



Report of the European Union Expert Dialogue on Biofuels and REDD – implications for Indigenous Peoples Akantes, Amsterdam. May 8, 2009

On 8 May 2009, the Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV) in cooperation with the Global Forest Coalition (GFC) organised an European Union (EU) expert dialogue meeting to discuss the implications for Indigenous Peoples of EU policies on biofuels and REDD (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries). The main objective of this EU expert dialogue was to provide a forum for key Indigenous Peoples experts, EU governments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), companies and scientists to exchange information and perspectives on these two issues and explore ways to uphold the rights of Indigenous Peoples within REDD and biofuels policies, mechanisms and frameworks. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Expanded Program of Work on Forest Biodiversity were the two main points of reference. The EU expert dialogue was made up of more than 40 experts (see annex 1 for a list of participants).

Introductory session



Mr. Leo van der Vlist (NCIV)

Mr. Leo van der Vlist of the NCIV welcomed everyone attending the meeting. He was followed by two short plenary introductory sessions. Mrs. Yolanda Sikking (GFC) presented the agenda and the reason for the dialogue. Mr. Estebancio Castro Diaz, from the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests (IA), gave an introduction on REDD and Biofuels and the position of Indigenous Peoples in the context of Climate Change.

“Introduction to REDD, Biofuels, and the position of Indigenous Peoples in the context of Climate Change”

Mr. Castro Diaz congratulated NCIV for celebrating its 40th anniversary and expressed the hope that NCIV will continue working on indigenous issues in the future. He appreciated the opportunity to explain the position of Indigenous Peoples (IP's) in the context of climate change. IP's have voiced strong concerns that forest projects financed through REDD mechanisms can have severe negative impacts on IP's well-being if their rights are not adequately established and protected. However he stressed that IP's have varied positions. “We are diverse peoples, and we have different understandings and different needs.”



Estebancio Castro Diaz, (IA), Kuna Yala Nation (Panama)

According to Mr. Castro Diaz there are three major issues:

1. The prospect of money. When people talk about REDD they go to the communities and say 'you will receive a lot of money'. People get crazy. However, the benefits of REDD are unknown. For example, IP's in Panama are still waiting on compensation for lands taken for an electric dam that was built in between 1973 – 1976. What is going to happen? Which concept of forest will be used? If UN FAO definition of forests are used, IP's will have problems, because this definition includes plantations. This would mean that plantations could replace native trees and diminish biodiversity and traditional knowledge.
2. Taking into account the historical relationship between IP's and the State governments, which, in general, have not been very good, it will not be easy to convince IP's to accept new policies from international institutions and UN agencies. IP's live on the land and not in offices, like the policy makers do. Because the REDD scheme will be applied in IP's lands the full and effective participation of IP's is imperative. IP's have talked a lot about the risks and benefits. Money means development, but IP's also have to safeguard their traditional lives and traditional systems of decision making.
3. The full and effective participation of IP's in the REDD and biofuels consultation process is necessary. It is difficult to ask IP's to take part in the negotiations if they do not have enough information. Moreover, IP's are diverse people, with different understandings and different needs. In Brazil IP's are interested in seeing the possibilities in REDD. They have their own self determination which means the right to decide for themselves. We need to go beyond what we see as our possibilities. We are very clear if the REDD is to be applied, the UN parties, the private sector, and the financial institutions must take into account the UNDRIP.

Mr. Castro Diaz stated that in relation to REDD we assume too much and don't really know future outcomes. The benefits for IP's are not clear and there is misleading information. One thing IP's know is that REDD should respect the rights in the UNDRIP in particular the rights protecting land and traditional knowledge systems and the right to free, prior and informed consent. There is a growing interest in biofuels in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. This interest is generated because of money, but many questions arise when states, UN organisations and companies are dealing with IP's: How will REDD be linked to biofuels mechanisms? What forest will be used? What is the concept of forest degradation? Does this include shifting cultivation? Should there be free prior informed consent of IPs? What changes will biofuels bring in land use? What changes will biofuels bring in traditions/IP's knowledge? How will the financial mechanisms be used? What approach will be used - rights based or economic? How do we deal with the adaptation and displacement of IP's?

