

**United Nations' 2015 International Day of Forests
Theme: "Forests / Climate / Change".**



What change?



World Rainforest Movement

United Nations' 2015 International Day of Forests Theme:

“Forests / Climate / Change”

What change?



A briefing of the World Rainforest Movement (WRM)

Introduction

Forests are vitally important for human communities that depend on them not only for food but also for spiritual sustenance. As an indigenous leader from the Amazon region in Latin America says: *"We have many customs, many beliefs and many traditions directly related to the forests, the air, water, the earth and the sun in a very profound and respectful unique cosmological spiritual relationship"*.¹

But for years, many communities all over the world have experienced the destruction of their forests. A woman from a community in Africa where forests are being cleared to make way for industrial oil palm plantations complains: *"Our children will not know anything about forests. We are going to lose the medicines we get from the forests. We will be more vulnerable to [violent] storms. We will have nowhere to plant our food crops"*.² The replacement of forests by monocultures represents an enormous loss to the community and can often lead to hunger. An Asian peasant says: *"Before the [industrial] plantation, 100 hectares of farmland and forest would support hundreds of families; but now, thousands of hectares are given to just one company which does not even feed one entire family."* In the light of this, what has the UN to say on the occasion of celebrating the **International Day of Forests** on March 21, 2015, a date designated by the UN and promoted by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)?

According to FAO's webpage, the theme for the International Day of Forests this year is *"Forests / Climate / Change"*. A one-minute promotional video is part of the informational material. We imagined the video would begin by talking about forests; it does not. The video begins by talking about the problem of climate change. A number of celebrities appear on it, declaring that the climate crisis is the biggest problem of our time. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon says: *"Climate change is a defining issue of our age."* Only after these statements the video actually starts talking about forests; however, it first highlights that forest destruction contributes to the climate crisis: *"Over 500 million hectares of forest [were] burnt in the last decade"*. *"Forests trap carbon as they grow, and store it in the wood and soil,"* the video goes on, emphasizing the role of forests in mitigating climate change. "Sustainable forest management" for wood extraction is also presented as having a positive effect on climate: *"When the wood is used, the carbon stays locked inside it,"* followed by the exclamation: *"SUSTAINABLE!"* The final message of the video is: *"Sustainably managed forests are the frontline against climate change."*³

The UN's message appears rather confusing. Why does it emphasise a view of forests as only a means of "storage" to "trap" carbon, ignoring the other important functions of forests and their vital importance for the communities that depend on them? Why does the UN ignore the main cause of the climate crisis, which is the continuing and constantly increase of CO₂ emissions from burning fossil fuels? What lies behind the solution FAO suggests for deforestation when it recommends "sustainably managed forests," combining carbon storage in wood with economic use of the same wood, based on the statement that *"when the wood is used, the carbon stays locked inside it"*? Finally, does calling an area where timber

¹ Declaration by Ninawá Inu Pareira Nunes, an indigenous leader of the Huni Kui people from the state of Acre in the northern Amazon region of Brazil.

² <http://wrm.org.uy/es/libros-e-informes/uncertain-futures-the-impacts-of-sime-darby-on-communities-in-liberia/>

³ <http://www.fao.org/news/audio-video/detail-video/en/?uid=11001>

extraction is practised a "sustainable forest" not turns a blind eye to the impacts of logging on the thousands of interdependent webs of life present in forests and its harmful effects on the "profound and respectful cosmological spiritual relationship" that forest-dwelling communities enjoy as their way of life?

A brief overview of proposed "solutions" to overcome deforestation since the Rio 92 Earth Summit

To begin to understand FAO's message on the occasion of the International Day of Forests, it is worth reviewing some of the main ideas put forward and discussed internationally since 1992 to stop the rainforest deforestation crisis: (1) sustainable forest management, (2) the REDD+ mechanism⁴, that is, to economically quantify and value the capacity of forests to fix and store carbon and (3) the different "zero deforestation" proposals launched recently. Common to all of them is the fact that they were prepared without considering the opinions or participation of forest-dependent people, settlements or communities. These proposals were imposed in a top-down way, in most cases creating further problems for the people and communities where these "solutions" were applied.

Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) was introduced as a "solution" to rainforest deforestation in the late 1980s and was presented at the international level during the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. SFM was identified as a key strategy to achieve "*positive social and economic benefits without compromising tropical forest ecosystem functioning*". The idea was put forward by timber companies, multilateral banks such as the World Bank, and large conservation NGOs. It is a response to the negative impact of forest devastation as a consequence of logging.

In practice, so-called "sustainable" selective logging promoted by SFM allowed the continuation of logging—an inherently destructive activity now being presented as positive—with the promise of "keeping forests standing".⁵ It is not surprising that the promise of preserving forests has not been kept. Despite an increase in areas under SFM throughout rainforest regions worldwide, deforestation has also increased. In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), for example, the same companies that endorsed SFM were responsible for the highest levels of deforestation. Forestry certification schemes, such as the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) seal, have further reinforced the economic importance of SFM.

In Brazil, particularly in Amazonian states like Acre, the idea of "standing forests" became a model to follow. But this does not mean that deforestation has ceased; on the contrary. With the support of the National Economic and Social Development Bank (BNDES, for the

⁴ REDD is the acronym for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation. It was launched in 2005 at one of the annual UN climate conferences. REDD+ was launched in 2009 and expands the scope of REDD to include the following items: "conservation of forest carbon stocks", "sustainable forest management" and "enhancement of forest carbon stocks". This means that any forested area where it is proposed to maintain a "standing forest" can qualify for REDD+ financing, even if there are plans to extract wood under "sustainable management", which continues to destroy the forest, albeit somewhat more gradually. Alternatively, projects to "regenerate" forest areas by planting monocultures with species like eucalyptus, even transgenic varieties, can qualify as REDD+ projects. Furthermore, natural parks or conservation areas that blame local people for causing deforestation are also included under the REDD+ umbrella.

⁵ <http://wrm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/forests-plunder-discourse-of-sustainability-hides-destruction-caused-by-logging/>

Portuguese acronym), there are big incentives to encourage "sustainable forest management" and even "community SFM" based on timber extraction activities. In conversations held with rubber extracting communities in the state of Acre who were encouraged to adopt "sustainable management" and commercially extract high-value timber, it was clear to these rubber producers —whose knowledge of forests is extensive— that this practice also leads to forest devastation. Destruction just takes place somewhat more gradually, without any significant benefit for local communities. It is the timber companies and the consultancy firms involved who effectively benefit.⁶

Concern over rainforests and deforestation diminished in the international agenda since the early 2000s. The situation changed with the launch of the Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (**REDD**) initiative at a 2005 conference on climate change. Like SFM, REDD promised positive outcomes for the communities that conserve forests. However, REDD, later REDD+, did not provide a solution but instead caused these communities more problems. A WRM report of 2015 provides a systematic analysis of 24 REDD+ projects carried out on different continents in recent years and discusses their impacts on local communities.⁷ The report shows that these projects, as well as national plans to promote REDD+, attribute the main cause of deforestation to the practices of forest-dwelling communities, especially food growing. The communities living in areas covered by REDD+ projects are now being subjected to restrictions on forest use which interfere in their way of life and reinforce a "conservationist" view of forests, that is, the idea that a well-conserved forest is a forest without people in it. After 10 years of REDD+ and some billions of US dollars in investments, this mechanism has proved to be not only a false solution to the climate crisis, but is also clearly incapable of combating the real direct and underlying causes of deforestation.

Zero Deforestation: What would be wrong with that?

The third trend that is being emphasized more recently, **Zero Deforestation**, looks promising at first glance.

Launched in Brazil in 2007, the new idea to solve deforestation incorporated some of the previous "solutions", like that of "keeping forests standing" and trying to sell "ecosystem services"⁸ such as carbon. Brazil has the largest rainforest area in the world and it also has the highest rate of deforestation. A group of nine NGOs, including Conservation International (CI), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Greenpeace and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) launched a proposal to reduce deforestation to zero in Brazil by 2015. The NGOs applied for funding of one billion Brazilian reals (around US\$ 300 million) per year "to provide financial compensation to those effectively reducing deforestation" in the Amazon region. It was striking that the president of BNDES, Luciano Coutinho, was present at the launch of the campaign. BNDES is Brazil's state development bank, financing a large part of the works

⁶ <http://worm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/brazil-voices-of-local-communities-in-acre-denounce-violations-in-community-based-sustainable-forest-management/>

