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# PROPOSED AGENDA
## Forest and Farm Facility Steering Committee Meeting
### Day 1 Wednesday, February 17th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 09:00</td>
<td>Opening Welcome and Introductions: SC Chair with remarks from ADG-FOA/Dir. FOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:10</td>
<td>Adoption of Agenda: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:10 – 09:30</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes from Second Steering Committee Meeting: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>Overview and major topics for guidance and discussion: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 12:00</td>
<td>What we are achieving: Stories of impacts and outcomes: Coaches, M &amp; L team with observer invitees from other FAO Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Discussion: Chair or Nominee from SC -with observer invitees from other FAO Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>What we are achieving: the Exchanges and Training Programs: Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 14:30</td>
<td>Communications and knowledge generation update: Communications (FAO) and knowledge generation (IIED) teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 – 15:00</td>
<td>Learning and challenges to implementation at country and regional and global levels: Manager and Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 15:30</td>
<td>Discussion: Chair or Nominee from SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>2015 Financial Statement: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:30</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 17:00</td>
<td>Discussion and approval of Financial Statement: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 – 17:30</td>
<td>Wrap up of the last year: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:30 – 21:00</td>
<td>Group Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Day Two Thursday February 18th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>Special issues for discussion - Mid-Term Evaluation: Manager and SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:15</td>
<td>Coffee/tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:15</td>
<td>Special issues for discussion - Fund raising, Partnerships and Strategic planning issues: Manager and SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-11:45</td>
<td>Reflections from Observers and Donor Support Group: DSG Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 12:45</td>
<td>Work Plan for 2016 – Management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 – 13:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 – 14:00</td>
<td>Discussion of Work Plan 2016: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 14:30</td>
<td>Proposed Budget for 2016: Manager and team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:00</td>
<td>Discussion of Budget for 2016: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 15:30</td>
<td>Approval of 2016 Work Plan and Budget: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break( observers depart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:00</td>
<td>Final Internal SC Discussion. Decision on next meeting: SC Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Round of Thanks (Dir FOA)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACOFOP</td>
<td>Association of Forest Communities of Peten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA</td>
<td>Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFP</td>
<td>All Gambia Forestry Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APROVE</td>
<td>Honey Producers Association of the Velasco Province (Plurinational State of Bolivia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPB</td>
<td>Alianza Mesoamericana de Pueblos y Bosques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>Agriculture and Natural Resources (the Gambia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APTM</td>
<td>Plurinational Mother Earth Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Community Forestry Instruction (Myanmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFNWG</td>
<td>Community Forestry National Working Group (Myanmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFPPA</td>
<td>Community forest product producers association (Myanmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOEC</td>
<td>Interagency Coordination of Peasant Economic Organizations (Plurinational State of Bolivia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAMIB</td>
<td>National Confederation of Indigenous Women of Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAFOR</td>
<td>National Forestry Commission (Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAP</td>
<td>Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (Guatemala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of the Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPRACAO</td>
<td>National Federation of Cocoa Producers and Collectors of Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDCC</td>
<td>District development coordinating committee (Zambia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCDI</td>
<td>Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative (Myanmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td>Finance Alliance for Sustainable Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>Forest Development Authority (Liberia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECOFUN</td>
<td>Federation of Community Forest Users Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDECOVERA</td>
<td>Federation of Cooperatives of Verapaz (Guatemala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF</td>
<td>Forest and Farm Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF-SPAK</td>
<td>Farm Forestry Smallholders Association of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEGT</td>
<td>Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNCSI</td>
<td>Federation of Nepalese Cottage and Small Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMCIOB</td>
<td>National Confederation of Originating Indigenous Peasant Women (Bolivia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUN</td>
<td>Farmer Union Network (Liberia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACF</td>
<td>Global Alliance for Community Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>Interinstitutional Coordination Group (Guatemala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTI</td>
<td>Indigenous Territorial Government (Nicaragua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Three Rights Holders Group Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFS</td>
<td>Kenya Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFWG</td>
<td>Kenya Forest Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATPTF</td>
<td>International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFFA</td>
<td>International Family Forestry Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIED</td>
<td>International Institute for Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAB</td>
<td>National Forest Institute (Guatemala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAFOR</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional Forestal (Nicaragua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFFFP</td>
<td>local forest and farm platform (Zambia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoA</td>
<td>Letter of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA&amp;D</td>
<td>Market Analysis and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMA</td>
<td>Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the Comprehensive and Sustainable Management of the Forest and the Mother Earth (Plurinational State of Bolivia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction and overview

“It is time for a change in consciousness. It is a fact that agriculture and forestry can no longer be treated in isolation. Linking the two is imperative for socioeconomic development in the twenty-first century.”

Dr Evelyn Nguleka, President of the World Farmers Organization and the Zambia National Farmers' Union at a World Forestry Congress subtheme session organized by the Forest and Farm Facility

Forest and Farm Producers Organizations – the “operating system” for a sustainable future.

How will the Sustainable Development Goals with their related targets be turned into real changes that affect the lives of the people they are designed to benefit? Who will translate the new Intended Nationally Determined Contributions towards climate-change mitigation and adaptation – including the new, fully endorsed REDD+ programmes – into actions that have meaning, and who will respond to the needs of those closest to the resources and the people most affected?

The female and male farmers, youth, indigenous peoples and communities in rural towns and villages who still depend on forest and farms for their livelihoods remain primary actors in the production of food, fuel, fibre, building materials, water, environmental services and the maintenance of living and functioning landscapes. Their traditional institutions, enterprises and organizations represent a major – if still poorly recognized – component of rural economies and are the de facto social and economic “operating systems” in many countries; they have never been more vital for meeting the pressing challenges facing the world.

In the view of the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF), strengthen forest and farm producer organizations (FFPOs) is essential for ensuring the inclusive and sustainable management of productive landscapes, providing practical alternatives to economic migration, adapting and mitigating the effects of climate change, building wealth, and reducing rural poverty. This is the core of the FFF’s work and constitutes the Pillar I of our programme. (See chart below on the three pillars)

Given the complexity that landscape scale solutions demand and the multiple challenges that FFPOs face, FFF’s second major focus of work (Pillar II) focuses on facilitating and supporting multi-sectoral, multi stake holder platforms that help develop coordination across ministries and departments – leading to reduced conflict, and more integrated policies.

And lastly FFF prioritise the direct sharing of knowledge and learning through exchange visits and communications activities that help link FFPOs, government officials and other stakeholders through genuine participatory processes within countries, between countries at a regional level and finally at the global level decision making processes (Pillar III).
This report provides detailed information on the FFF’s work in ten partner countries – the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala and Nicaragua in Latin America; the Gambia, Kenya, Liberia and Zambia in Africa; and Myanmar, Nepal and VietNam in Asia – and at the regional and global levels in 2015. An overview is provided of the progress made by, and the challenges facing the FFF, drawing on the first full cycle of monitoring and learning (M&L), which is now embedded in practice and procedure. An all-staff retreat held in mid-December was the culminating event in the M & L cycle and allowed considerable discussion around the application of the M & L. The M&L system shows that the FFF has accomplished a great deal, especially considering the relatively small funds available per country. (Aggregate Indicators are presented in Annex 1).

**FFF is empowering a significant number of Forest and Farm Producer Organizations (Pillar I)**

FFF provided support in varying amounts to three global and two regional forest and farm producer alliances (each representing large numbers of national federations), six national federations, and more than 200 local forest and farm producer organizations of various sizes. This represents a doubling of coverage from 2014 at the local and national levels. Combined, these producer organizations represent more than 40 million people. They have the potential to take new ideas and approaches to scale horizontally. The M & L system is providing more precise figures on women’s
representation in these organizations. In much of the work on organizational strengthening at the national level, the percentage of women in producer organizations varies from 15 to 100 percent, with the representation of women in leadership positions varying from 10 to 70 percent, depending on the country.

**Stronger Forest and Farm Producer Organizations are having impacts on policies and tenure security (Pillar I and II)**

To varying degrees in each of our partner countries we see encouraging stories of the increased engagement and participation of FFPOs in various policy processes – including those related to food security and nutrition, climate change – especially through REDD+ programmes, forest restoration and other important national debates. The FFF provided support for 204 planning meetings by forest and farm producer organizations. Many of these prepared for inputs to 96 multi sectoral policy meetings, at which specific changes were achieved in 26 policies, representing a doubling in policy engagement. While we hope to see this level of engagement increase from year to year the past year also saw some significant higher level outcome results of policy advocacy.

In The Gambia – 77 community forestry groups were given official recognition, securing their tenure and access to the productive resources which they have been expecting since 2007. Another 30-40 community forestry groups now hope to receive their agreements in 6 months. The efforts of the National Farmers Platform, regional Community Forestry Task Force groups and the support the FFF and FAO Gambia office, were publicly acknowledged by the Minister and other officials in newspapers, radio and television. In Guatemala an important new forest and landscape incentive programme: Probosque, was passed into law with significant support of the FFF Facilitator who was crucial the process, convening the cross sectoral process and FFF’s apex partner the National Alliance of Forest Communities and Agroforesters (Alianza) in the drafting of the bill. Four of six recommendations made by the Alianza were incorporated in the bill which will provide 30 years of incentives for forest and landscape restoration to smallholders, indigenous peoples, community forests and the private sector. In Nepal and Myanmar important new government regulations were passed to improve the ability of smallholders to harvest and market timber from community forests (Myanmar) and their farm lands (Nepal) – the result of successful advocacy of the Federation of Community Forestry User Groups and their new sister organization the Association of Family Forest Owners of Nepal and of forward looking government officials in Myanmar. FFPOs reported that twenty-five new networks or linkages proved beneficial to them as a result of their participation in multi-sectoral platforms.