Mr. Castro Diaz concluded that IP's are not against development or measures to mitigate climate change. IP's culture is not static but they call for their rights to be respected and recognized and their self-determination to be implemented. Even though the participation of IP's in REDD and climate change discussions has been extremely limited, IP's maintain a positive attitude. If states are prepared to work with IP's there is a possibility to move forward and uphold IP's rights.

Questions for Mr. Castro Diaz:

"Do you mainly see biofuels as a threat to your land, or do you also see it as an option for local energy supply?" (*Peter de Koning – Ministry of Foreign Affairs*)

Biofuels are a threat for IP's because they effect the loss of traditional knowledge and biodiversity. Apart from the economic benefit, we don't see anything else. Even the economic benefit is questionable, because IP's don't seem to benefit from their resources. We don't want biofuels to be used as an excuse for their development.

“Can you elaborate on the impact of these policies for ecosystems, water?” (Anna Pinto, *Indigenous Peoples Centre for Policy and Human Rights*)

One example is the Kuna in Panama live on islands, they will probably have to move to the mainland, because of the rise in sea levels.

“In the context of territories or land, do you also see positive incentives?” (Helen Paul, *Econexus*)

The lands and resources of IP's have always been a major issue at the international level. At the moment, we do not see any benefit in the case of Kuna because there is no deforestation and degradation. Our land is still 90% forest. The government of Panama calls it “unused land”, but it is the basis of our spiritual, cultural and social life. If we want benefit from the REDD scheme we have to cut down our native trees and replace it with plantations. This is non-sensical. There are no benefits in the case of the Kuna. We have our land and a legally recognised territory. We don't want to create perverse incentives like REDD.

“REDD is probably going to be a market based approach. Can you explain this mechanism?” (Teresa Anderson, *Gaia foundation*)

The concern we have with the market based approach is that we have seen bad examples, for example when the Embera community of Panamá participated. REDD related mechanism creates division between families, some want to earn money, others don't want to join the system. How can you fix that? You need to maintain the traditional mechanisms. However one thing is clear, IP's prefer a rights based approach and not a market based approach.

“You talk about the violation of rights. People in general are ‘invasive species’. Do you feel everything has to be static?” (Renaat van Rompaey, *Wageningen International Experts*)

We are not against development. Today our land is different from 70 years ago. But we must have the right to develop our own land, in cooperation with our government. We emphasize, we need to be part of any negotiation related to our lands and territories. Without that, it is hard to accept the imposition of developments that we are not part of but which exploit our land. We are seven different groups in Panamá. In Kuna Yala REDD is not applicable. Also, we don't want to be consulted on REDD on behalf of the other indigenous groups. Not many governments want to sit down with IPs and respect their rights. Therefore IPs need strong international standards.

Dialogue on Biofuels and REDD continues in separate meetings.

1. REDD presentations:

“Indigenous experiences with REDD-related frameworks, initiatives and pilots”

The first presentation was given by Mr. Kanyinke Sena. He stated that whenever IP's are given the opportunity to talk they are expected to discuss specific technical details of proposals and normally their fundamental concerns are not addressed. Climate change is a reality in Kenya and other countries. The experience that Mr. Sena had with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is that IP's did not have a voice in Bali. Governments are just imposing their policies and ideas. IP's hear that in Bonn this June, there may be some discussions on the rights of IP's. Mr. Sena elaborated on the different challenges: full and effective participation and the acknowledgment of IP's rights. If we don't share information we cannot have full agreement.



Kanyinke Sena, Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordination Committee, *Ogiek Cultural Initiative Programme (OCIP)*, Kenya

The question is, what standards are they bringing to the table? IP's need capacity building in relation to how to look at these standards. There are many questions from the community perspective: knowing what is happening, how to deal with companies and governments on these issues, and how can IP's prepare themselves.

Question for Mr. Sena:

“How can we start to work on IP's rights? How can we learn from processes in the past? How can we include the World Bank? How can we think about a working group of IP's? What is our political space to interject? What is our strategy to work on a high level standard? How do we make sure we are ahead of the process/the government?” (*Michelle Medeiros, Greenpeace International*)

We have to start in the community. We have to take the information to them before the government takes it to them! REDD should address the drivers of deforestation and cannot work in isolation. But our government is employing consultants. The government gives only a small amount (\$20.000USD?) to capacity building of communities. The most that can happen is a national workshop, but there will be no activities at the grassroots level.