⁷ <http://worm.org.uy/books-and-briefings/redd-a-collection-of-conflicts-contradictions-and-lies/>

⁸ "Ecosystem services" is a term used when the functions of nature are artificially defined and converted into comparable units of "carbon", "biodiversity", "water filtering", "pollination", etc.; subsequently they are measured and traded as "certificates" that represent the service. See <http://worm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/pes-turns-into-permission-for-environmental-shattering/>

and companies that directly contribute to deforestation nationwide, such as large hydroelectric plants, mining and soy and meat agribusinesses. Rather than announcing that such financing would be stopped—something that could indeed lead to a reduction of deforestation—the president of BNDES said on that occasion that they *“are here to offer determined support to this programme that makes feasible the end of deforestation in the Amazon, by developing funds that can substantially contribute to activities that keep forests standing.”* He was probably referring to the policies of the Brazilian federal and state governments, like that of Acre, aimed at promoting “sustainable forest management,” and at the same time providing incentive mechanisms for the sale of ecosystem services, like REDD+. No wonder, then, that Greenpeace announced that the one billion Brazilian reals a year needed for “zero deforestation” would also be used *“to pay for forest environmental services”*.⁹

In the following years, other initiatives inspired on the Brazilian model and promoted by the international NGOs involved emerged with the same name around the world. These, however, were directly announced by large private companies, notorious for their responsibility for extensive rainforest deforestation. In 2011, the African palm company Golden Agri Resources declared that it would stop destroying rainforests. Two years later, the largest African palm oil production company in the world, Wilmar, announced its zero deforestation policy. Asian Pulp and Paper (APP), one of the major pulp wood plantation companies in Indonesia, announced, also in 2013, that it would end deforestation practices among its suppliers, in addition to improving communication and conflict resolution with the communities depending on the forests.¹⁰ APP, together with APRIL, another large company promoting pulp wood plantations in Indonesia, has been accused of deforesting nearly 2 million hectares of forests, in the province of Riau on the island of Sumatra alone.¹¹ In 2014, agribusiness giants like Bunge and Cargill joined the growing list of large companies committed to zero deforestation.

There are so many initiatives that Forest Trends—an international alliance of corporations, financial institutions, governments and NGOs—together with the WWF and others, will launch on March 25, 2015, the initiative “Supply Change”. They state that the webpage of this initiative *“will provide up-to-the-minute accounting of corporate actions on deforestation relative to the public pledges [of the companies]”*.¹²

The New York Declaration on Forests: Linking climate with forests

An announcement made in September 2014 drew worldwide attention: the New York Declaration on Forests, launched on the occasion of the UN Climate Summit.¹³ The declaration announced a commitment *“to cut natural forest loss in half by 2020, and strive to end it by 2030”*, backed by nearly all the organizations and corporations mentioned above which had previously committed themselves to “zero deforestation”.

⁹ <http://www.greenpeace.org/brasil/pt/Noticias/pacto-nacional-prop-e-metas-an/>

¹⁰ <http://news.mongabay.com/news-index/zero%20deforestation%20commitments1.html>

¹¹ <http://wrm.org.uy/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/EJOLTplantations.pdf>

¹² <http://www.forest-trends.org/>

¹³ <http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/09/FORESTS-New-York-Declaration-on-Forests.pdf>

But while the declaration talks of eliminating deforestation from the commodity and consumer goods production chains, it does not make any mention of the problem underlying the current production and consumption model. This model is the driver of the demand created by excessive and growing consumption by a minority of the world population, concentrated in large urban centres and mainly in countries in the northern hemisphere. Neither does it address the fact that it is impossible to universalize such a high standard of consumption, since there are not enough "natural resources" to achieve this. The declaration does not make any reference on how to effectively reduce deforestation if the current model is maintained and expanded. For example, a study by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) envisages a scenario of increased global consumption of minerals, ores, fossil fuels and biomass by three-fold to 140 billion tonnes by 2050. Much of these resources are located in rainforest regions.¹⁴

The New York Declaration does state that "*forests represent one of the largest, most cost-effective climate solutions available today*". The declaration also makes positive mention of different programmes aimed at promoting the "ecosystem service" of the carbon storage of wood, or REDD+, and says that these programmes "*have generated knowledge and experiences to advance the REDD+ agenda*".