**Forest and Farm Producers are adding value -gaining access to markets and better prices (Pillar I)**

Vitally important this year has been the increased access for forest and farm producers and their organizations to improved prices and better sales opportunities. This has happened to some degree in many of the countries were FFF is providing both training and other kinds of facilitation for small entrepreneurs. Concrete advances were documented in some of the 103 group enterprises supported producing products such as timber, charcoal, seedlings,
bamboo, rattan, textiles, fisheries, fruit juice, honey, craftwork, nuts, pottery, mangrove salt, poultry, cinnamon, cardamom, mushrooms, yams, star anise and other non-timber forest products. Businesses take time to develop, and many of these producer groups are now starting to implement their business development plans. In Vietnam, within several months of getting organized Acacia mangium timber growers groups are getting up to 15% better prices and receiving large orders from furniture makers. In the Gambia, cashew growers managed to unite under a single national federation and contributed to a huge increase in the price of cashews for their 15,000 members and their families. Forest fruit producers from the Chiquitania region in Bolivia have improved their market linkages through trade fairs.

**FFF is helping FFPOs leverage resources (Pillar I)**

Increasingly FFF country programmes are linking small grants to groups receiving the MA & D training with a view to help them finalize effective enterprise development plans and seek secure finance or other incentive programmes through government programmes. This is seen by governments in Kenya, Bolivia, Vietnam and others as a model to link to larger financing programmes in country. Support to strengthen the regional and national organization of cacao producers and help prepare a national policy for organic cacao will link these FFPOs to USD 37 M in funding from the government. Funds are not the only resources that FFPOs require. Thirty-two service provider organizations were mobilized in support of the FFF’s work in 2015 (a doubling of the number compared with 2014).

**Knowledge experience is being shared between FFPOs, government supporters and regional and global processes (Pillar III)**

Twenty-one national and international exchanges were organized resulting in 17 documented examples of transfers of either technical or business practice. Government officials from Bolivia, Zambia, and Myanmar were each inspired by policy innovations in Mexico, Kenya and Vietnam respectively. FFPOs were able to learn about practical approaches to territorial management, agroforestry practices, tree growing and value addition for a wide variety of products through these exchanges. In a particularly unique case – a leading Federation of Cooperatives (FEDOCOVERA) in the Verapaz Region in Guatemala is being supported to develop its own school of agroforestry business focusing on youth and women and its opening event will be an exchange visit from forest and farm producers and government officials from Nicaragua, Bolivia, Belize and other parts of Guatemala. Larger regional meetings Central America, Africa and South and southeast Asia provided an opportunity for FFPOs and government officials to get together and draw attention to key challenges they were facing, including the importance of secure tenure, ensuring the rights of indigenous peoples (including Free Prior and Informed Consent-FPIC), providing access to support services and markets, engaging more effectively with youth and expanding the role of women. These regional events culminated in a major global event held in September immediately before the World Forestry Congress in Durban, South Africa, a wide range of events during the Congress, and further events in November–December at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Paris, France.
Over the year twenty-four communication packages were prepared (including a special paper on engaging youth in FFPOS) and provided direct inputs into 17 national, regional and international processes.

**Responding to context means coping with challenges and seizing opportunities**

A number of dramatic events affected the programme in different countries – requiring a change of pact and even significant redirection in some cases. The earthquake in Nepal dramatically affected work there – particularly as one of the two major focal districts, Kavre was very badly affected. This was followed by (and contributed to) the final passage of a new constitution which significantly re-draws the administrative boundaries of the country. Our partners in the Federation of Community Forestry Users of Nepal (FECOFUN) with members throughout the country have to struggle with both the short term devastation and concomitant demands from the earthquake and the political turmoil of the constitutional reform process – both of which put new demands on community forest resources, but also provided an opening to push for liberation of rules related to the sale of trees and forest products for communities and farmers. Liberia is making a slow comeback from the Ebola crises – but FFPOs were deeply affected. At the same time significant new external funding has created further complexity in the country. Two major elections: in Guatemala and Myanmar also added to the uncertainty in 2015. Remarkably the landmark forest incentive law: Probosque passed in parliament at the same time that both the previous vice-president and the sitting President of the country were in jail. In Nicaragua the government has issued new regulations requiring all external funding to go directly through government agencies and not to FFPOS. This resulted in a slowdown and complete re-design in the programme there.

Finally the ongoing impact of the economic slowdown and the dramatically expanded refugee crises in Europe have combined to cast further uncertainty around both current and new funding for the Forest and Farm Facility. In spite of many efforts to attract new funds – and a set of new communications materials, and the compelling case for strengthening forest and farm producer organizations – resource mobilization continues to prove extremely difficult.

Overall this first year of full implementation in 10 countries reflects the relevance of the FFF’s approach, the hard work of its forest and farm producer organization partners, champions in government, the linking and leveraging of ideas and resources, and the collective hard work of the FFF management team.

**Issues needing input and guidance from the Steering Committee**

The two primary issues for which the management team seeks inputs and guidance from the steering committee are around the Mid-Term Evaluation – scheduled to start in February following the SC meeting and the urgent need for additional resource mobilization. Special sessions will be dedicated to these topics at the SC meeting this year.
2. Progress with FFF Monitoring and Learning (M&L) system

Background

It has now been a full year since the FFF M&L system became operational, following design workshops in February 2014, in-country piloting in March–December 2014, a review of processes conducted at the annual FFF retreat in December 2014, and final sign-off of the new responsibilities and reporting procedures in January 2015. Major efforts (described below) were made in 2015 to ensure that country and international teams both owned and could use the M&L framework in their work.

The M&L system is now a co-owned cyclical set of processes based on the FFF’s theory of change. It enables learning and adaptive management across the entire FFF programme of activities. It captures data on challenges as well as success stories and thereby allows key programme staff to learn from best practice and avoid pitfalls.

As noted in last year’s annual report, the M&L system is cyclical by design. It involves a series of iterative annual stages: planning; grant implementation; oversight and monitoring; reporting and reflecting; and joint adaptation. A similar cycle is employed in in-country programmes (Figure 1) and regional and global letters of agreement (LoAs), although LoAs do not involve scoping missions or baseline studies.

Figure 1. The Forest and Farm Facility monitoring and learning system employed in each partner country
The FFF M&L system has six main objectives:

1) To ensure that key programme staff record decisions and the outcomes of those decisions.
2) To provide lessons for partners and programme staff to enable mutual improvement.
3) To enable course correction and adaptation in light of emerging priorities and conditions.
4) To gather evidence of FFF added value as a means of drawing in partners and supporters.
5) To enable reporting to the Steering Committee, donors and stakeholders.
6) To provide accountability – both internally and externally.

The M&L system uses a common set of quantitative and qualitative indicators in its monitoring component, and in-country partners can add additional indicators as required. A series of reflective questions is used to interrogate the qualitative indicators aimed at capturing stakeholder perceptions about how and why particular activities have (or have not) achieved impact and therefore indicating what might need to be adjusted, introduced to, or struck out of, FFF work plans.

An important element of the M&L system is group reflection. In-country FFF partners and facilitators meet annually to report on progress using the indicators and reflective questions. The facilitators of all ten country programmes and of the regional and global programmes meet the FFF management team in an annual retreat to discuss progress and adapt management accordingly. All are now aware of the FFF’s overall theory of change and the main building blocks for delivering it – that is, the three pillars of activity and associated outcomes and outputs shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2. The Forest and Farm Facility pillars, outcomes and outputs, under which activities fall and are monitored**
In practice, many of the activities of the FFF are implemented through LoAs and small grant agreements based on subsets of activities in countries or internationally. Each level of the programme structure has specific responsibilities, as described below.

**LoA recipients’ level.** The implementing organizations (i.e. LoA recipients) agree to terms of reference that include reporting requirements against outcomes and outputs based on specified indicators and reflective questions. Their roles as implementers therefore also include responsibility for: collecting information on the initial conditions (baseline) of the organization/policy process/regional or global initiative and monitoring progress throughout the year; and reporting annually (to both the country facilitator and the FFF management team) describing achievements against outcomes and outputs, highlighting the lessons learned, and proposing changes for future work.

**National level.** The ten country facilitators and the IUCN team responsible for the regional/global LoAs agree on terms of reference that include reporting requirements against outcomes and outputs based on specified indicators and reflective questions. Their roles as facilitators therefore include responsibility for: organizing annual stakeholder meetings to which implementing organizations (LoA recipients) are invited to present draft reports on progress, validate findings at the country level, and plan and adapt for the following year; and prepare annual synthesis reports for the FFF management team based on reporting by implementing organizations (LoA recipients).