“Road map for safeguarding indigenous rights in EU REDD policy and proposals”

Mr. Bas Clabbers continued the dialogue on REDD and concentrated his presentation on the negotiation processes. Mr. Clabbers admitted that the Dutch Ministry also has assumptions without having a full picture as to what REDD looks like. To include IP's rights is not only a moral issue, we can also learn by engaging with IP's. According to Mr. Clabbers we will have two paths up to and after COP15:

- Legal commitments on dealing with (the rights of) local communities and indigenous peoples
- Showing the benefits of positive and effective engagement of local communities and indigenous peoples

Now it is time to come to formulate a paragraph on REDD and IP's rights, which will be short, because it's part of a bigger picture. After the Copenhagen meeting we will expand on this.



Bas Clabbers, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, The Netherlands

For the presentation of Mr. Clabbers go to:

<http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/presentations/Road-Map-EU-REDD.pdf>

Questions for Mr. Clabbers:

“How can the full and effective participation of IP's in the processes to define REDD mechanisms and readiness programs be ensured?”

There is funding from the parties for IP's and IP's are invited to participate as observers in all meetings.

“Knowing that only a small paragraph on IP's will be part of the declaration in Copenhagen, what issues do we want included?”

Referring to more general rules and obligations, the more general the easier it will be accepted. But there is a risk that the way it is phrased will mean nothing, or it is so general that it makes no sense. For example any text relating to IP's rights can be limited by the phrase ‘according to national law’. Mr. Clabbers invited the participants to phrase a text which could be integrated in Copenhagen.

“ What is the effect of the market based approach?”

The effect of a market based approach depends very much on the required size of the reduction. The larger the reductions that are imposed by the EU, the larger will be the size of the market. It is difficult to say though, how large the reductions should be and this is also dependent on the economic developments within the EU. This is not a single issue, but the combination of what our fellow countries and developing countries will do. Experiences includes work in the Mount Elgon National Park in Uganda. In this particular case, certification was achieved, but turned out to be difficult to maintain. Decreasing market prices imply that less money is available for the park.

“How can we make sure monitoring will be done?”

What will be the impact on local communities in terms of conflicts and disadvantages for communities? What can we contribute in reducing the speed of this process and make IP's communities involved and able to make choices? A good monitoring system is needed and it is good to invest in it.

2. BIOFUELS presentations

“Eat Fuel: Biofuels in Asia” – Anna Pinto, Centre for Organization Research & Education (CORE), India

Ms. Pinto pointed out that the present negotiation on biofuels is based on the use of minor modifications to the existing motorized and industrial power machinery. The discussion focuses on how to substitute fossil fuels by biofuels, not on a change in our paradigm of development. Biofuel production is itself energy intensive. It allows us to continue to use more fuels. This creates more toxic wastes and this causes new epidemics of diseases. If biofuels are the answer, what is the question? How do I keep my lifestyle with 2 cars, a house, and holidays in the Bahamas? Do we really want to maintain this model of the world? That's the question that IP's would like to raise.

India alone has at present intention of developing 11 Mha of jatropha to produce 13 MT of biodiesel and has further plans of extending this over 40MHa of “wasteland”. Large private corporations are receiving support for this including access to lands which are indigenous territories in more than 6 states in India. Conflicts over land between indigenous, small farmers, marginal and landless on one side are developing with corporate, government agencies and private landlords in each state that is earmarked land for biofuel cultivation. With water problems in tea, sugarcane and cotton affecting crops, lands previously devoted to this are being considered for jatropha now. Land for food cultivation is scarcer and government obligations to marginal farmers and indigenous people are being violated with private acquisition. Over 16 million people from the 6 prioritized states may be displaced if the intended scale of jatropha plantation is realized. Where will they go?

Questions that Ms. Pinto considered more important were; how do we prevent our own extinction? are we in an energy crisis? has climate change already happened? 25 years ago already our elders informed us about changes they noticed in the food and the air. We have to realise that we are a species in crisis and that what we do today only has its effects on the climate after 50 years from now. Now is the time that we have to decide whether we are going to accept the consequences, or whether we are going to stop the causes of Climate Change.

