



Letter No. 113-2013- AIDSESEP

Lima, July 12, 2013

Dear Sirs:

CD-FIP (FIP Steering Committee) and the Government of Peru

Gabriel Quijandría, Vice-Minister of Natural Resources, MINAM, gquijandria@minam.gob.pe,
Rosario Acero, Director, General Forestry and Wildlife Department, racero@minag.gob.pe,
CIAM, vgalarreta@gmail.com
Ombudsman: defensor@defensoria.gob.pe, dsanchez@defensoria.gob.pe

Multilateral Banks

World Bank: gdieterle@worldbank.org, Mbarton@worldbank.org, kbishop@worldbank.org,
jramirez1@worldbank.org, lfduchicela@worldbank.org, mpillai3@worldbank.org
FIP: "Gloria Visconti" gloriav@iadb.org; Andrea Kutter akutter@worldbank.org
IDB: carlospe@iadb.org; María de Cunha mariadc@iadb.org; Jaime Fernández Baca jaimofer@iadb.org

Members of the FIP Sub-Committee

U.S.A.: katie.berg@treasury.gov/ Spain: Aize Azqueta Quemada, aize.azqueta@mineco.es
Norway: morten.nordskog@md.dep.no, Andreas.Dahl-Jorgensen@md.dep.no
England: Ben Green, B-Green@dfid.gov.uk/ Denmark: Christoffer Bertelsen, chrber@um.dk
Australia: sean.batten@ausaid.gov.au/ Sweden: asa.wiberg@foreign.ministry.se
Japan: ryusuke.nakayama@mof.go.jp/ Ghana: Musah Abu Juam, majuamuk@yahoo.co.uk
Brazil: Artur Cardoso de Lacerda, artur.acerda@fazenda.gov.br,
marco.araujo@fazenda.gov.br
Congo: Felicien Kahenga, fmulenda2000@yahoo.fr/
Indonesia: Agus Sarsito, asarsito@yahoo.com/ Mexico: miguel.abaid@conafor.gob.mx

FIP Actors and Observers

Mesa Redd+ Peru, hchepiu@dar.org.pe, grupo-redd-peru@googlegroups.com
Indigenous Peoples: juancarlos.jintiach@gmail.com, ariasmarcial@gmail.com
Civil Society: jlichtenstein@bicusa.org, rjacobsen@globalwitness.org,
hheineken@globalwitness.org

Copied to: Amazon indigenous organizations and international solidarity partners

We are addressing you, on behalf of the Indigenous Peoples of the Amazon, spanning 1350 communities, 75 local organizations, and 9 regional organizations, under the umbrella of AIDSESEP. As owners of 13 million hectares of Amazonian land, we are the main forestry actor in the country, and we wish to indicate our strong disagreement with the Forest Investment Program (FIP), version 06.20.2013, which includes infringements on and misinformation about our traditional rights and territories, and violations of international regulations. We deplore the ostensible and superficial attention given to the observations and proposals (including the Amazonian Indigenous *REDD+ proposal*), which we have been working on since 2011.

We are attaching a new detailed analysis of this FIP, indicating the items that need to be modified, with the respective arguments, as well as five annexes of additional arguments. The following is a summary of the problems and solutions indicated in the report attached:

I. Misinformation on and threats to indigenous land rights: *Violation of Safeguards and OP765-IDB* Insufficient funds for titling *Territorial infringements in the general strategy and in the intervention zones, the impact on the Kampu Piyawi Integrated Territory (or Shawi) of a Regional Conservation Area (RCA) being imposed without consultation * Inconsistencies in the approach to territories.*

II. Correct falsehoods, half-truths, and unacceptable voids: ** Flawed and skewed analysis of Indigenous Peoples* Indigenous demands are not addressed * Unacceptable falsehoods about forestry law* Law on ecosystem services, without any consensus * Concealment of megaprojects and underlying causes * Some positive points that should not be contradicted in the same text.*