**Global level.** The FFF management team (i.e. FAO, IIED and IUCN) at the global level have clear roles and responsibilities within the M&L system. One responsibility shared by the team is to host an FFF annual retreat, together with in-country facilitators. At this retreat, annual syntheses and other progress reports are presented, discussions about strategy and tactics are held, and planning for the year ahead commences. Reporting responsibilities are partitioned between the three management team organizations as follows: IUCN collects reports from regional and global LoA recipients (e.g. forest farm federations) and provides a synthesis report which they pass to FAO; FAO assembles reports from the regional/global programme and the annual synthesis reports from each country facilitator and all LoA recipients, which they pass to IIED; IIED synthesizes the reports it receives from FAO into a global annual report that documents progress against indicators, analyses learning outcomes against reflective questions, and identifies common learnings for uptake in the forthcoming year. An abbreviated form of the global annual report is inserted into the annual report to the Steering Committee on progress, and donors also receive the full version. The FFF management team is responsible for identifying independent experts to carry out final evaluations after 2.5 and 5 years, respectively. The mid-term evaluation is planned for February–April 2016.

**Progress in 2015**

**Dedicated M&L missions.** In 2015, country coaches improved the way in which M&L indicators are incorporated into formal LoA processes. Specific M&L follow-up missions were made to FFF partner countries either individually (e.g. the Gambia, Kenya, Myanmar, Nepal, Viet Nam and Zambia) or regionally (e.g. the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala and Nicaragua; and the Gambia, Kenya, Liberia and Zambia). Regional missions were sometimes conducted in combination with joint workshops for training trainers in the Market Analysis and Development (MA&D) approach. Processes for developing the in-country M&L cycle were discussed during missions, including detailed discussions on responsibilities, participatory techniques, reporting templates for various parties, including LoA recipients and FFF facilitators, and joint learning outcomes.
Assessment of comparable indicator systems. In early 2015, the Steering Committee requested the FFF management team to look at possible synergies with other indicator sets in related programmes such as those developed by AgriCord, the Finance Alliance for Sustainable Trade (FAST), the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), the Forest Poverty Toolkit, and the new FAO strategic programmes. Although the FFF M&L system was already quite advanced by then, it was instructive for the FFF management team to consider some of these other sets of indicators.

The AgriCord system for profiling the strengths of farmer organizations using an octagonal spider diagram provides a useful approach that could be used in assessing the impacts of forest and farm producer organizations. It is based on the following:

1) Representation = extent and relevance of external relations and alliances with other stakeholders.
2) Participation = degree of involvement of farmers in policymaking and decision-making.
3) Accountability = leaders report to farmers (farmers control the organization).
4) Strategic potential = capacity to pursue long-term goals in service provision and strategy development.
5) Professional capacity = expertise and implementation capacity.
6) Gender = women’s membership, participation and involvement in external relations.
7) Income diversification = ability to generate own income compared with external resources.
8) Representativeness = membership base within the potential and relevant farmer constituency.

Most of these issues are covered in FFF output indicators 1.1–2.2 and 4.1. Nevertheless, elements of the AgriCord system (such as the ability of the producer organizations themselves to offer services to their members, and the indicators on income diversification) could be better captured in the FFF learning questions.

FAST’s “impact indicators for investments in sustainable forestry” constitute a similarly useful set of indicators for tracking the economic, social and environmental performance of investments. The FAST indicators provide a more detailed and comprehensive assessment of performance in the area of enterprise development compared with the FFF M&L indicators. FAST’s economic indicators are a good guide to assessing economic performance – and could help LoA recipients clarify what they aim to achieve economically. FAST’s environmental indicators are similarly useful for setting out the areas of consideration (albeit in natural forest management) where LoA recipients might make progress. The social indicators offer specific measures, although they shy away from questions of ownership and representation that are more prominent in Agricord’s approach. A question remains, however, on the extent to which it is useful or feasible to add further depth to the FFF M&L reporting.

The FSC criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management are similar to the FAST indicators – although they do not address the economic viability of producer organizations. They comprise usefully detailed criteria and indicators in ten largely social (1–5) and environmental (6–10) realms of sustainability: 1) compliance with laws; 2) workers’ rights and employment conditions; 3) indigenous peoples’ rights; 4) community relations; 5) benefits from the forest; 6) environmental values and impacts; 7) management planning; 8) monitoring and assessment; 9) high conservation values; and 10) implementation of management activities. Audits against FSC criteria and indicators are costly professional exercises, and it would be unreasonable to expect LoA recipients to undertake them. It may be possible, however, to develop a “sustainability” checklist based on some of these indicators as an aide-memoire for in-country facilitators.
The Forest and Poverty Toolkit aims to broaden the measurement of forest and poverty interactions through structured tools that gather data on wealth ranking (tool 1); how people depend on forests (tools 2–5); and solutions to the problems of forest-dependent people. This is similar (although perhaps inferior) to the “Effective Project Design for Sustainable Forest Management” toolkit. It includes several ways of measuring progress through participatory methods but is less useful for informing the FFF M&L system.

FAO’s five new strategic objectives (SOs) are accommodated in the FFF M&L system, in part because many of the FFF in-country facilitators are FAO staff and so must ensure that their reporting on FFF activities can be included in the SO reporting formats.

The five SOs are:

1) Help eliminate hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition.
2) Make agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and sustainable.
3) Reduce rural poverty.
4) Enable inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems.
5) Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises.

FFF in-country exercises have helped position the FFF firmly within SO3, specifically in relation to SO3 Output 1.1 (“strengthening rural organizations and institutions and empowering rural poor”) and SO2, specifically in relation to SO2 Output 2.2 (“Countries are supported to strengthen national governance frameworks that foster sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management”). Indicators for both these outputs match FFF indicators under its Pillar 1 and Pillar 2, respectively, and milestones must be inserted and measured for each country.

All the indicator systems described above provide insights that can be used to improve either the scope or depth of the FFF M&L system. It would be interesting to discuss whether revision towards more scope or depth is needed, and whether the benefits of such a revision would outweigh potential costs, and interfere with efforts underway to fully implement the existing M & L system without too many changes.

A toolkit for partners for implementing the FFF M&L system. As part of additional funding provided by Sida in 2015 to improve M&L, an M&L implementation plan for IIED was developed in early 2015 to guide remote and in-country M&L support. As part of that support, IIED produced a toolkit for FFF in-country facilitators – “How to use the FFF framework for monitoring and learning” – to help in the planning and implementation of in-country M&L systems. The toolkit contains practical guidance and tools for integrating the M&L system with in-country activities and planning, such as the annual meeting and report, developing LoAs with implementing partners, commissioning baseline studies, and maintaining oversight and M&L records. IIED commissioned the translation in Spanish of the toolkit and of all reporting tools and PowerPoint presentation templates for ease of use by Spanish-speaking FFF facilitators and partners, who usually report in Spanish.

Revised reporting templates. Monthly reporting and annual synthesis reporting caused problems in 2014 – the former because it often involved excessive work for hard-pressed in-country facilitators, and the latter because it was insufficiently oriented towards the indicators of overall FFF programme achievement. New templates for monthly reporting and annual M&L synthesis reports by in-country facilitators were developed in 2015. One innovation
was to ensure that all reporting headings were framed as questions. For the annual M&L synthesis report, this involved transcribing indicators and learning questions into a single set of report headings phrased as questions. Simply by answering the questions, LoA recipients and in-country facilitators provide information on the indicators. Learning questions are now built into the structure so that more personal, qualitative reflections on progress accompany quantitative “indicator” questions. This question-style reporting format was also adopted in PowerPoint templates for LoA recipients, thereby ensuring that LoA recipients cover all the indicators in their reports to FFF in-country facilitators. The ultimate outcome of these changes has been the production of more interesting (highlight-oriented) monthly reports and fuller, better-structured annual reports against the full set of outputs and indicators.

**M&L mentoring.** As the FFF global management team, in-country facilitators and LoA recipients became more familiar with the FFF M&L system in 2015, e-mentoring (in addition to face-to-face missions) was provided to LoA recipients via Skype on specific issues of concern. For example, e-mentoring on the implementation of the M&L system was conducted with teams in the Gambia, Nepal and Zambia, and additional face-to-face mentoring was provided to Liberian facilitators during training in the Gambia.

Among other things, these mentoring sessions showed the difficulty of keeping track of overall progress. Thus, IIED introduced to the toolkit a summary progress matrix, which both served as an aide-memoire for in-country facilitators in their regular reporting and helped them keep in view the overall ambition of the FFF so as to prompt action in areas where work plans were not yet fully developed. Another issue that emerged was the question of how to do adequate baseline studies – and how these relate to initial in-country scoping work. In response, a template was created for developing terms of reference for country baseline studies and added to the toolkit.

Global partners were coached in the use of reporting templates at the global partners’ inception meeting held in Geneva, Switzerland, in January 2015. IIED staff mentored facilitators face-to-face during country missions to the Gambia, Kenya, Myanmar, Nepal, Viet Nam and Zambia and on regional missions (e.g. to Guatemala, where they also met with the Bolivian and Nicaraguan facilitators, and to Zambia, where FFF facilitators from Gambia, Kenya and Liberia were also present).