For the presentation of Ms. Pinto go to:

<http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/presentations/EAT-FUEL.pdf>

“Overview of Biofuels Certification Schemes: Resistance To ‘Sustainability’ Criteria For Soy” - Nina Holland, Corporate Europe Observatory

Ms. Holland first gave an overview of various biofuels certification schemes. She used key criteria to assess whether these schemes have engaged stakeholders, what their relationship with the Renewable Energy Directive of the European Commission (RED) is, whether the criteria are mandatory or voluntary and what the relevant aspects for indigenous peoples are within the schemes.

Secondly Ms. Holland presented photos from Paraguay which showed people with skin affections and other health problems from the pesticides used for soy production. She further mentioned that in North West Argentina 1 to 3 million hectares will be deforested for soy production and indigenous peoples are not really consulted and lose their land because of the deforestation. Such cases show the big gap between reality and European offices and certification processes.

For the presentation of Ms. Holland go to:

<http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/presentations/Biofuel-Certification-Schemes.pdf>

“European Committee for Standardization’s initiative for sustainability criteria for biomass, CEN/TC383”- Leo van der Vlist, NCIV

Mr. Van der Vlist presented useful insights and details regarding the initiative from the European Committee for Standardization (CEN) to develop sustainability criteria for biomass. Mr. Van der Vlist's final observations were that this initiative is potentially important but that it lacks a good mandate from the European Commission, that not many NGO's participate and no IP's are involved.

For the presentation of Mr. Van der Vlist go to:

<http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/presentations/CEN.pdf>

PLENARY SESSION

1. Report to the panel on REDD meeting:



*Moderator of the REDD dialogue
Peter de Haan, Director AIDEnvironment.*

The role of NGO's, IP's and International Cooperation

- *Should we slow down the process?*
We better not talk about slowing down the process. We are already talking about REDD for 5 years and don't have the mechanism yet.
- *Can we learn from the Clean Development Mechanism that has already started?*
Yes, but there is a fundamental difference. CDM is on a project level, and REDD will be a program at the national level.
- *Why is free, prior and informed consent left out?*
We are talking in a UN context, and some governments do not accept this. They state that this has to be dealt with at the national level between IPs and the national government.

Build-in considerations of Indigenous Peoples into Copenhagen

- *One of the concerns raised is that communities don't trust the government to bring profits to the local level. Will there be a legal institute where local people can complain?*
Such an institute is not included in the REDD mechanism.
- *How can local communities benefit?*
They can benefit by preserving the forest and hopefully also by reducing deforestation. Benefits will be derived at a national level, so the national government has to take care of the benefit sharing with indigenous peoples.
- *How do you make the process transparent?*
We have the obligation to make the whole process transparent. At least the information should be available about what has been agreed to in the consultation between the host country and the investing country.

Conclusions/action points

The expert dialogue builds upon the outcomes of the Anchorage meeting (Indigenous Peoples' Global Summit on Climate Change, Anchorage, Alaska, USA, 20-24 April 2009) and prepares the ground for the Copenhagen summit later this year. Thus, the outcomes of 'Anchorage' were taken as the point of departure for the discussion on REDD. The working group intended to come up with a single rallying point that could be introduced before and during the Copenhagen summit. It proved impossible though, to arrive at conclusions that were unanimously accepted by the plenary session. Below, conclusions are presented that reflect the opinion of larger numbers of participants. It was agreed that these notions were to be the basis for further discussions in the coming months.

1. The working group on REDD concluded that 'consent' goes further than 'consultation'. If REDD mechanisms could only be put in place with the consent of IP's, this would give the latter a much stronger bargaining position. Thus, the need for consent on REDD mechanisms would potentially strengthen the position of IP's. During the plenary session though, it proved impossible to reach unanimity on this issue. Whereas all agreed that 'consent' would strengthen the position of IP's, some participants felt that opposition from national governments will make it impossible to get this notion accepted.
2. By nature, IP's are scattered and no single body can claim to represent the IP's of the world. It is proposed to create an expert group of IP's within the UNFCCC. This group could evolve from existing forum. If such a group is created, it's capacities would have to be built.
3. Many IP's do not have the capacity to actively and proactively participate in the definition of REDD mechanisms and readiness programs. Capacity building of IP's is a precondition for active involvement.
4. The importance of integrating existing human rights texts such as from the UNDRIP, has been reiterated. This would strengthen the position of IP's in many countries.

