

Title:

Pitfalls of tree planting show why we need people-centered natural climate solutions

Authors:

Forrest Fleischman, University of Minnesota, Dept. of Forest Resources. ffleisch@umn.edu

Shishir Basant, Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology, Texas A&M University.
shishir.basant@tamu.edu.

Ashwini Chhatre, Bharti Institute of Public Policy, Indian School of Business, Hyderabad, India
ashwini_chhatre@isb.edu

Eric A. Coleman, Florida State University, Department of Political Science, ecoleman@fsu.edu

Harry W. Fischer, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of
Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala. harry.fischer@slu.se.

Divya Gupta, Bharti School of Public Policy, Indian School of Business, Hyderabad, India.
divya_gupta@isb.edu.

Burak Güneralp, Department of Geography, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA.
bguneralp@tamu.edu

Prakash Kashwan, Department of Political Science, University of Connecticut, Storrs,
prakash.kashwan@uconn.edu.

Dil Khatri, Southasia Institute of Advanced Studies, Kathmandu, Nepal. khatridb@gmail.com,

Robert Muscarella, Department of Ecology & Genetics, Uppsala University.
robert.muscarella@ebc.uu.se

Jennifer S. Powers, University of Minnesota, Depts. of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior and
Plant and Microbial Biology, Saint Paul, MN USA. powers@umn.edu

Vijay Ramprasad, Center for Ecology, Development and Research, Dehradun, India.
vijay.ramprasad@cedarhimalaya.org.

Pushpendra Rana, Indian Forest Service, Talland, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India,
pranaifs27@gmail.com

Claudia Rodriguez Solorzano, University of Minnesota, Dept. of Forest Resources.
rodr0423@umn.edu

Joseph W. Veldman, Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology, Texas A&M University,
College Station, TX, USA; Instituto Boliviano de Investigación Forestal, Santa Cruz, Bolivia.
veldman@tamu.edu

Authorship statement

FF & JV conceived of and drafted the manuscript. All authors provided substantive and
significant feedback during the writing process.

Main Text:

Scientists, corporations, mystics, and movie stars have convinced policymakers around the world that a massive campaign to plant trees should be an essential element of global climate policy. Public dialogue has emphasized potential benefits of tree planting while downplaying pitfalls and limitations that are well established by social and ecological research. We argue that if natural climate solutions are to succeed while economies decarbonize (Griscom et al. 2017), policymakers must recognize and avoid the expense, risk, and damage that poorly designed and hastily implemented tree plantings impose upon ecosystems and people.

We propose that people-centered climate policies should be developed that support the social, economic, and political conditions that are compatible with the conservation of Earth's diversity of terrestrial ecosystems. Such a shift in focus, away from tree planting and toward people and ecosystems, must be rooted in the understanding that natural climate solutions can only be effective if they respond to the needs of the rural and indigenous people who manage ecosystems for their livelihoods.

To motivate this shift in focus, we highlight ten pitfalls and misperceptions that arise when large-scale tree planting campaigns fail to acknowledge the social and ecological complexities of the landscapes they aim to transform. We then describe more ecologically effective and socially just strategies to improve climate mitigation efforts.

1. Ecosystems, not tree planting campaigns, capture and store carbon

In terrestrial ecosystems, plants capture carbon from the atmosphere, which is stored in biomass and soils. Through processes including microbial decomposition, herbivory, and fire, carbon is released back to the atmosphere. Because most ecosystems have the potential to capture more carbon than they lose, a host of natural climate solutions have been proposed to enhance carbon

sequestration (Griscom et al. 2017). Despite the importance of belowground biomass and soil organic matter to carbon storage, the most visible and easily measured carbon resides aboveground in trees. The high visibility and cultural resonance of trees has led advocates to elevate tree planting as paramount among natural climate solutions (Veldman et al. 2019). Unfortunately, large-scale tree planting programs have high failure rates, resulting in wasted resources and little carbon sequestration (Duguma et al. 2020). Worse yet, planting in ecosystems with naturally sparse tree cover, like savannas and peatlands, is destructive for biodiversity and counterproductive for addressing climate change (Temperton et al. 2019). By focusing on forests and trees, scientists and policymakers miss the opportunity to conserve and restore the wide diversity of Earth's ecosystems that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