**Streamlined processes of collecting data.** Before in-country facilitators submitted their annual national M&L synthesis reports in 2015, almost all FFF participating countries held annual learning meetings, bringing together all FFF implementing partners to report on progress. This greatly improved overall awareness, at the country level, of the way in which the various FFF activities fit together, and it also helped facilitators in reporting on those activities. FAO coaches received and provided technical inputs to each country report. IIED divided responsibility for summarizing annual M&L synthesis reports received from in-country facilitators among its staff: Duncan Macqueen oversaw the introductory chapter and reporting from the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Liberia, Myanmar, Nicaragua and Viet Nam; and Anna Bolin oversaw reporting from the Gambia, Guatemala, Kenya, Nepal and Zambia and the global and regional programmes co-managed with IUCN.

In addition to these activities, FAO coaches and the M&L team at IIED worked closely with national facilitators to provide feedback on monthly reports, plan work plans in line with the M&L system, and develop LoAs with implementing partners and small grant recipients. The next section provides summaries of progress in each participating country, based on annual M&L synthesis reports.
3. Country reports

Plurinational State of Bolivia: producers get organized and catalyse new policy-support programmes

Country coach: Jhony Zapata; national facilitator: Boris Fernandez

Timeline of the FFF programme in the Plurinational State of Bolivia

**Key highlight, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFF launch Sep 2014</td>
<td>Establishing a National Federation of Cocoa Producers, backed by work to design a national policy and programme for cocoa production, will see producers receive US$30 million from the government over the next five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The 38 indigenous peoples who make up the Plurinational State of Bolivia are among South America’s poorest and most forest-dependent people. Half the land area (53 million hectares) is covered in forest. Through the Government of Evo Morales’ Forest and Lands Audit and Social Control Authority (ABT), 23.2 million hectares of land have been newly titled or retitled to communities through a legal mechanism known as the Original Indigenous Native Peasant Territories. The government also set up the Plurinational Mother Earth Authority (APTM) that oversees three new climate-change mechanisms, including the Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the Comprehensive and Sustainable Management of the Forest and the Mother Earth (MCMA). The FFF began operations in the country in September 2014, after coordination with the Government of the Plurinational State through the Ministry of Rural Development and Land (MDRyT) and the Ministry of Environment and Water (MMAyA). The launch in the Plurinational State of Bolivia was used to create an advisory committee for the FFF composed of representatives of the Departmental Federation of Indigenous and Peasant Women Originating in Pando Bartolina Sisa (FDMCIOP "BS"), MMAyA, MDRyT and APTM. At its first meeting, the advisory committee approved the “Framework for the implementation of FFF”, which recommended that it support the implementation of the Law of Mother Earth, the Productive Revolution Law, the Forest Restitution and Food Production Law and the Economic Peasant Organizations Law; that it be implemented in three departments (North La Paz, East Santa Cruz and West Pando); and that it prioritize women’s groups among national, departmental and municipal producer organizations.

Results and learning in 2015

**Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement**

**Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement**

In 2015 the FFF provided support to the El Ceibo cooperative, which, in turn, is facilitating the formation of the National Federation of Cocoa Producers and Collectors of Bolivia (COPRACAO) comprising five departmental federations (La Paz, Pando, Beni, Cochabamba and Santa Cruz). COPRACAO will contribute to the validation and approval of the National Policy for Cocoa Production, which targets
crops grown in agroforestry systems and the upgrading or restoration of native cocoa production systems. COPRACAO will also contribute directly to the preparation and design of a programme on cocoa production, within the framework of the National Policy to be funded by the Government of the Plurinational State of Bolivia for the benefit of cocoa producers and which will have a budget of US$30 million over the next five years.

The FFF supported the representation of producer organizations in the Social Pact for Forests (PSB) led by the Vice President of the Plurinational State of Bolivia and the Ministry of Environment and Water. The PSB is intended to design and agree on a national forest policy; a forest sector plan; and a proposed new legal and institutional framework for the sector. In 2015, the FFF provided the National Fund for the Development of Forests (Fonabosque) with technical assistance in developing its institutional and legal structure so that it can finance the projects of forest and farm producer organizations. Fonabosque has an annual budget of more than US$2 million, and it will provide much-needed investment to forest and farm producer organizations in the country. It is expected that the restructuring of Fonabosque scheduled to take place in 2016 will allow the channelling of a significant percentage of the available financial resources to producer organizations.

**Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business**

In 2015 the FFF supported the Interagency Coordination of Peasant Economic Organizations (CIOEC) to build on the training on MA&D the FFF provided in 2014 and the exchanges of experiences it facilitated among producer businesses. CIOEC undertook an initial diagnosis of 65 producer organizations in Pando (which hosts the largest area of Amazon Basin of any of the Bolivian departments) and is now assisting 20 of these to build capacity with the aim of improving their legal and financial status and developing business plans. By the end of 2015, seven producer organizations had become operational.

The first of these organizations to receive specific further support from the FFF was the Honey Producers Association of Velasco Province (APROVE). Having developed a business plan through the 2014 MA&D training, a proposal was made to strengthen the capacity of the organization and facilitate the inclusion of product packaging (sachets of honey) in the school breakfast programme run by the local township. The support is also providing technical assistance to increase honey production with a view to expanding the market for their products across the province. More than 100 member families of the honey producers association are benefiting from this support.

The FFF also commenced work with the Association of United Working Groups (MINGA) to establish a technical service to assist forest groups in developing "integrated forest and land management plans" (PGIB-Ts), which will form the basis for securing commercial rights for indigenous communities. The ambition is to formally register at least ten PGIB-Ts and provide training to 20 indigenous men and women leaders in those communities in business development based on their new rights. MINGA organized the first trade fair of wild edible fruit of the Chiquitania in February 2015 with support from the FFF, several local and government institutions, and development partners.
Fantasy partners in Bolivia with whom formal agreements have been signed

- The El Ceibo cooperative – to establish the National Federation of Cocoa Producers and Collectors of Bolivia and contribute to national policies and programmes
- The Interagency Coordination of Peasant Economic Organizations – to help develop the business capacity of 20 producer organizations (small grant)
- The Association of United Working Groups – to establish a technical assistance service for developing integrated forest and land management plans to secure indigenous rights (small grant)
- The Honey Producers Association of the Velasco Province (APROVE) – for marketing and business development

Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms

Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

Within the scope of the Framework Law of Mother Earth, the Joint Mechanism for Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change (MCMA in Spanish) was expected to be a decision-making and implementation mechanism, and the FFF was requested to support this cross-sectoral platform. To date, however, only one MCMA platform has been established – in the Department of Pando.

The intention is for the FFF to support the operational development of MCMA s in the three domestic regions it encompasses. At this stage, support has been limited to four signed agreements (with El Ceibo/COPRACAO, CIOEC, MINGA and APROVE), although these four producer initiatives are likely to ultimately form key parts of the MCMA’s subnational platforms. While the formal roll-out of the MCMA platform has been slow, it is expected that, in 2016, the ongoing support of the FFF will allow the establishment and operation of MCMA platforms in the two other domestic regions.

The FFF has also supported discussions for the preparation of national financial mechanisms for the sustainable and integrated management of Bolivian forests. Two South–South cooperation missions were undertaken in 2015 with the participation of people working on this issue from Brazil, Chile, Guatemala and Mexico and the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean. These people worked with representatives of government, producers and other key stakeholders in Bolivia in the preparation of a proposal for a national financial mechanism. A proposal for this financial mechanism was prepared as an output of the second mission. In the next step, the government will work to finalize the design of the financial mechanism.

Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes

Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa

Producers in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala and Nicaragua have jointly undertaken several exchanges of experiences, which have also involved representatives of organizations from Mexico and Chile. There was one regional exchange in 2015 – to producer organizations in Mexico. Initiatives were
established around three main themes: 1) forest governance; 2) integrated territorial management; and 3) market linkages. The regional initiative envisaged the development of inputs to policy guidelines and the formulation of recommendations to be made at the World Forestry Congress and UNFCCC COP 21, both of which were held during 2015. Bolivia’s national delegation was composed of producers of cocoa and Brazil nuts; representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Water; the National Forestry Development Fund; and an indigenous female Member of Parliament of the Plurinational State of Bolivia. The FFF directly supported the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Plurinational State of Bolivia in publishing the Bolivian position at UNFCCC COP 21, which drew on some of the issues discussed in that prior process.

A planning meeting with We Effect on working in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala and Nicaragua to support producer organizations was held in Guatemala in November 2015. The Governor of Pando participated as part of the Bolivian delegation, and the meeting proved a good opportunity for him to learn from experiences in other countries about the importance of supporting the organization of producers for business purposes (e.g. as in the case of FEDECOVERA). The governor mentioned that he will coordinate with the FFF and FAO Bolivia to build a programme for producers in Pando using a territorial development approach, and that he is ready to put government funds into the programme.

**Challenges in implementation and Lessons learned**

The FFF’s focus on strengthening producer organization in the Plurinational State of Bolivia within the existing framework of national laws has given it credibility with the government. This has allowed the FFF team and partners to engage with government institutions to design programmes that will benefit producer organizations, such as a new national programme on cocoa production, worth US$6 million per year over five years, and FONABOSQUE, worth US$2 million per year. This multiplier effect has been achieved through a commitment to work directly with producers and build their strength in numbers to articulate their needs to receptive decision-makers.