Report to the Panel on Biofuels meeting:

*Moderator of the Biofuel Dialogue
Wolfgang Richert, Consultant WOLF*



Engagement of indigenous peoples in Biofuels policy processes

- *Is engagement of IP's (groups or representatives) in policy making or standard setting processes regarding biofuels useful? Do IP's want that engagement? If yes, how and where is that engagement most useful?*

After a clear 'YES' to the principal question and the statement that biofuels should be stopped, it has been very fruitful that NGO's have tried to build bridges, however IP's representatives in the room pointed out that these are not their processes and never will be. The whole argument is run on the EU's terms. IP's don't view the world as something that can be owned, IP's look at the world as something that they are care takers for, to share the world with responsibility.

A lot can be learned from the UN process. It created openings for IP's. It let IP's voice be heard, either directly or through NGO's. We have to continue to engage at all levels. If you want to bring the parties together there must be equal discussion. IP's get 3 minutes to talk about mother earth in a conference, while the UN gets 40 days of expert meetings to discuss biofuels.

It was stated again that the IP's view of the world is different and that this is a key problem. It was even mentioned by Ms. Pinto as an "alien world". While IP's are dealing with human rights issues, the EU are only talking about WTO issues. IP's should stop trying to convince non-indigenous peoples and make them experience this personally. An invitation was made to all participants and stakeholders to join a 2-day retreat organised by IP's and their elders in order to exchange experiences, world views and mutual understanding.

Documentation and monitoring

- *How can IP's contribute to present evidence and monitoring of direct and indirect impacts on biofuels?*

Documentation of real practices, experiences and developments in the field are very important in order to influence policy making processes. In this IP's can play an important role as they experience the impacts themselves. Serious attention is given to indirect social and environmental effects. The reality is that the EU countries will take a decision to 2020 to implement the plan on biofuels. In 2014 there will be a review of this action plan. We already know that due to the high biofuels demands the targets set are unlikely to be reached.

IP's may not be able to stop this, but may still be able to show the consequences in their communities. NGO's in the south and the UK are still saying it should be stopped. However people in the field are not saying anything or are not being heard. The EU should be obligated to consider this information as a precautionary principle. Monitoring is a crucial issue. We should use technologies that the internet and multimedia offers to collect this information. A clearing house mechanism would be a good way to share field experiences worldwide and make it available to others. Maybe the EU could implement this itself?

It is very important that the Renewable Energy Directive is not seen as something static, but IP's can influence it very much. NGO's and local communities should put the facts regarding serious concerns into the public arena. The level of confrontation should rise. Good documentation is very important and can have significant consequences to policy makers, companies and governments.

Desired action points

All participants were enthusiastic about the following two action points. The organizers are kindly requested to implement this initiative and most participants are willing to participate in the follow-up.

1. Organise a 2-day retreat between IP's and EU leaders; and
2. Create a clearing house mechanism to exchange knowledge and experience on biofuels.

After the presentations, responses focused on the following aspects:

Mr. Bas Clabbers:

It was a very useful discussion. All issues discussed here are still under discussion elsewhere. It is useful to experience again what is needed on the ground. I got a better understanding. In terms of moving forward, we need to be pragmatic: work on the text. Bring your voice into the meetings in Bangkok and Bonn towards Copenhagen.

Michelle Medeiros:

In our session I kept asking what are we doing now. There is an urgency. We have very little time to address. After Alaska how do we move into concrete action on climate discussions and not just REDD. How can IP's get access and how can we empower them so their voice can be presented? 1.2 billion people are forest dependent. Even though the demands are difficult it is our responsibility.

Mr. Kanyinke Sena:

The discussion has been very useful for us. There is a very strong concern in the room for supporting the issues that concern IP's. It's time to start thinking outside the REDD box. We will try to engage the African countries in this discussion.

Mr. Estebancio Castro Diaz:

We have different tasks. We thank the representatives from the Ministries for their advice.

Ms. Pita Verweij:

Communication has been very important today. We have such different worlds. The word “alien world” struck me because it has the connotation of hostile. It was enriching. I am in favour of a more holistic approach, but western scientists think about plantations and forests in terms of carbon storage. Also look at the perspective of local communities who want to participate in the discussions. The coming week Pita has to come up with examples and she is looking for concrete cases where biofuels have negative indirect impacts! This will influence the Renewable Energy Directive

Ms. Anna Pinto:

Today devastating examples of the effects of biofuels on the ground were shown. It makes the participants of this expert meeting very aware. We must not talk about money, this is about culture, spirituality, and survival.

