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Who Am I

• Political scientist
• Specialize in policy studies
• Curious about environmental policy development
  • Focus largely on forest sector
  • Assess policy choices made by
    • Governments
    • Environmental groups
    • Firms
    • Intergovernmental processes
  • Emergence of market-mechanisms
    • Forest Certification
    • “non-state market driven” (NSMD) global governance
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Two questions guide most of my work

• How do we explain domestic & international environmental forestry policy development?
  • Divergence across time
  • Divergence across cases

• What can strategists do to
  • Address global forest degradation
  • Promote sustainable forest policy
    • Domestically
    • Globally

• What are innovative policy options/institutions?
Defining Sustainability

• Sustained yield
  • Timber/resource sustainability

• Ecosystem sustainability
  • Ecosystem structure and function
  • Biodiversity

• North America
  • Most land owners do practice first definition
  • Second definition hotly disputed
Approach of talk

I. Brief review of forestry in British Columbia
   a) Land ownership
   b) Tenure system
   c) Policy changes in 1990s

II. Factors facilitating these changes

III. Implications
   a) For ratcheting up global forest standards
British Columbia, Canada
Just how beautiful is British Columbia?

- Very beautiful
But, just how big are British Columbia’s trees?

• Very big
Canadian Part of “US Pacific Northwest”
Important Forest Ecosystem
British Columbia: Land ownership

- 94% publicly owned
- "Crown land"
- Provincial government

US very different
Northwest split between public and private
US South east – largely private
British Columbia: Tenure

• Timber concessions
  • Coast area based
  • Interior volume based

• Payments for cutting trees
  • “stumpage”
  • How, and what to charge source of controversy

• Innovations:
  • Small forest enterprises gaining increased access
  • “small business enterprise program”
  • About 15% of volume
  • Regional development
  • Small business
British Columbia: Environmental Forest Policy

- 1990s transformative change
  - Protected Areas double
    - 6 percent to over 13%
  - Forest practice code
  - Environmental prescriptions
  - Land claims
    - Indigenous peoples given access to resource
Comparing BC: Protected Areas (2000)
Comparing BC: Riparian Zones

* (30 meter width, 30%bank slope, perennial, fish-bearing)
Lessons: Public land

Table 1.0: Timber Harvest in US Pacific Northwest on Private and Federal Lands 1965-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons: Stakeholder involvement

- Environmental Forest Protections
  - Almost always coincide with greater involvement/role for
    - range of stakeholders
    - "civil society"
Shading represents eco-forest groups
Adapted from Wilson (1990: 146)
Shading represents eco-forest groups
Adapted from Wilson (1990: 146)
Lessons: Stakeholder involvement

• British Columbia proactive
  • Commission one Resources and the Environment
  • Land and Resource Management Plans
    • Bottom up stakeholder process
      • Deliberated over where to protect
      • How to manage
  • Government gave objectives
    • Stakeholders fleshed out details
    • Felt part of the process
• Central Coast
  • Industry and environmental groups
    • Spearheaded collaborative efforts
Lessons: For Global Standards

III. If Time!

I. Need to think about how domestic forest policy
II. May be important for sparking “ratcheting up” of global standards
III. Global Forest convention non-starter
IV. Certification has some promise
Analytical Framework: The California and Delaware Effects

- The “California Effect” (Vogel)
  - Phenomenon where business in regulated markets
  - See strategic self interest in promoting similar regulations on their less regulated competitors
    - Bootleggers and Baptists coalition
  - Market integration (economic globalization) requirement for such phenomena to occur
  - Prerequisite: active environmental and social NGOs
    - Spark initial regulations
    - Environmental groups’ markets campaigning healthy
The “Delaware Effect”
- The Phenomenon where businesses flee to less regulated markets
- Or act as break to increase regulations
  - Common phenomenon in an era of increasing economic globalization
    - Forest firms operating in Indonesia or Malaysia
    - or from US Pacific Northwest to US Southeast
Area Certified: by Region and Certification system

Forest area under different certification standards

- North America
- Western Europe
- Eastern & Central Europe
- Latin America
- Oceania
- Asia
- Africa

Certification systems:
- NVFCCR
- CERFLOR
- LEI
- MTCC
- PEFC
- ATFS
- CSA/PEFC
- SFI
- FSC

Million hectares
Lessons: Nurturing the California Effect?
Brief History of Global Efforts to Promote Sustainable Forestry 1992-2006

Ratcheting Down: Delaware Effect?

- Global Forest Convention
- FSC style certification
- Industry initiated certification programs
- United Nations “non-binding agreement on forest practices”

Policy Scope:
- Comprehensive
- Limited

Time Axis:
- 1992
- 1993
- 2004
- 2006
- 2020?

Over time some support in North America and Europe
Limited support in global South
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Future History of Global Efforts to Promote Sustainable Forestry 2006-2020

Ratching Up: California Effect?

Policy Scope

Comprehensive

Limited


The Beginning of Ratching Up?

Forest Law Enforcement and Governance Trade Processes (FLEGT)

Illegal logging - international efforts

Problem focused, market embedded certification?
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Global Forestry Challenges

Key countries China imports from:
- Russia
- Malaysia
- Indonesia
- Thailand
- PNG
- Gabon

Source: Chinese customs statistics

From White et al, China and the Global Market for Forest Products, March 2006
US and Europe as Consumers

What do consumer choices matter so much?

Consumers in North America and Europe

From 1997 to present
Imports to US from China have increased 1000%
Imports to EU from China have increased 800%

From White et al, China and the Global Market for Forest Products, March 2006
Processes for Sparking a California Effect?

1) Relatively high domestic environmental standards
   a) In countries with coveted consumer markets
   b) In some countries who compete for coveted markets

2) Widespread recognition of these differences
   a. On part of NGOs
   b. Industry
   c. Governments

3) Strong global concern about environmental problems in countries with relatively *weaker* policies

4) Recognition that consumption is biggest challenge to global forest deterioration