2. Preventing ecosystem destruction is the most cost-effective natural climate solution

Because ecosystems are crucial to carbon sequestration, avoided deforestation, improved forest management, and protection of grasslands, peatlands, and shrublands from land-use conversion should be the priority (Temperton et al. 2019). Tree planting campaigns divert funding from conservation toward riskier, more costly, and less effective interventions. Planting trees without addressing the social drivers that caused deforestation in the first place will not mitigate climate change because those same drivers will destroy planted forests or shift ecosystem destruction elsewhere. Globally, the most prominent land-based source of carbon emissions is the expansion of commodity agriculture (IPBES et al. 2018). To protect ecosystems from commodity agriculture, it is essential to secure the rights of rural and indigenous people to make land management decisions. Land rights must be coupled with economic policies that support ecosystem-friendly land-use practices, provide just compensation for the carbon that ecosystems

store, and offer incentives for governments, corporations, and land managers to conserve ecosystems (IPBES et al. 2018).

3. Forests can regrow on deforested land without tree planting

In most places where reforestation is desirable, forests can regenerate naturally from seeds or resprouts, even in landscapes that appear to be highly degraded. Because natural regeneration requires little human intervention, it is usually much less expensive than tree planting. Whereas natural regeneration often leads to faster forest recovery, greater carbon storage, and more co-benefits for biodiversity and people, misapplied tree planting can hinder forest regrowth (Duguma et al. 2020). Where natural regeneration is insufficient, assisted natural regeneration may involve planting a small number of trees targeted to specific goals—such as establishing seed sources or species that are valued by local people—rather than maximizing the number of trees planted.

4. Tree plantations sequester less carbon, less securely, than naturally regenerated forests

Global forest restoration initiatives promote fast-growing plantations of commercial pulp and timber species as a natural climate solution despite clear evidence that these plantations lead to little long-term carbon storage (Lewis et al. 2019; figure 1). Worse yet, widely planted species in the genera *Pinus* and *Eucalyptus* are extremely flammable and can exacerbate wildfire risk and ecosystem carbon loss (Veldman et al. 2019). To be clear, fast growing trees can serve an economic purpose, but should not be confused for forest restoration or a natural climate solution.

[suggested placement of figure 1]

5. Tree plantations in grasslands, shrublands, and peatlands destroy biodiversity

Many ecosystems that do not naturally support dense tree cover are targeted for large-scale tree planting (Veldman et al. 2019; figure 2). Establishing tree plantations where forests did not

historically occur destroys the habitats of plants and animals adapted to open ecosystems and threatens the livelihoods of people dependent on those ecosystems to produce wild game and domestic livestock. The iconic savannas of Africa are a prime example of the ecosystems that are threatened by large-scale afforestation campaigns (Bond et al. 2019). In addition to the biodiversity cost, because fire and tree-killing megafauna, like elephants, are natural forces in these ecosystems, afforestation provides less long-term carbon storage than maintaining savannas in their open state, where most carbon is protected from fire and herbivory underground.

6. Trees can reduce water availability

Advocates of tree planting often assume that trees improve ground and surface water recharge, but the reality is more complicated: in the wrong places planted forests deplete ground water and can cause streams to dry up (Jackson et al. 2005). Although trees can facilitate water infiltration into soils, they also increase evaporation of intercepted rainfall and transpiration from leaf surfaces. The impact of trees on the balance between recharge and evapotranspiration is complicated and depends on many factors (Jackson et al. 2005). If a co-benefit of a proposed tree planting scheme is to enhance water resources, a careful site-specific evaluation is imperative to determine if potential gains in recharge will be offset by increased evapotranspiration.

7. Trees can warm the atmosphere

Trees interact with the climate system in ways that can cause warming to exceed the cooling benefit of carbon sequestration (Li et al. 2015). Trees, particularly evergreen conifers, are darker and taller than most other land covers, and thus absorb more visible and ultraviolet sunlight (shortwave radiation) compared to highly reflective bare ground, snow, or grasses. When trees replace highly reflective surfaces, the albedo of the ecosystem decreases and more shortwave

radiation is absorbed, which is emitted as heat (longwave radiation). The warming effect of trees is particularly pronounced in cold, snowy regions, like alpine and boreal forests, as well as arid and seasonally dry regions, where cloud cover is sparse. In general, natural forest restoration in high rainfall regions, like the humid tropics, cools the climate, but there are many locations on Earth where tree planting cannot be considered a natural climate solution because of unintended warming (Griscom et al. 2017).