CLOSURE

Mr. van der Vlist thanked everyone for coming, especially those coming from afar. It was a useful discussion and it is hoped that the dialogue will continue.

*Report: Yolanda Sikking, Global Forest Coalition, Yolandasikking@yahoo.co.uk 06-23913217
and Leo van der Vlist and Harko Koster, Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples, leo@nciv.net 06-12936948*

ANNEX 1. List of Participants

Organization	Name	E-mail
AidEnvironment	Peter de Haan	peter@aidenvironment.org
Centre for Latin American Studies (CEDLA)	Fabian de Castro	f.decastro@cedla.nl
Corporate Europe Observatory	Nina Holland	nina@corporateeurope.org
Econexus	Helen Paul	h.paul@gn.apc.org
Environmental Defense	Jos Cozijnen	info@emissierechten.nl
FERN	Jutta Kill	verle@fern.org
FIAN Nederland	Gudrun Muller	fian@fian-nederland.nl
FIAN Nederland	Lucia Goldfarb	lucia.goldfarb@gmail.com
	Francesco	
Forest Peoples Programme	Martone	francescomartone1@gmail.com
Gaia Foundation (UK)	Teresa Anderson	teresa@gaianet.org
		volanda.sikking@globalforestcoalition.org
Global Forest Coalition	Yolanda Sikking	on.org
Greenpeace International	Korine Jacquenart	kjacquenart@greenpeace.org
	Michelle	
Greenpeace International	Medeiros	michelle.medeiros@greenpeace.org
Greenpeace Nederland	Hilde Stroot	hstroot@greenpeace.nl
GTZ (Germany)	Heidi Feldt	H.Feldt@T-Online.de
GTZ (Germany)	Silke Spohn	silke.spohn@gtz.de
Indigenous Peoples Centre for Policy and Human Rights	Anna Pinto	annapinto@coremanipur.org
	Paul Kanyinke	
Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordination Committee (IPACC)	Sena	kanvinke@yahoo.com
Institute of Social Studies (ISS)	Lee Pegler	pegler@iss.nl
Institute of Social Studies (ISS)	Lorenzo Pellegrini	lorenzopelle@gmail.com
International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal People of Tropical Forests (IAITTF)	Estebancio Castro	
IUCN Nederland	Diaz	castroestebancio@gmail.com
IUCN Nederland	Erwanto	erwanto@iucn.nl
	Peter van Sluis	peter.vansluijs@iucn.nl
	Anouk van Grinsven	anouk-van.grinsven@minbuza.nl
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken	Peter de Koning	peter.dekoning@minbuza.nl
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken	Peter de Koning	pdk@mekonecology.net
Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuur en Visserij	Bas Clabbers	b.j.l.clabbers@minlnv.nl
Ministerie van VROM	Aida Tunovic	aida.tunovic@minvrom.nl
NANAI	Franci Taylor	francitaylor@hotmail.com
Nederlands Centrum voor Inheemse Volkeren (NCIV)	Leo van der Vlist	leo@nciv.net
Nederlands Centrum voor Inheemse Volkeren (NCIV)	Harko Koster	harko_koster@yahoo.com
Silvestrum	Irene Visser	irene.visser@silvestrum.com
Terra (Italy)	Sergio Baffoni	sergio.baffoni@gmail.com
The Nature Conservancy	Yabanex Batista	ybatista@tnc.org
Tropenbos International	Marieke Wit	marieke.wit@tropenbos.org
Trouw	Laura v.d. Wal	Laura_van_der_wal@hotmail.com
Universiteit Utrecht	Sofia Beunder	sophiabeunder@gmail.com
Universiteit Utrecht	Pita Verweij	p.a.verweij@uu.nl
	Marion Bastos	
Vrije Universiteit van Amsterdam	Lima	mairon.bastos.lima@ivm.vu.nl
	Renaat Van Rompaey	renaat@wix.nl
Wageningen International Experts	Wolfgang Richert	wolf@wolfgangrichert.nl
WOLF		