBRD); by 2030, 60% of countries do so (WB: 45 IDA/blend and 41 IBRD).

28. # of climate-smart agriculture investment plans adopted; WB: at least 10 by 2020 and 30 by 2030; RMDBs: 3 each by 2020, 9 each by 2030.

29. % of climate projects reporting climate-related outcomes. By 2020, 50% of MDB climate projects report climate- related outcomes; by 2030, 100%.

30. %/# of client countries w/MDB support for NDCs translated into climate actions, and/or climate considerations into policies and budgets. By 2020, 20% of client countries have such MDB support (WB: 15 IDA/blend and 13 IBRD); by 2030, 60% of countries do so (WB: 45 IDA/blend and 41 IBRD).

31. % of client countries receiving capacity building support to improve management of forest resources. At least 7% (WB=10) by 2020, 21% (WB=30) by 2030.

**CROSS-CUTTING**

32. # of ag commodities/% of client countries for which MDB support results in reduction of deforestation rate or achievement of AFOLU goal in NDC. Commodity-induced defor rate reduced by 50% by 2020 (for relevant commodity/ies in each country w/project; min. 6 countries- WB 3, RMDBs 1 ea.), by 100% by 2030 (ditto & min. 18 countries- 9 WB, RMDBs 3 ea.); 20% of country AFOLU goals supported by 2020, 60% by 2030.

33. Raise # and scale of policies increasing payments for verified forest emission reductions and/or defor-free sourcing of commodities via long-term engagements in 20% of client countries (WB: 15 IDA/blend, 13 IBRD) by 2020 and in 60% of countries (WB: 45 IDA/blend, 41 IBRD) by 2030.

34. %/# of countries for which MDB projects have strengthened forest governance, transparency and the rule of law, while also empowering communities and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples, especially those pertaining to their lands and resources. At least 7% (WB=10) by 2020, 21% (WB=30) by 2030.

35. %/# of countries for which MDB support strengthens input of stakeholders in achieving national or international forest goals. At least 7% (WB=10) by 2020, 21% (WB=30) by 2030.

36. By 2030, MDBs double support to (i) protect & optimize the management of natural forests, (ii) encourage sustainable plantations and tree planting, and (iii) support sustainable forest value chains (timber and NTFPs).

37. By 2030, MDBs double support to promote forest-smart interventions in other sectors such as agriculture, transport, energy, and extractives, by 15% by FY2020 and by 45% by FY2030 relative to FY2016 (or FY15-17 avg.) baseline.
The UN Strategic Plan for Forests includes six goal areas:

1. Reverse the loss of forest cover worldwide, with targets to “increase area by 3% worldwide.”
2. Maintain or enhance the world’s forests and associated carbon stocks, and “implement sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.”
3. Increase significantly the area of protected forests worldwide.
4. Mobilize significantly increased, new and additional financial resources [for SFM].
5. Enhance both ecological and social resilience to climate change
6. Improve health & recreation!

The need to re-plant/restore forests has been internationally recognized by countries committed to the Bonn Challenge, a global effort to bring 150 million hectares of deforested and degraded land into restoration by 2020 and 350 million hectares by 2030. As of end-June 2019, 170.4 million hectares have been pledged in 59 separate commitments with potential climate benefit of 15.66 Gt of CO2 sequestered. These include 21M ha. from India and 12M ha. from Brazil. However, as NYDF has documented, only 26.7M ha., 18% of the 2020 goal, has been realized.

As reported in Applications of Forest Monitoring Tools for Development Projects (BIC, March 2019), forests:

- Are dependent on by 1.6 billion people globally as sources for building, buildings, medicine, and food (Waisq & Ahmad, 2004)
- Generate billions of dollars in revenues (building materials, pharmaceuticals, paper)
- Contain 80% of terrestrial biodiversity
- Store 45% of the world’s terrestrial carbon (Bonan, 2014)
- Influence availability and quality of freshwater (Perlis, 2007)
- Enhance both ecological and social resilience to climate change
- Improve health & recreation!


Some derive from the overlap itself, e.g. Aichi Target 3 mandates that “positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied;” forests being the home of so much biodiversity means this applies to forests.

Some other Aichi Targets are:

- Target 7 states: “By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.”
- Target 14 states in part “By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services...are restored and safeguarded”—relevant since forests provide many such services.
- Target 15 provides that “by 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration.”

The UN Strategic Plan for Forests includes:

- 1st, “Reverse the loss of forest cover worldwide,” with targets to “increase forest area by 3% worldwide.”
- “Maintain or enhance the world’s forest carbon stocks,” and “[implement] sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.”
- 2nd: “Enhance forest-based economic, social and environmental benefits, including by improving the livelihoods of forest dependent people.”
- 3rd: “Increase significantly the area of protected forests worldwide...”
- 4th: “Mobilize significantly increased, new and additional financial resources [for SFM]"
• 5th: “Promote governance frameworks to implement SFM...”