8. Perverse financial incentives lead to rushed planting and high tree mortality.

When ambitious targets for the number of hectares or number of saplings planted are rewarded with large monetary commitments, governments and other organizations tend to focus on the act of planting rather than long-term maintenance to ensure tree survival and growth (Duguma et al. 2020). As a result, many tree planting initiatives have very high tree mortality rates. In the rush to achieve targets, forest restoration fails because trees are planted incorrectly, in the wrong places, and without the support of local people. Successful reforestation programs must plan for long-term maintenance by people who live and work nearby. Glamorizing and rewarding the act of tree planting undermines local institutions and social networks that are required for long-term carbon sequestration.

[suggested placement of figure 2]

9. Tree planting threatens rural livelihoods

Tree planting programs often target ecosystems or farmland that rural people depend on for subsistence livelihoods (Malkamäki et al. 2018). Frequently these people have insecure land tenure, and the land may be viewed by governments or other actors as “available” for tree planting. Replacing croplands with trees can result in unemployment for agricultural workers and elevate food prices (Lewis et al. 2019). Tree planting can bring positive livelihood benefits, but

only if land rights enable people to select the trees they need, maintain their local food production systems, and secure the future benefits of ecosystem conservation (Duguma et al. 2020, Malkamäki et al. 2018).

10. Tree planting targets the global south to capture emissions from the global north

While the majority of carbon emissions come from the industrialized countries of the global north, large-scale planting schemes focus on the opportunity to plant trees in the global south (Bond et al. 2019, Lewis et al. 2019). Proponents of large-scale tree planting, such as Plant-For-the-Planet and the Trillion Tree Campaign, equate tree planting with climate justice and prosperity for the global south. Unfortunately, these proponents ignore the opportunity costs of using land for trees instead of for other economically beneficial activities. Further they feed the public perception that tree planting at its best is good and at its worse is benign. To the contrary, because tree planting poses significant risks to ecosystems and people, critical questions of social justice must be answered by proponents of tree planting for climate change mitigation. Is it just for the states of the global north to ask the world's poorest people and most threatened ecosystems to bear the costs of fossil fuel emissions?

Effective climate solutions require social systems that support people to conserve ecosystems.

Climate change is a complex problem for which tree planting is a simplistic solution that often results in a mismatch between the technical capacity of foresters and the ecosystems and social contexts they target. For natural climate solutions to be effective, they must focus on the people whose decisions determine the long-term viability of ecosystem conservation and carbon storage. Because long-term investments require local support, natural climate solutions are more likely to be successful if they provide benefits for rural and indigenous people who rely on ecosystems for

their livelihoods. For small-scale farmers, pastoralists, and forest-dwelling people to prosper while conserving and restoring ecosystems, they must be empowered with decision-making rights over land and must benefit economically from sustainable land management (IPBES et al. 2018).

For example, expansion of commodity agriculture, which is often driven by distant investors, can be checked by securing land rights and enhancing the political power of indigenous and rural people. This involves redirecting investment and using modern technology to monitor and enforce certifications and bans on commodity agricultural expansion (IPBES et al. 2018). Land managers will invest in restoring carbon storage when their land rights are secure and they are confident that investments in ecosystems will benefit their livelihoods (Duguma et al. 2020). Increasing the carbon stored in ecosystems is an important element of any climate mitigation strategy. Unfortunately, the current focus on large-scale tree planting initiatives is at best a distraction from this goal. We suggest instead that efforts to implement natural climate solutions should focus on policies that support the restoration efforts of small farmers, hunters, and pastoralists, and hinder the displacement of ecosystems with export-oriented commodity agriculture. Once developed, people-centered climate solutions will be the most effective natural climate solutions because they will align conservation goals and the interests of the rural people responsible for managing ecosystems. Natural climate solutions that count saplings rather than address both the ecological and social drivers of ecosystem destruction are unlikely to succeed.

References Cited

B Bond WJ, Stevens N, Midgley GF, Lehmann CER. 2019. The Trouble with Trees: Afforestation Plans for Africa. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 34:963-965.

196 Duguma LA, Minang PA, Aynekulu BE, Carsan S, Nzyoka J, Bah A, Jamnadass RH. 2020.
 197 From Tree Planting to Tree Growing: Rethinking Ecosystem Restoration Through Tree.
 198 Griscom BW, et al. 2017. Natural climate solutions. Proceedings of the National Academy of
 199 Sciences 114:11645-11650.