Have the commitments to "zero deforestation" borne fruit?

One feature common to all the commitments undertaken by companies, and large NGOs, as well as those in the New York Declaration on Forests, is that they are voluntary commitments. The non-binding character of these commitments means that there are no effective results to be shown. However, there are plenty of denunciations about environmental and social violations of the companies after undertaking these commitments. One example is that of Wilmar and its actions in Uganda, where the expansion of its oil palm plantations led to the displacement of peasant farmers. After three years of unsuccessful attempts to establish dialogue with the government and the company, in February 2015, the affected peasant farmers decided to file a lawsuit against the company to seek justice.¹⁵ Another example is that of APP. In late February 2015, an activist from a peasants' organization was murdered in the province of Jambi in Sumatra, Indonesia, by security forces hired by the PT WKS company, one of APP's suppliers. This took place within a context of a long history of violence exercised against the communities that have resisted the appropriation of their lands by PT WKS.¹⁶ The examples of Wilmar and APP show that the fact that companies have little direct responsibility for their local production standards poses serious difficulties for the analysis of results. Wilmar, for example, has no less than 800 suppliers producing crude African palm oil in different countries, mainly in Indonesia.

To address this difficulty, Wilmar announced in January 2015 that it would adopt a dashboard using satellite imaging to monitor each of its suppliers.¹⁷ Will such monitoring lead to fast local responses, and will these be capable of halting destruction and restoring already destroyed areas? Another disturbing issue concerning monitoring, which also affects the

¹⁴ <http://wrm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/a-brief-overview-of-deforestation-in-tropical-forests/>

¹⁵ <http://www.foeeurope.org/uganda-palm-oil-court-land-grab-190215>

¹⁶ ¹⁶ <http://www.walhi.or.id>

¹⁷ <http://news.mongabay.com/2015/0122-wilmar-transparency-dashboard.html>

credibility of voluntary certification schemes like the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO),¹⁸ is the tendency to protect against deforestation only forests that are considered of "High Conservation Value (HCV)". The problem is that the assessment of a forest as of "HCV" does not necessarily reflect the views of local communities, a fact that obviously leads to widely differing conclusions as to whether zero deforestation has been achieved or not. According to a leader of the Muara Tae community in Indonesia, whose lands were invaded and partially destroyed by an African palm company, "*HCV assessment is only to survey certain areas and only protects those areas, based on their own desires. As for us here, all of the territory of Muara Tae has a high value. The forests in Muara Tae's territory all have great potential. Besides that, they really belong to the community. The territory of Muara Tae is our daily source of livelihood. For farming, for vegetable gardens. So if you want to find high value, all of Muara Tae has value.*"¹⁹

Returning to the Wilmar company, even with the most sophisticated satellite system to detect deforestation, it has not announced a permanent system for the control of suppliers' compliance with other commitments that are part of its socio-environmental responsibility policy. How will Wilmar manage to prevent exploitative labour conditions and social conflicts in its production chain?²⁰ And how will it deal with countless existing disputes over land property between companies and communities in Indonesia and other countries where it has operations?

From "zero deforestation" to "zero net deforestation": A subtle, yet key difference

It is striking that the New York Declaration on Forests includes the phrase "*cut natural forest loss in half.*" Is there another type of forest other than natural forests?

In the view of forest-dependent communities, there is not. But for the UN, corporations and large NGOs like WWF, CI and TNC, which are among the signatories of the New York Declaration, non-natural forests exist. They are large-scale monoculture plantations of eucalyptus, acacia, rubberwood or pine trees supplying the pulp and paper industry, tire manufacturers, timber production, etc.²¹ These bodies use the FAO definition of forests as, basically, a collection of trees irrespective of variety and scale, thus opening up a wide range of opportunities for attaining the "zero deforestation" goal stated in the New York Declaration. In the 2000-2010 decade alone, the area defined by FAO as "planted forests" increased by 50 million hectares worldwide, comprising mainly large-scale monocultures of eucalyptus, acacia, rubberwood and pine trees for industrial purposes, with serious negative impacts on local communities. The emphasis on forests being viewed as carbon "storage" services implies that industrial tree monocultures are assessed and valued for their potential to