• 6th: “Enhance cooperation, coordination, coherence and synergies on forest-related issues...”

10 CGF further reports: “More recently, on 16 March 2017, the twelve largest global chocolate and cocoa companies committed to working together, pre-competitively, to end deforestation and forest degradation in the cocoa supply chain, an initiative which was convened and supported by the World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), The Prince’s International Sustainability Unit (ISU) and IDH (the Sustainable Trade Initiative).” One effective tool for ending deforestation in supply chains more broadly, per CGF, is “the development of Production, Protection and Inclusion (PPI) compacts. These are agreements between public, private and civil society parties to enhance productive land and secure livelihoods in exchange for forest protection. These compacts are based on participatory land use planning.”

11 There is, of course, room for improvement. While it is good that AfDB has set some numerical targets, as in “of the Bank’s planned investments (2016-2020) towards climate finance, approximately 15% will be invested in climate-smart agriculture, forestry, water resource management, and the social sectors which have clear adaptation benefits for African people,” the percentage could be increased. Even if AfDB achieves 40% of its approvals going to climate action, 15% of that is only 6% of the total portfolio going to CSA, forestry, etc., which is unlikely to achieve impact at scale.

12 Most detailed of all among ADB’s commitments is this (included as cross-cutting, since it relates to avoided deforestation, planning, and inclusion):

  With respect to the sustainable management of second-growth forests, the Bank will promote
  (i) the establishment of permanent forest estates in accessible second-growth forests for sustained timber management, including their utilization in major forest industries;
  (ii) the use of appropriate pricing mechanisms to ensure better timber management on these estates;
  (iii) concession management reforms by providing long-term tenure to private sector entrepreneurs selected through competitive bidding;
  (iv) the introduction and adherence to sustained-yield principles and related management approaches as an alternative to destructive/illegal logging;
  (v) involvement of forest-dwelling and/or forest-dependent communities, including the traditional mangrove users in the rehabilitation, enrichment planting, and assisted natural regeneration in second-growth forests through community-based forest management agreements that will include improved land tenure and other incentives as appropriate;
  (vi) the use of internationally accepted “certification of origin” for wood marketed as originating from sustainably managed forests; and
  (vii) the establishment of small-scale industries based on non-wood forest products as a long-term measure for reducing poverty, providing rural employment, and developing rural areas.

13 For example, ADB pledges that “The Bank will actively pursue protection and rehabilitation of degraded forestlands in its DMCs.” Its commitments also recognize the commercial pressures on forests and proper responses: “ADB will encourage establishment of fast-growing, high-yielding industrial and fuelwood tree plantations in selected degraded forests and grasslands....ADB will also support efficiency in harvesting and delivery systems in plantations project and in fuelwood use.”

14 The first chapter (pp. 3-13) of the Forest Action Plan is entitled “Contributions to Sustainable Development,” followed by sections entitled “Forest Provide Pathways out of Poverty,” “Forests Mitigate Climate Change and Strengthen Resilience,” “Forests Support Jobs and Wealth Creation,” and “Forests Provide Ecosystem Services that Sustain Economies.” The summary (p. 3) states in part:

  Forests sustain the livelihoods of millions of people, provide a promising pathway out of poverty, and contribute significantly to national economies. Forests also offer essential ecosystem services that support various economic sectors and contribute to ecological resilience and stabilization of the global climate system. However, the global extent of forests has continued to decline. ...Concerted action is needed if society is to make long-lasting use of global forest resources for poverty eradication and sustainable economic development, and protect the global forest estate for future generations.

According to the Forest Action Plan (p. 52):

  The Systematic Country Diagnostic (SCD) and Country Partnership Framework (CPF) instruments offer ideal platforms to identify the challenges and opportunities related to forests in a strategic and integrated manner within the WBG and with country counterparts upstream in the programming process. The Environment and Natural Resources GP, which leads the work on forests, is committed to the preparation of Country Forest Notes. These succinct but comprehensive notes will present the status of forests and provide options to minimize trade-offs by assessing the potential adverse impacts of sector investments on natural forests, but also by highlighting the opportunities for improved land use management, notably through restoration.

15 On a more positive note, the World Bank also committed to help produce REDD+ Strategies for 50 countries; while these are focused more particularly on reducing deforestation, they are also intended as part of national planning. This appears on track, thanks to work of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund.

16 On a more positive note, the World Bank also committed to help produce REDD+ Strategies for 50 countries; while these are focused more particularly on reducing deforestation, they are also intended as part of national planning. This appears on track, thanks to work of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund.