200 IPBES, Montanarella L, Scholes R, Brainich A, eds. 2018. The IPBES assessment report on land
 201 degradation and restoration. Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on
 202 Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

203 Jackson RB, Jobbágy EG, Avissar R, Roy SB, Barrett DJ, Cook CW, Farley KA, Le Maitre DC,
 204 McCarl BA, Murray BC. 2005. Trading water for carbon with biological carbon
 205 sequestration. Science 310:1944-1947.

206 Lewis SL, Wheeler CE, Mitchard ETA, Koch A. 2019. Restoring natural forests is the best way
 207 to remove atmospheric carbon. Nature.

208 Li Y, Zhao M, Motesharrei S, Mu Q, Kalnay E, Li S. 2015. Local cooling and warming effects
 209 of forests based on satellite observations. Nature Communications 6:6603.

210 Malkamäki A, D’Amato D, Hogarth NJ, Kanninen M, Pirard R, Toppinen A, Zhou W. 2018. A
 211 systematic review of the socio-economic impacts of large-scale tree plantations, worldwide.
 212 Global Environmental Change 53:90-103.

213 Temperton VM, Buchmann N, Buisson E, Durigan G, Kazmierczak Ł, Perring MP, de Sá
 214 Dechoum M, Veldman JW, Overbeck GE. 2019. Step back from the forest and step up to the
 215 Bonn Challenge: how a broad ecological perspective can promote successful landscape
 216 restoration. Restoration Ecology 27:705-719.

217 Veldman JW, et al. 2019. Comment on “The global tree restoration potential”. Science
 218 366:eaay7976.

Acknowledgments

We thank K.D. Holl for helpful feedback on a previous version of this manuscript. F.F, A.C., E.A.C., H.W.F, B.G., V.R., P.R., & C.R.S. were supported by NASA award #NNX17AK14G. J.W.V. was supported by USDA-NIFA Sustainable Agricultural Systems Grant 12726253, USDA-NIFA McIntire-Stennis Project 1016880, and the National Science Foundation under award number DEB-1931232.

Author Biographical

Forrest Fleischman (ffleisch@umn.edu) is an assistant professor in the Department of Forest Resources at the University of Minnesota, in St. Paul, MN. Shishir Basant is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology at Texas A&M University, in College Station, TX. Ashwini Chhatre is an associate professor of public policy, and academic director of the Bharti Institute of Public Policy, at the Indian School of Business, in Hyderabad, India. Eric A. Coleman is an associate professor of Political Science at Florida State University, in Tallahassee, FL. Harry W. Fischer is assistant professor (Biträdande Universitetslektor) in the Department of Urban and Rural Development at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, in Uppsala. Divya Gupta is a research associate at the Bharti School of Public Policy, and Indian School of Business, in Hyderabad, India. Burak Güneralp is an assistant professor in the Department of Geography at Texas A&M University, in College Station, TX. Prakash Kashwan is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Connecticut, in Storrs, CT. Dil Khatri is the executive director of the Southasia Institute of Advanced Studies, in Kathmandu, Nepal. Robert Muscarella is senior lecturer and associate professor in the Department of Ecology & Genetics, at Uppsala University. Jennifer S. Powers is an associate professor in the Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior and the

242 Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, at the University of Minnesota, in St. Paul, MN.
243 Vijay Ramprasad is a research associate at the Center for Ecology, Development and Research,
244 in Dehradun, India. Pushpendra Rana is Chief Conservator of Forests at the Himachal Pradesh
245 Forest Department, in Shimla, India. Claudia Rodriguez Solorzano is an adjunct assistant
246 professor in the Department of Forest Resources, at the University of Minnesota, in St. Paul,
247 MN. Joseph W. Veldman is an assistant professor in the Department of Ecology and
248 Conservation Biology at Texas A&M University, in College Station, TX, and a research
249 associate of the Instituto Boliviano de Investigación Forestal, in Santa Cruz, Bolivia.



Figure 1. Government officials inspect a two-year-old plantation of Eucalyptus clones on government-controlled land in Telangana, India. Low biodiversity, soil disturbance, exacerbated fire risk, altered hydrology, and restricted access to local people mean that this afforested land, although a potentially valuable source of wood fiber for paper, disrupts rural livelihoods and should not be considered a natural climate solution.



257

258 *Figure 2. As part of an effort to “improve” forest cover in Telangana, India, foresters bulldoze*
259 *savanna-woodlands to establish a plantation of Eucalyptus clones. Similar plantation*
260 *activities around the world frequently replace intact ecosystems with commercial tree species*
261 *that offer few carbon, biodiversity, or livelihood benefits.*