The Donor and “Friends of the Facility” (DSG) met on Friday February 18, 2011 at the World Bank Office in Brussels, Belgium. The DSG meeting was organized after the 2 day PROFOR meeting, and before the annual Steering Committee (SC) meeting which has taken place in Durban, South Africa, from 22 to 25 February 2011.

Present were representatives of the European Commission, Belgium, Finland (Chair), Germany, the Netherlands, the World Bank and FAO (see Annex I).

Following the adoption of the agenda (see Annex II), the representative of Finland chaired the meeting.

Finland and Germany represent the donors in the SC.

Brief presentations by the Facility Manager:
- (i) 2010 Country Support, (ii) 2010 Information Services, (iii) budget implementation and funding situation at the end of the year, (iv) Programme Delivery;
- (iv) Background and proposal on the “Facility beyond 2012”; and
- (v) 2011 Workplan and Budget proposal.

Discussion on the 2010 Progress Report (PR)
- Noted no major issues in the PR; all major activities implemented as planned; the 2010 Progress Report accepted;
- Discussed the relation between NLBI (the Forest Instrument) and NFP and concluded that there is a strong and complementary link; while NFP is a national framework on “how” to implement SFM, the NLBI as international instrument provides a policy framework on “what” to do to achieve SFM;
- Noted that the NFP Facility is a very efficient mechanism to deliver small grants, a novum in FAO;
- Noted that the NFP is still not used in all partner countries as the platform for coordination and for discussion of forest policy related issues;
- Continued to adhere to the principle that the NFP Facility support is country driven and that the activities are identified and prioritised by the stakeholders;
- Noted that programme delivery remain at around 25% of overall expenditures in order to keep the quality of service delivery at a high level;
- Noted that a broad range of themes are financed by the Facility within the framework of an NFP and supported by the Facility Team and FAO Regular programme staff and, in some cases, by special expertise;
- Noted with satisfaction that the NFP key principles of “Country Leadership” and “Participation” have been well achieved, but the depth and range of partnerships could be improved; whereas the principle of “cross-sectoral linkages” was not achieved;
- Concluded that the NFP-framework is still relevant but that the implementation needs to be further strengthened;
Main issues discussed on the “Facility beyond 2012”

Rational for a third phase

- Four (4) bottlenecks were identified: empowering local stakeholders, SFM and restoring landscapes, and cross-sectoral cooperation. The central issue is to enhance sustainability in forest land and forest use;
- The rational for the new facility is thus to enhance sustainability and improve the range of products and services in a landscape;
- A major challenge is to use the 1.5 billion ha of degraded forest landscapes for restoration. To achieve this the NFP has to play a role; the task is cross-sectoral and would need an eco-system services approach;
- All actions in forestry should be integrated in one policy framework, leading to one national stakeholder committee on landscape issues since countries cannot afford more than one national platform for coordination, implementation and follow-up; there is a need for vertical integration;
- The GFP support to the establishment of G3 is recognized, (although no real activities were undertaken) as well as the added value of GFP in NFP Facility partner countries;

Proposed concept of the new facility

- The new Facility is welcomed as it addresses the need for cross-sectoral integration and would support more transparent and enhanced coordination;
- The demand driven principle of the NFP Facility could be sacrificed to focus on specific themes as long as effectiveness is kept high; but what is the niche of the new facility?
- The new facility should not been driven by opportunism, such as responding to the climate initiatives, as the results on the ground will be far off; could the new facility prepare the ground for further actions of REDD+ and FLEGT and coordination between them?
- One deliverable could be the empowerment of forest communities whose livelihoods depend on forest. This deliverable needs to be well justified as the support of local people is not an end in itself; what could be delivered should be clearly identified;
- The new facility should be built on the need for institutional analysis and multi-stakeholder empowerment; a criteria for becoming a partner of the new facility should be a clear demonstration of this need and political commitment by the government; the future support should be based on firm commitments in some 50 countries;
- How can the new platform have a real impact, such as the Alianza in Guatemala. Why does it work in Guatemala, and not in some other countries? Which Government institution would be the focal point for the new facility?
- The 800 non government organisations which the NFP Facility has supported are mainly working in the “implementation phase” of the NFP. The new facility should support the involvement of those organisations in real decision making, not only in “stakeholder consultations”.
- Support to local level organizing is fine, but the political level should not be forgotten. The NFP needs to reposition itself and the CPF members could play a role in the NFP-campaign.

Proposed name of the new facility

- The NFP Facility has become a known brand name, and should be maintained, but with a new task/mandate; the proposed new name “local forest voice” is too narrow and it has no notion of coordination in it.
- The logo could be kept

Proposed transition milestones
The preparation of a full-fledged project document is requested, incorporating what FAO has learned from its experience with the Facility. This document should be shared and supported by the governments.

There is a need to contact potential donors, as proposed in the “Beyond 2012” document, later in the year. Meanwhile, donor representatives will share the ideas for a new facility with colleagues in their respective agencies.

Conclusions on “Facility beyond 2012”
The chair concluded the discussion highlighting the following points:
- None of the donors present in the meeting opposed the idea for creating a new facility
- The new facility should draw on the 10 years of NFP Facility experience
- The content of the new facility will be further discussed by the SC in Durban
- A more substantial project proposal is needed for commitments
- Need to organise, later this year, a meeting with potential donors to seek their inputs and interest for funding the new facility
- By December 2011, the new project document should be in place

Discussion on the 2011 Workplan and Budget (WP)

- Noted that the proposed 2011 WP is based on an acceptance of a gradual transformation to a new facility during the year;
- Accepted the 2011 WP;
- Reiterated the conclusions and recommendations from the discussion at the meeting on the new facility to be taken into consideration;
- By December 2011, a final technical document reviewing the 10-year experience of the NFP Facility should be ready, in a digestible form, with a synthesis of max 5 pages; this document could be a marketing tool for the new facility; contracting external expertise for drafting this important work should be considered.
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#### Donors and International Partners

<table>
<thead>
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<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Coto Moreno</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>EuropeAid Cooperation Office, Brussels, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bruneval</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
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<td>International Forest Policy - Africa Programme; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Accra, Ghana</td>
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<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague, Netherlands</td>
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<td>PROFOR Manager, The World Bank, Washington, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Martin</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Director, Forest Economics &amp; Policy Division, Rome, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christophe Van Orshoven</td>
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</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>NFP Facility</td>
<td>Manager, FAO, Rome</td>
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# AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>• Selection of chair&lt;br&gt;• Welcome and presentation of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>• Highlights of 2010 Progress Report, including financial situation&lt;br&gt;• Round table Q/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>• The Facility beyond 2012&lt;br&gt;  - The “Horizon Searching Process”&lt;br&gt;  - Background and Proposal&lt;br&gt;  - Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>• Proposed Workplan and Budget 2011&lt;br&gt;  - Brief presentation&lt;br&gt;  - Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>• Summary of Donor recommendations to the Steering Committee&lt;br&gt;  • AoB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>• Closure of the meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>