The slow implementation of the MCMA in the three domestic regions in which the FFF operates was a challenge in 2015, but it has been overcome through FFF’s direct support for producer organizations, in close coordination with the government. Strong producer organizations will be important members of subnational MCMA platforms and could actively contribute to their implementation.
Gambia: producer organizations trigger community forest transfer

Country coach: Sophie Grouwels; national facilitator: Kanimang Camara

Timeline of the FFF programme in Gambia

### Background

The legal framework for community forestry in the Gambia is globally renowned and, in 2011, the government received an award for its forest policy and efforts in improving livelihoods through community forestry. In the last decade, however, the benefits accruing to communities have stalled due to stagnation in the transfer and final approval of community forests by the Forestry Department. The revival of the community forestry programme has been a key target of the FFF and its stakeholders in the Gambia. In 2015, these efforts bore fruit.

#### Key highlight, 2015

In 2015, as a result of successful advocacy by the FFF and partners, 50 community forest maps and 50 community forest management plans were developed and endorsed by the Gambia’s Department of Forestry, and 77 community forest areas covering an estimated 5,335 hectares were transferred to local communities. This ends a decade of stalled community forest transfers and has provided important incentives for communities in the Gambia.

#### FFF partners in Gambia with whom formal agreement have been signed

- National Farmers Platform of the Gambia – for the organization of forest and farm producers at the national and subnational levels to engage in policy dialogues.
- National Environment Agency - for the review, monitoring and implantation of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy to engage with government institutions in cross-sectoral multistakeholder platform
- Nine small grants to primarily women’s entrepreneur groups:
  1) The Association of Sahelian Women in the Fight Against Drought and Hunger
  2) All Gambia Forestry Platform
  3) Japanteh Society
  4) Rural Development Organization
  5) Tumana Association for Development
  6) Bureng Multi-purpose Center
  7) Brufut Allatentou Society
  8) Rural Poultry Farmers Association
  9) Aquaculture Fish Farmers Association
Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement

One of the most important successes in 2015 was the transfer of 77 community forest areas covering 5,335 hectares to local communities across the Gambia. This achievement was the result of many years of advocacy but was triggered by three key factors. First, in late 2014, a decision was taken at a workshop organized by the FFF and FAO to revitalize the community forestry programme in the Gambia by setting up regional community forestry task forces with representatives from local authorities, councils of elders, councillors, community forest user groups and women representatives. The FFF facilitated a dialogue between these task forces, the Forestry Department and National Assembly members to revive the country’s community forestry programme. The regional community forestry task forces were duly established and trained in each of the country’s six regions with the aim of advancing community forestry tenure transfers to local communities. Second, community forestry committees and members of regional task forces raised their concerns about the lack of progress on community forestry during a tour of the provinces by the President of the Gambia, accompanied by the FFF facilitator. This was preceded by increased organization and training of community forestry committees around the Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Policy and related community forestry issues. Third, the FFF supported forest and farm producer organizations in submitting a proposal for the existing preliminary phase of the community forestry regulations to be reduced from 18–36 months to 12–18 months, a proposal that was supported by the Department of Forestry’s regional staff. The aim is to facilitate the transfer of community forests and to address the backlog of claims accumulated by the Forestry over the years. As a result of these factors, the President of the Gambia provided his support to resolving the stalemate and ensuring that the Forestry Department was able to fulfil its mandate by appointing a new minister in charge of the forest sector.

FFF activities related to the transfer of community forests also had a direct effect on the organization of the Gambia’s forest producers. New transfers led to an increase in the membership of the All Gambia Forestry Platform, which gained ten new community forestry committee members in 2015.

Figure 3 – The structure of FFF support to forest and farm producer organizations in the Gambia.
The district level organizations are the 9 small grantee organizations.

The Regional Level are the different administrative units/provinces of The Gambia: CRR = Central River Region / URR = Upper River Region / LRR = Lower River Region / WCR= West Coast region / NBR= North Bank Region

**Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business**

The Gambia began implementing its small grants programme in 2015, with nine selected forest and farm producer groups focusing on a mix of forest and farm products. One small grant recipient, the All Gambia Forestry Platform, also participated in MA&D training, which will enable it to deliver business development services to its provincial members. A total of 24 community forestry committees were trained in MA&D in 2015; this led to the identification of six “main products” (ecotourism, handicraft making, beekeeping, nursery management, timber production, and firewood production) described in 50 community forestry management plans.

At the national level, the Federation of Gambia Cashew Farmers Associations (which has 15,000 members from eight associations) was inaugurated, which improved the organization of cashew farmers, providing them with information and assisting them to negotiate effectively with buyers and thereby increase profit margins. As a result, informal farmers successfully lobbied the government to reduce the informal cross-border trade of cashews, which enter the country in the Upper River Region and affect both the quality and prices of cashews in the Gambia. Farmers appreciated the introduction of on-the-spot payments for cashew and the increase of cashew prices from 13 dalasi to 65 dalasi per kilogram.

The overall organization of forest and farm producers for conducting business was strengthened by activities to increase the availability and quality of market information at the rural level. These activities included organizing the collection of information by producers at the rural level, the channelling of this to apex forest and farm producer organizations, who, in turn, collect national-level data and feed the results to members via telephone, radio, exchange visits and group meetings. The information helped producers determine the type of buyers to target and informed them of buyer preferences. The convening of contact and collaboration fairs for producers and other actors on the product value chain has proven effective in stimulating dialogue and forging alliances among forest and farm producer organizations and other actors.

**Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms**

**Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management**

In 2015 the FFF continued its focus on reviewing and monitoring the ANR Policy through the support of the ANR Working Group and Platform and the organization of a
tour to the provinces to explore on-the-ground implementation with forest and farm producer organizations and other stakeholders. The FFF also strengthened feedback mechanisms between the ANR Working Group and Platform (hosted by the National Environment Agency) and other development agencies and programmes, which will enable the National Farmers Platform to better engage with the government on issues of concern to forest and farm producers. This has led to increased awareness of the ANR Policy among regional and district stakeholders. At the domestic regional level, the ANR Working Group and Platform coordinated regional technical advisory committees (TACs), which oversee field-level activities through multi-disciplinary facilitation teams. This year the organized forest and farm producer organizations succeeded in incorporating “farmer-based organizations” in the TACs. Finally, six regional community forestry task forces with a membership of 20 people per region were constituted in 2015 with a view to advancing community forest tenure transfers and resolving or managing forest-related conflicts; the FFF provided these task forces with training on the procedures for transferring natural forest to communities.

The ANR Working Group and Platform engaged with forest and farm producer organizations on issues relevant to the Rio conventions (i.e. the UNFCCC, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Convention for Combating Desertification) and continued engaging on the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. The latter is linked to the ongoing development of the Gambia’s first “land policy”, and the ANR Working Group and Platform is exploring ways of ensuring the involvement of forest and farm producer organizations in this process. The role of the ANR Working Group and Platform is being expanded to provide oversight to projects and programmes, such as the Great Green Wall of the Sahara and the Sahel Initiative and the Global Environment Facility, which may link to and expand FFF activities in the country. It will hopefully play a role in oversight of funding from the Green Climate Fund, if Gambia is successful in receiving these. A proposal currently being developed by UNEP outlines a process for “scaling up FFF approaches” to strengthen Community forestry and producers organizations as key actors in climate change responses.

**Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes**

*Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa*

The Gambia’s FFF programme participated in four regional engagements in 2015, in collaboration with FFF countries in Africa and the regional apex body, the Network of Farmers’ and Agricultural Producers’ Organisations of West Africa (ROPPA). In May, two representatives of forest and farm producer organizations from the Gambia travelled to Zambia to participate in MA&D training there and to learn from other African FFF countries. In June, three representatives of forest and farm producer organizations and one representative from government travelled to Kenya to participate in an FFF regional exchange visit, back-to-back with the first African Farm Forestry Producer Organizations Conference in Nairobi, Kenya. In the ROPPA exchange visit, three Gambian farmers attended a regional event in Burkina Faso; NACOFAG, a member of the National Farmers Platform of the Gambia, became vice-chair of ROPPA.

The experiences gained at these events were shared at national and subnational levels with the forest and farm producer organization stakeholders. In October 2015, for example, the National Farmers Platform of the Gambia launched a website to facilitate the exchange of information on policies, markets and products and on other issues of interest to forest and farm producers. FFF
activities featured frequently in news broadcast on rural and national radio programmes and occasionally on television; videos produced during the FFF annual meeting were shared on YouTube.

**Challenges for implementation and Lessons Learned**

One of the challenges in the Gambia is to increase the representation of women in forest and farm producer organizations; currently, women make up only 35 percent of total membership nationally. It appears that the dynamic new minister who oversaw the granting of community forest tenure was recently removed.

The FFF annual meeting in November 2015 revealed the remarkable results achieved through FFF activities in 2015. This served as a key motivator for 2016, and recommendations were made on key policy issues that would help in moving FFF forward. For example, it was recommended that the timeframe for handing forest management responsibilities to local communities in the form of community forests should be reduced to 12–18 months (from 18–36 months, as prescribed in the Forest Policy and Regulations, depending on the rate of forest degradation). Participants recommended that ongoing projects and programmes should be geared towards forest landscape management and improving the livelihoods of producers, and periodic feedback should be provided to the ANR Working Group and Platform on the development and implementation of plans to ensure coordination and avoiding the duplication of efforts at the local level. In view of the upcoming review of the ANR Policy, it is timely for the National Farmers Platform of the Gambia to consolidate the viewpoints of farmers and foresters in the Gambia on the implementation of the policy to date and insights to be incorporated in the revised policy.