¹⁸ Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) is the main certification scheme for industrial oil palm plantations. www.rspo.org

¹⁹ <http://worm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/indonesia-how-rspo-addressed-concerns-raised-against-first-resources-one-of-its-members/>

²⁰ <http://news.mongabay.com/2015/0122-wilmar-transparency-dashboard.html>

²¹ Oil palm monocultures are today not regarded as "planted forests" under the FAO definition. But in 2010 Indonesia, the world's foremost producer of palm oil, attempted to pass a decree to include oil palm plantations in the forest sector, with an eye to lucrative carbon credit sales from these plantations. <http://www.wetlands.org/Portals/0/publications/submission%20or%20policy%20doc/Annex%20on%20the%20Need%20for%20the%20Review%20of%20the%20UNFCCC.pdf>

"offset" CO₂ emitted when a forest is destroyed. It should also be remembered that several companies are eager to promote the planting of transgenic trees in order to further increase their productivity.

Mechanisms to "offset" the destruction of forests, seeking to expand areas of tree plantations or conserve other forest areas classified as "similar" or "equivalent", where no extractive activities are planned, are seen by many of the companies and NGOs that signed the New York Declaration as a solution that will allow continued deforestation of tropical rainforests while protecting the interests of corporations. Oil and mineral extraction or agribusiness practices necessarily lead to destruction; there is no way around it. But the idea of "zero deforestation" is an attempt to convince everyone that offset mechanisms can avoid any "net deforestation," on the basis that conserving an "equivalent" area or planting a monoculture of eucalyptus or acacia can compensate for the destruction of forests. The fact of deforestation is now taken for granted, and we are asked to believe that it has been "effectively offset".

But in countries where the activities of extractive industries and agribusiness corporations are concentrated, like Indonesia, Brazil, Peru and Colombia, it is already difficult to find enough land for such "offset" projects necessary to fulfil the "zero net deforestation" commitment. Aware of the appalling impact of this destructive model on local people, corporations keep silent about the extensive land areas that would have to be appropriated for the implementation of "offset" projects. For example, Fundepúblico, a Colombian foundation for the public interest, writes that companies in Colombia *"cannot find the land to establish the offsets"*, and that *"in the cases where offsets have been established, environmental agencies do not know the exact location of offset sites."* Furthermore, *"the puzzle of matching offset demand with offset supply has yet to be solved. And it's a complicated one. With over 8 million hectares under mining titles, over 130 oil and gas companies, with operations in the country over at least 1.5 million hectares, including Shell, Oxy, Chevron, ExxonMobil, and Petrobras, and thousands of kilometers of highways in the pipeline that will affect critical biodiversity hotspots, one of the key questions is where the hundreds of thousands of hectares needed in offsets are going to come from."*²²

Looking towards COP 21 in Paris: Why say No to "zero deforestation"?

Action plans—which, by the way, are voluntary—advocated by those who promote the ideas of "sustainable forest management," ecosystem services like REDD+ and/or "zero deforestation," are consistent with each other and reinforce the message of the 2015 International Day of Forests organized by FAO. An "industry" of consultancy companies has also grown up to "certify" that the destructive actions of corporations are "sustainable."

These plans envisage no other prospect than the continuation of the destructive model of production and consumption and the strengthening of corporate power. For example, they do not consider the idea of "leaving the oil in the ground," advocated for many years by the Oilwatch network. Nor do they envisage leaving minerals in the soil, or highlight the importance of Via Campesina's struggle in defence of each country's food sovereignty

²² See <http://wrm.org.uy/books-and-briefings/trade-in-ecosystem-services-when-payment-for-environmental-services-delivers-a-permit-to-destroy/>

aiming to put a stop to the unhealthy and insane transport of massive quantities of biomass, foods and by-products worldwide. There is no discussion, either, of ending the extraction of tropical woods and the expansion of monocultures of palm, soy, eucalyptus, etc., despite all of these being excellent proposals to fight both climate change and deforestation.

According to the logic of the UN proposal via FAO, the prospects in coming decades are for even greater power and scope for corporations, not just private companies but also state corporations that follow the same logic, impacting on forests and community territories all round the world, especially in the global South. In the race for the last remaining fertile lands, oil reserves and mineral deposits, some "biodiversity hotspots," "high conservation value forests" and "high carbon value forests" will be appropriated and utilized to supply new "merchandise" by means of "ecosystem service" certificates.