III. Discrimination against Amazonian Indigenous Redd+ proposal (RIA) and Community Forest Management (CFM) and preference being given to “offsets”: ** Violation C169, Art. 7 and with regard to RIA * Respect the legality of RIA in MDD (Ordinance 018-2013) * No discrimination against the public funds option in Redd+ * Serious bias in not conducting an in-depth investigation into underlying causes * Empty rhetoric with regard to the ecosystem approach * Lack of consideration of the carbon reserves of Loreto * CFM problems in the general approach and intervention zones.*

IV. Exclusion of Indigenous Peoples from the governance of FIP: **Indigenous Peoples left out of the decisions* Nonfulfillment of commitments to AIDSESP* Indigenous Peoples involved in forestry policy* Local organizations in decisions.*

V. Privatist, extractivist, and entrepreneurial bias in FIP: **Nature or competitiveness?* Privatism reiterated * Climate fraud with the megaprojects * Blind support to “laundering” of logging concessions * FIP is involved in the logging mess * Conflict of interests in Atalaya.*

VI. Inconsistency and bias with plantations, oil palm, and settlers: **National threat * Insistence on plantations * FIP for colonization? * Overlapping with Indigenous Peoples’ territories * Unnecessary risk of conflicts with FIP.*

VII. Bias and technocratic and bureaucratic interests: ** Exaggeration of technocratic role* Does forestry institutional management depend primarily on the budget?* Does consensus compensate for institutional weakness?* Underlying causes are hidden * Violation of customary law (C169).*

Finally, we demand full respect of the right to consultation and prior consent. We reject the attempt to discuss over 150 pages of the FIP and RPP in one day. It reflects an indecent haste, and in order to find solutions to this conflict, we propose the following:

- (a) *End the obsession with approving FIP hastily. It may or may not be achieved by October 28 in Washington DC, but a consensus-based document must be produced and not rejected because it was imposed.*
- (b) *Establish a permanent commission between the CD-FIP and AIDSESP to resolve disagreements and reach reasonable consensus on FIP and on the allegedly*

“updated” RPP.

- (c) Incorporate the agreements with INDUFOR (architects of the FIP) into FIP to allocate US\$7 million to land titling; US\$3 million to the CFM, and US\$2 million to community governance. Make the corrections to FIP proposed in the attached report and in other letters and reports sent to MINAM.*
- (d) The two final consensus-based documents to be disseminated through all media to regional and local indigenous organizations and other social actors involved.*
- (e) Organize an AIDSESEP meeting with regional and local indigenous organizations involved, and the CD-FIP, to share the two documents (FIP and RPP) at a meeting lasting a minimum of at least 3 days.*
- (f) Consultations conducted by regional and local indigenous organizations involved, with grassroots communities included in the intervention zones.*
- (g) Organize, through AIDSESEP, workshops with regional and local indigenous organizations involved in the intervention zones. Allow for internal dialogue within the indigenous community, and then share it with the other actors.*
- (h) Incorporate the recommendations into a consensus-based document between the CD-FIP and AIDSESEP, which should be presented with the support of the parties to the FIP sub-committee at the end of the process indicated.*
- (i) Avoid excluding AIDSESEP for a third time from the FIP sessions, and MINAM should support the participation of a leader and technocrat from AIDSESEP at the session where FIP-Peru is discussed. Full, unrestricted democracy.*

We thank you for your attention in this matter and ask:

- The CD-FIP to drive an effective dialogue process to build consensus.
- The Ombudsman to intervene so that the State will respect indigenous rights.
- The members of FIP, for their opinions and dialogue on our proposals.
- The members of the WB, IDB, FIP, for their opinions and dialogue on our proposals.
- The actors and observers from FIP, for public pronouncements in defense of indigenous rights in Peru in the FIP process.

Very truly yours,



Attached: Report on the FIP analysis and proposals, and Annexes 1,2,3