Forest and farm producer organizations should redouble their efforts to include more women, safeguards on transparency and the accountability of funds, and youth-related activities (to mitigate rural exodus).

**Guatemala: organized producers transform incentive systems for millions of rural people**

Country coach: Jhony Zapata; national facilitator: Ogden Rodas

Timeline of the FFF programme in Guatemala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFF launch</td>
<td>Feb 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline study</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market training</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;L workshop</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government facilitation</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-conference</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business focus</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key lessons learned, and focus for 2016

Two lessons learned in 2015 will inform activities into the future. The first was the effectiveness of bringing producers together in fairs to speed up information sharing and create new business opportunities for producers. The second lesson was the need to engage with both the executive and legislative branches of government to obtain their full support for the ongoing transfer of community forests – this will be paramount for achieving the objectives the Forest Policy 2010–2019 to hand over 200 000 hectares of community forests to local communities.
Background

Guatemala’s forest policies have been evolving since 1989. At that time, a new protected-areas law established the philosophy that social and economic development should be compatible with the conservation of natural resources. In the 1990s, new forestry incentive schemes, forest concessions (both community and industrial), decentralization forestry (at the municipal level) and a system of protected areas emerged. In the 2000s, further developments linked to the national forest programme (NFP) led to the formation of the National Alliance of Community Forestry Organizations (“the National Alliance”), which today comprises ten second-level organizations and 400 member organizations with 77 000 members managing 750 000 hectares of forest. In 2014, FFF support strengthened the National Alliance as a platform for engaging people in national decision-making processes. The National Alliance began lobbying for new forest financing policies and instruments for its members. In 2015, FFF support continued to be the cross-sectoral glue that integrated much larger programmes of support (e.g. from Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade – FLEGT; UN-REDD; and forest and landscape restoration initiatives) around the explicit interests of the National Alliance.

Figure 4. Core Guatemalan pillars of FFF activity
Results and learning in 2015

**Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement**

*Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement*

In 2015, through its LoA with the Utz Che organization representing the National Alliance, the FFF supported lobbying and technical and legal inputs on behalf of the National Alliance’s 400 member organizations that led to the approval of the Probosque Law under Decree 2-2015 by the Guatemalan Congress, with the inclusion of four of the six amendments proposed by the National Alliance. Under this law, 1 percent of revenues in the national budget will be distributed to forest producers from 2017 for the ensuing 30 years – constituting an estimated US$20 million per year and US$667 million over the full period. Based on the previous impacts of the PINFOR and PINPEP programmes, it is estimated that the Probosque Law will generate 20,000 direct and 60,000 indirect jobs per year – supporting (over the 30-year period) about 7.5 million people (of whom 30 percent are women) in 1.5 million families. This impact on rural development in Guatemala is attributable to inputs from the FFF amongst others. The strategy of policy dialogue developed by the National Alliance, also contributed to other policies including the design of regulations for the new Climate Change Law (pertaining to safeguards on REDD); and a new national strategy for forest and landscape restoration.

**The National Alliance ensures that the poor and smallholders will benefit from the new national incentive programme**

Examples of proposals (3 out of 4) from the National Alliance which were accepted and incorporated in the Probosque Law:

1. The maximum size of the incentive provided to a single project should not exceed an investment equivalent to a 0.5 percent of the financial resources available to the programme during the year (the initial proposal was that the maximum size would be equivalent to a 3 percent of financial resources during the year).
2. 50 percent of the annual distribution of financial resources of Probosque will be for projects smaller than 15 hectares.
3. Projects already supported by previous incentive programs (PINFOR and PINPEP) will continue receiving support from Probosque as long as they are in forest areas that provide environmental services. Priority will be given to forest land with importance for the production of water and in the highlands of watersheds.

*Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business*

The general purpose of FFF support in Guatemala in 2015 was to increase the capacity of producer groups to develop agroforestry businesses. Such support led to the establishment of the Business Information System for Small and Medium Agroforestry Enterprises (covering 63 such enterprises), which is kept up-to-date and administered by a member organization of the National Alliance (Utz Che). FFF support also enabled the development of a web-based instrument for promoting products produced by small and medium-sized agroforestry enterprises in the National Alliance ([www mipyecomunitaria org](http://www.mipyecomunitaria.org)). In addition to such marketing support, Utz Che oversaw 11 diagnoses to identify the needs of small and medium-sized agroforestry enterprises in four areas: 1) business organization; 2)
production; 3) public finance; and 4) markets. Based on those diagnoses, the programme team prepared tools to assist in business development (e.g. for preparing business development plans and plans for organizational development). The businesses included: wood products and carpentry, handicrafts, production and marketing of beans, corn, coffee, cacao, textiles and coffee tours.

**FFF partners with whom formal agreements have been signed**

- Utz Che - as a representative of the National Alliance of Community Forestry Organizations of Guatemala to work at the policy level – and another agreement for work with the National Alliance to develop a communication strategy and build organization capacities in communication
- INAB – for its work with the Intersectoral Coordination Group and to arrange cross-sectoral platforms on fuelwood, food security, forest and landscape restoration, Probosque, forest law enforcement, governance and trade, climate change (the Green Climate Fund National Strategy and the REDD programmes of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and UN-REDD)
- Association of Forest Communities of Peten (ACOFOP) – for enterprise support work (small grant)
- Federation of Cooperatives of Verapaz (FEDECOVERA) – for the establishment of a business school

Six exchanges were arranged for producer organizations, hosted by businesses specializing in particular products: ADIMIL/Asociación de Santiago Atitlán – textile products; ALBALPON/Danta Chocolate – cacao products; SACALA/Asociación Forestal Cruce la Colorada/Carpintería Nueva Era/Asociación Asilvo Chancol/ADIPAZ/AMAPOR/ADASEV – wood products; COACAP/FUNDALACHUA – cacao products; Nuevo Mexico/Cooperativa la Lucha and AMAPOR/DEGO – agricultural products. In addition, 13 members of four small producer organizations (ADIPAZ, AFIC, INASA, and Cooperativa Nuevo México) participated in internships on the production of wood products, with an emphasis on quality processes.

The FFF team made an inventory of public and private initiatives supporting the development of small and medium-sized agroforestry enterprises through training, establishment, management and access to financing. The inventory included assessments of the capacity of the National Forest institute (INAB), other public agencies, and Centro de Aprendizaje de Desarrollo Empresarial Rural to support producer organizations and a compilation of capacity-development materials on negotiation, entrepreneurship, communication, development and market analysis.

The inventory helped the team to match needs with suppliers and identify gaps. Training was conducted on technical, managerial and commercial aspects of small and medium-sized agroforestry enterprises for at least 25 people, as well as training to support institutionalized aspects of forest management and the production of timber and non-wood forest products. The FFF supported a diagnosis of the capabilities and business visions (e.g. organization, production and trade) of Chachaklum and other groups in the southern Petén, and the development of harvesting plans and incentives for 350 hectares of plantations/natural forest. Communication tools (e.g. newsletters, advertisements and radio spots) were produced to promote new forest products such as the ramon or bread nut (*Brosimum alicastrum*). Finally, an international exchange of experiences was conducted between 25 producers from the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala and Nicaragua.
With FFF support, FEDECOVERA is developing a rural school of agroforestry business with a focus on youth and women as a contribution to rural development in Guatemala. Building on previous collaboration, the FFF is supporting FEDECOVERA in designing and developing the school model on organizational development, productive entrepreneurship and value-chain development and facilitating linkages and collaboration with leading universities and research centres in the country and knowledge exchanges with other countries. In its initial pilot phase in 2016, the school will receive 20 students from rural communities.

**Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms**

*Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management*

In addition to its inputs to the development of the Probosque Law described above, the FFF is supporting four multisectoral platforms. Two of these are at the national level – the Interinstitutional Coordination Group (GCI) and the Firewood and Energy Platform and two are at the regional level in the Petén – the Intersectoral Platform for Land and Environment (MITA) and the Petén Agroforestry Platform.

Members of the GCI are INAB, the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP), the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment. Within the GCI, the FFF provided secretariat support for the design of proposals for thematic agendas on natural resources and the environment (food security, the economy, and energy). The GCI played a key role in the preparation and approval of the Probosque Law, because GCI members were united, an important message for the National Congress – previously, those government institutions had been unable to agree on various issues. Support for the Interinstitutional Round Table on Woodfuel and Energy had produced a guide to tree species for energy plantations (FFF) and a guide to the efficient use of fuelwood in Guatemala. Progress was made in 2015 on the Integrated Mechanism on Forests and Food Security, which completed its inventory (began in 2014) of forestry and agroforestry practices for food security. The Integrated Mechanism also started work on identifying linkages between forests and Guatemalan food and nutritional security, and it began a pilot programme for agroforestry systems for food security linked to the new programme of forestry incentives, in the South of Petén (FAO/FFF–Telefood). The “forests and the economy” mechanism designed communication and integration mechanisms and raised awareness about links between the forest agenda and related sectors (i.e. “forests and energy” and “forests and food security and nutrition”).