"High conservation value" areas will be useful for "green capitalism" because of their increasing scarcity. They will serve as "storage" areas, not only for carbon, but also for several other "ecosystem services" that can be acquired as "credits" to "offset" the destructive impacts resulting from corporate actions.

This year a new climate agreement is expected to be reached at COP 21 in Paris, France. Our task is to persevere that the real causes of the climate crisis will become finally attacked: the burning of fossil fuels and the whole model of production and consumption that is based on it. We cannot allow this agreement between the UN and governments—or any other agreement at national or sub-national level—to include false solutions based on conserving some areas of forest as a subterfuge to pretend that something is being done to reduce global CO₂ emissions. Neither can we accept proposals to continue destroying forests on the pretext that they will be "offset." The simple reason is that every area, every place, with its own specific people and community, is unique and needs to be preserved, not destroyed, and no "offset" can provide real compensation.

More than ever, we need to strengthen the "Plantations Are Not Forests!" campaign. FAO could make better use of the International Day of Forests by announcing that it will review its definition and seek to define the true meaning of forests. It could enter into a process in which the communities and peoples that depend on forests can participate fully and effectively.²³

FAO could also have made and shown a different one-minute video, on the real effects of increasing appropriation and exploitation of tropical rainforest areas by transnational corporations. It could show that, as a result, forests will continue to disappear and peoples and communities that depend on the forests will lose their way of life. The video could conclude with a call to end deforestation and to advocate, for instance, no further expansion of mining and no more drilling for oil.

We should also uncover the hidden links in the "zero deforestation" commitments between REDD+ projects and trade in other "ecosystem services," on the one hand, and the advancement of destructive industries such as oil extraction, large-scale monoculture plantations, mineral extraction, hydroelectric plants, etc., on the other. We ask everyone to join the Call to Action prepared in 2014 for the climate summit in Lima, which directly shows

²³ See the open letter to FAO on the occasion of International Day of Forests 2014, <http://wrm.org.uy/all-campaigns/open-letter-to-fao-on-the-occasion-of-the-international-day-of-forests-2014/>

and denounces these links and voices a clear NO to the false solutions for the climate crisis involving offsets. See the Call to Action here: <http://wrm.org.uy/actions-and-campaigns/to-reject-redd-and-extractive-industries-to-confront-capitalism-and-defend-life-and-territories/>²⁴

We conclude that the "Change" mentioned by FAO as part of its theme for March 21 does not represent any real change at all. This must be condemned. At the same time, communities that depend on forests and all the organisations that support them need to unite to demand the changes that will enable us to confront and transform the destructive model that the UN and governments, subservient to corporate interests, want to perpetuate and continue to promote whatever the cost.

WRM, March 21 2015

²⁴ Call to Action to reject REDD+ and extractive industries to confront capitalism and defend life and territories, <http://wrm.org.uy/actions-and-campaigns/to-reject-redd-and-extractive-industries-to-confront-capitalism-and-defend-life-and-territories/>

About WRM. The World Rainforest Movement (WRM) is an international organization that, through its work on forest and plantation related issues, contributes to achieving the respect of local peoples' rights over their forests and territories. WRM is part of a global movement for social change that aims at ensuring social justice, the respect of human rights and environmental conservation.

The WRM distributes a monthly electronic bulletin in English, Spanish, French and Portuguese, to serve as an information dissemination tool of local struggles and on global processes which may affect local forests and peoples. The WRM also disseminates relevant information and documentation through its web site in four languages English, Spanish, French and Portuguese. Besides, WRM has produced a number of other written and audiovisual materials, all free for download at this webpage.

The contents of this publication can be totally or partially reproduced without prior authorization. However, the World Rainforest Movement should be duly credited and notified of any reproduction.

Montevideo, March 2015

World Rainforest Movement
International Secretariat
Maldonado 1858, Montevideo, Uruguay
Ph / Fax: +598 2413 2989
e-mail: wrm@wrm.org.uy
web site: <http://www.wrm.org.uy>

This document is also available in Spanish, Portuguese and French.

This publication was produced with the support of the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC).and Misereor (Germany). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect their views.