The GCI helped integrate issues such as the REDD National Needs Assessment, which identified gaps in a country in its capacity to undertake action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, developed a roadmap to reduce these gaps, and convened a workshop on forest degradation under REDD in Guatemala. This complemented the legal analysis conducted with UN-REDD to determine the feasibility of actions and measures for emission reductions for avoided deforestation. Links were made with the European Union–FAO FLEGT Programme, which was conducting a diagnosis of illegal logging in Guatemala and updating the plan for preventing and reducing illegal logging in Guatemala. Finally, technical support
was provided to the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources to establish and strengthen the Designated National Authority for the Green Climate Fund and to support the strategy for forest and landscape restoration.

**Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes**

*Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa*

As noted above, the FFF developed a strategy of political dialogue and communication for the National Alliance, which enabled producers to collaborate in their messaging. For example, FFF support for the participation of leaders of the National Alliance and representatives of government in international REDD and forest and landscape restoration processes bolstered local and national awareness of climate-change mitigation and adaptation possibilities in forest landscapes. The FFF in Guatemala also facilitated an exchange visit and an international workshop on community-based territorial management, forest governance and markets with the Mexican Network of Peasant Forestry Organizations (Red MOCAF) and the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), together with the National Forestry Commission of Mexico (CONAFOR), FFF Nicaragua and FFF Bolivia.

In direct media work, the FFF supported the production of film micro-documentaries on the recognition and registration of community lands for access to and use of forest-related natural resources based on case studies in: San Isidro San Jacinto and Baja Verapaz; Cold Water, Cuiquel and Chiallí, Tactic and Alta Verapaz; Semanza, El Estor and Izabal; and the Blessing, Guanagazapa and Escuintla. In collaboration with Rural Vision, other videos were produced to document the following experiences: forestry and agroforestry projects that have successfully developed business plans, such as the committee on the value chain of ramon nut (Brosimum alicastrum) in Petén, Guatemala; the establishment of agroforestry systems based on ramon through a successful approach made to the PINPEP financing programme; and the Chachaklum forest management services business system.

**Challenges in implementation and Lessons Learned**

A challenge in 2015 was balancing the participation of organized producers in policy discussions (e.g. in the preparation of, and approval by the National Congress of the Probosque Law) with activities aimed at improving livelihoods and developing businesses. Much attention was concentrated on participation in policymaking, which achieved positive results, such as the approval of the Probosque Law. Supporting producer organizations to build their organizational capacities to access the benefits of the new law and to develop their businesses will be an ongoing challenge for the FFF in Guatemala.

During 2015 it became clear that smallholders and community level producers are encouraged to join organizations supported by the FFF because they know there will be a judicious mix of technical, business and political support, thus covering their needs. Smallholders are also seeing the political effectiveness of working as a group. To increase the representativeness of producer organizations it has been necessary to implement gender policies, focus on productive activities and undertake motivational talks to break the paradigm that women should not enjoy the same level of participation as men. Producer organizations are increasingly learning the importance of commercial and business alliances and the need to work as a team. Technical exchanges and learning-by-doing approaches with groups with more advanced skills in particular activities has proven to be particularly useful in improving livelihoods. Access to finance is increasing due to business forums and exchange events, with better information and more service providers – but still much work needs to be done to increase the administrative and organizational capacity of producer organizations to access those services. The efforts of the FFF in 2015 to improve
communication among producer organizations and businesses was very useful; it would also be helpful to establish a permanent forum or database where producers can learn about the products, services and processes of other organizations.

The six national and one international exchange visits in 2015 resulted in concrete positive changes in forest and farm producer organizations. For example, participating producers adopted improved management practices in the cultivation of cocoa. COACAP refocused and improved the management of community nurseries and adopted appropriate techniques for adding value to cocoa, increasing the productivity of the organization. Some organizations improved their management and financial procedures, such as by developing and implementing administrative manuals.

Kenya: strengthening the Farm Forestry Smallholder Producer Association of Kenya to become a player in policymaking and rural development

Country coach: Jhony Zapata; national facilitator: Philip Kisoyan

Timeline of FFF in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFF launch</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline studies (May 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small letters of agreement</td>
<td>(12) Sep 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market training</td>
<td>May-Dec 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa exchange visit</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa conference</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Kenya, the government has introduced a number of national targets to boost forest cover and productive wood supply. The Constitution and Vision 2030 provide a target of recovering 10 percent forest cover in an effort to reduce deforestation and degradation and to create a foundation for addressing the current national wood supply deficit of 12 million m³. Smallholder forest and farm producers growing trees on farms are likely to be the main actors in achieving this target. This creates an opportunity for Kenya’s forest and farm producer organizations to engage with policy processes to improve the policy environment to better meet their interests and needs. To make this happen, the FFF is working in partnership with the Farm Forestry Smallholder Producers Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK), the Kenya Forest Service and We Effect to strengthen the capacity and organization of forest and farm producer organizations.

The FFF was officially launched in Kenya in November 2014, and two counties (Nakuru and Laikipia) were selected through an objective process to pilot the FFF in Kenya. In 2015, baseline studies – including stakeholder mapping – were prepared, and a stakeholder capacity-building assessment was undertaken in collaboration with We Effect. Significant progress was made in strengthening FF SPAK’s membership base and its capacity to organize and to provide business services to its members effectively.
FFF partners with whom formal agreements have been signed

- The Farm Forestry Smallholder Producer Association of Kenya (FFSPAK) – to strengthen its organizational capacities at the national and subnational levels and to provide services to producers
- The Kenya Forestry Service (KFS) – to facilitate cross-sectoral platforms at the county level and to operationalize the Forest Conservation Fund
- 12 small grants recipients – for strengthening producer organizations and the establishment of product-based associations at the county level and linkages with markets.

The selected partners are:
- in Nakuru County – Lake Elementaita Self Help Group, Beyond 1 Billion Trees Mau Women Community-based Organization, Community Food and Environment Group, Junction Bamboo Tree Nursery and Conservation Group, Menengai Crater Bee Keepers, Tumaini Mwangaza Investment Self Help Group
- in Laikipia County – Lariak Community Forest Association, Laikipia Livestock Marketing Association, Marura Environmental Conservation Community Based Organization, Nettle World Group, Shamanek Community Forest Association, Yaaku Cultural Group

Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement

In Kenya the FFF has as a vision to support Kenya’s smallholders by helping FF-SPAK, an emerging farm forestry association, to strengthen its organization and membership at the national and county levels. By establishing product-based associations at the county level, the FFF, FF-SPAK and other partners will help producers focus their collective activities to better market their products and develop viable businesses. Both the MA&D trainings and the small grant agreements are seen as vehicles for enabling this vision.

Figure 5: Structure of FFF support to FFPOs in Kenya
The 2015 call for small grants proposals was administered by FF-SPAK working closely with other partners such as We Effect, the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and county governments. To prepare producers for the call, a training course was prepared on proposal writing and delivered successfully in the two pilot counties, Nakuru and Laikipia, in partnership with We Effect. Of 40 applicants in the two pilot counties, 12 forest and farm producer organizations were selected to receive small grants. The partners will support these producer organizations in working on three main issues: 1) strengthening the internal capacities of the organization (We Effect); 2) reinforcing the product-based association of the selected product (FF-SPAK); and 3) market access and linkages (KFS). The product-based associations will be members of the relevant FF-SPAK county chapter.

The selected producer organizations received training on MA&D to build their entrepreneurship capacity. The proposal writing and MA&D training provided a good platform on which the producer organizations could outline and discuss their priorities. These priorities were raised at the FF-SPAK annual general meeting, of which one of the key resolutions was to organize producers better to participate in a policy dialogue with the government. The KFS was invited to the annual general meeting as a guest, and there are plans to actively in an active dialogue with the government in search of a better policy and legislative environment for forest and farm producers. In November 2015, FF SPAK attended a multistakeholder forum organized by the KFS to discuss the rules and regulations governing the registration of private forest owners. At both these meetings it was agreed that the challenge for smallholders in accessing and marketing forest products should be fast-tracked by the KFS as a policy priority.

Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business

The 12 successful small-grants applicants support a variety of forest and farm enterprises, focused mainly on growing various species of trees on farms and their associated products. In total, 456 members of FF SPAK in Nakuru and Laikipia counties will benefit from the support provided by the FFF through the small-grants programme. However, the call for proposals revealed that most forest and farm producer organizations lack adequate capacity to operate and engage in business. To address this, the 12 successful applicants incorporated plans in their proposals to form marketing committees responsible for conducting market surveys and organizing members to carry out product marketing. These committees will be formed as soon as the small grants agreements are in place (January 2016). To track the results of these efforts, indicators have been included in the FFF M&L system to track the progress of the producer organizations in the collective marketing of products and their capacity for business planning.

To ensure the sustainability of the businesses plans developed as part of the MA&D training, the FFF implementing partners have started engaging with financial institutions
with the aim of improving the access of forest and farm producer organizations to finance. Discussions were held with Equity Bank Ltd and Equity Foundation Bank on providing forest and farm producer organizations with both financial literacy training and financial services. The aim is to increase the number of financial institutions providing financial support to forest and farm producer organizations under the government-managed Forest Conservation and Management Fund.

**Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms**

*Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management*

A framework for establishing cross-sectoral platforms at the national and county levels was developed in 2015, and the platforms will be rolled out in 2016. To ensure that these platforms remain truly participatory, collaborative and effective, it was agreed that the forest and farm producer organizations should chair meetings and set the agenda and that an advocacy wing should be established within the platform. It was also decided that a fundraising mechanism should be established to ensure the sustainability of the platforms.

Although the cross-sectoral platforms have not yet been established, progress can be seen as a result of FFF’s engagement with stakeholders. The inception of the FFF in Kenya resulted in a renewed policy dialogue on the development of private forestry in the country, the marketing of forestry products from smallholder producers, and the organization of farmers to market their forest produce. This dialogue led to the holding of two stakeholder workshops organized by the KFS to develop rules for the registration of private forest owners. The proposed rules, if enacted, will spell out incentives to encourage farmers to practise private forestry and will likely lead to a paradigm shift in Kenya’s private forestry development agenda.

The stakeholder forum to develop regulations to register private forest owners in Kenya illuminated many inter-ministerial inconsistencies and jurisdictions affecting private forest owners. Issues raised with government included cultivation on steep slopes; multiple taxes on forest produce from farms; and land and forest tenure issues.

The FFF in Kenya has increased the visibility of FF SPAK, which has attracted the attention of government and other stakeholders, as evidenced by the number of invitations it has received to attend forums where various issues relevant to farm forestry are discussed.

**Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes**

*Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa*

Kenya hosted two events in 2015 – the FFF Africa exchange visit, and the African conference. The FFF Africa exchange visit took place on 5–7 June 2015, just prior to the African Farm Forestry Producer Organizations Conference. As part of the exchange visit, Kenya hosted 21 representatives from the four FFF-participating countries in Africa (Kenya, Gambia, Liberia and Zambia). During the exchange visit, participants travelled to Nakuru County, visited forest and farm producers in their villages, and exchanged ideas and knowledge. Participants also met county and national government
representatives in various forums, at which experiences and lessons from the Kenya situation were presented and discussed.

The African Farm Family Forestry Producers’ Organizations Conference was held in Nairobi on 8–12 June 2015. It attracted 110 participants from 20 countries worldwide, including representatives of farm and family forestry, governments, forest technical agencies, non-governmental organizations, donor agencies, academic institutions, and general forestry groups committed to encouraging the development of forest and farm producer organizations and their federations.

The FFF supported the participation of Kenyan forest and farm producer organizations and partners to attend the World Forestry Congress in Durban, South Africa, in September 2015. Both the African conference in Kenya and the World Forestry Congress proved to be effective in information sharing, as representatives from the various FFF countries met to discuss progress and share lessons on challenges and successes. The World Forestry Congress also inspired and helped shaped the ideas of the Kenyan FFF partners for forest and farm producer organizations in Kenya.

Challenges in implementation and Lessons Learned

A major challenge in Kenya is the scaling up of FFF support to achieve a national impact. In 2015, community groups were strengthened, and efforts commenced to establish product-based associations in two counties. In 2016, efforts should be made to speed up the process and to reach out to other counties.

The scoping mission of the FFF was conducted together with a German programme to strengthen producer organization in Kenya. The planning was done to ensure synergies during implementation (including the addition of two more counties). The German programme has not yet started, however, for various reasons (it is now planned to start in early 2016). To address this, a new project proposal was developed in partnership with We Effect to scale up to an additional ten counties, and efforts are being made through the FAO office and We Effect to generate funding for this.

The regional MA&D training courses in the Gambia and Zambia proved to be good opportunities for FFF implementing partners to discuss and learn from other FFF country teams on the approaches taken, progress made and challenges encountered in implementing activities. In 2015 there was considerable and increasing
communication between FFF actors, especially in Africa. The Kenya partners have felt that the experience-sharing between countries has been especially helpful for learning about the different realities and approaches taken to farm forestry and forest and farm producer organizations. One of the main findings from this experience was that although the challenges faced by forest and farm producers across Africa are broad, they are also similar. It was felt that regular information sharing was an important way of ensuring quicker collective progress in the face of common challenges.

Liberia: producer organizations develop agroforestry and biomass businesses

Country coach: Sophie Grouwels; national facilitator: Kolly Allison
Timeline of the FFF programme in Liberia

Background

Liberia emerged in 2003 from 14 years of national and regional conflict – in part fuelled by uncontrolled competition for timber. Sustainable forest management is critical, not only to furnish natural resources that can be used for poverty reduction but also because Liberia’s forests make up 40 percent of the remaining endangered Upper Guinean rainforest. The 2006 National Forestry Reform Law introduced “community” forest rights alongside “conservation” and “commercial” categories (the 3Cs). In September 2014, an agreement was signed with the Government of Norway to end all deforestation by 2020 in return for a results-based investment of US$150 million. Payments to communities for protecting forests will be piloted during that period based on community forest management agreements. With strong formal support for community forest management and use, Liberia was selected as an FFF partner country in January 2013.

The FFF began in Liberia in 2014 by working with the Farmers Union Network (FUN) to develop forest-related activities in three main counties: Lofa, Nimba and Grand Cape Mount. To complement this, the FFF also supported the Government of Liberia through the Forest Development Authority (FDA) and the National Forest and Landscape Forum (NFLF) to better coordinate multistakeholder, multisectoral cooperation and dialogue. A major issue in 2014 was an outbreak of the Ebola virus, which claimed several thousand lives in the country and curtailed forest-related programmes and trade for almost a year.

Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement

Work recommenced in earnest in 2015 in support of FUN and the National Association of Charcoal Unions of Liberia (NACUL). FUN, which was established in 2008, is the apex body
covering 15 counties of Liberia, with a membership of over 35,000 members (with a gender split of 45 percent women and 55 percent men). NACUL has focused its activities in Grand Cape Mount County, implementing and organizing charcoal producers there in five districts (and with a membership of 660, of whom about 30 percent are women). With FFF support, NACUL plans to extend significantly into two other counties (Margibi and Grand Bassa) and a rural district (Montserrado), the main charcoal-producing area for the capital, Monrovia.

FUN conducted a range of awareness-raising meetings in the counties in which it works, as well as in Monrovia, where the issues of their producer members have been raised in a number of fora. FUN hosted its first national convention in Bentol City, Montserrado County, on 20–21 November 2015, bringing together 250 farmers and forest producers to speak in one voice and to elect the FUN Board of Governance. The Honourable Josephine Francis was re-elected as President of the Board.

NACUL carried out a consultation for charcoal producers in Grand Cape Mount County, bringing together 764 members. FFF support enabled NACUL to continue engaging with relevant government authorities, non-governmental organizations and producer networks to enhance partnerships. A meeting held between the Liberia Revenue Authority, NACUL and representatives from Cape Mount, Margibi and Montserrado counties in July 2015 began the process of formalizing and legalizing the charcoal business in Liberia through business registrations. In August 2015, NACUL participated for the first time in a meeting of the Land Rights Working Group, championing and advocating for the preparation of the Land Rights Act. In October, NACUL participated in two workshops on the National Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forest and in the workshop "Rethinking Liberia's Forests: Implementing the New Vision".

To assist in identifying focus areas, NACUL held a 2-day meeting with representatives of Grand Cape Mount County and Montserrado County, members of the Board and staff, which produced the following four documents designed to enhance NACUL’s operations in Liberia: 1) standard operating procedures; 2) a financial policy; 3) bylaws and constitution; and 4) a 5-year strategic plan. The strategic plan contains provisions for advocacy and networking; information and experience sharing; training and capacity building (nursery development and tree-planting); fundraising; consultation and outreach strengthening (“mobilize and organize”); updating of charcoal and farmer organizations and groups; and monitoring and evaluation.

Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business

The FFF provided "training for trainers" in MA&D for four Liberian participants (from the three pilot counties); phases 1 and 2 of the training were held in Zambia, and phases 3 and 4 were held in Gambia. Those trainers then hosted a training course in Liberian English in Nimba County (on 26 September to 5 October 2015). The FFF team selected 30 forest and farm producer organizations from the three pilot counties to participate in the course, at which five FUN staff members were also trained as facilitators (bringing the total number of
trainees to 35, of whom 15 were women and 20 were men). In November, the FUN team made follow-up visit to those trained forest and farm producer organizations.

As part of the FFF Liberia programme, the following eight organizations are in the running for grants under the FFF small grants programme: to be rolled out in 2016: 1) Al-Satiba Salar Women Empowerment; 2) Kodebea Weaving Association; 3) Women’s Organization for Peace and Development; 4) Kanslayan (One Voice); 5) Nyankwakeseh Women’s Group; 6) Botanical Products Association of Liberia; 7) Liberia Chain Saw and Timber Dealers Union; and 8) the Honey Bees Association. The final selection will be made in early 2016 after the convening of a proposal-writing workshop based on the reformulated proposals of these organizations.

Through the work of NACUL, charcoal producers are being organized in five districts in Grand Cape Mount County and will soon be registered as a formal business group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFF partners with whom formal agreements have been signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Farmers Union Network of Liberia — for membership development, policy development and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Association of Charcoal Unions of Liberia — for membership, policy and business development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forest Development Authority — to facilitate the National Forests and Landscape Forum for cross-sectoral dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms

*Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management*

The FFF has financially supported the NFLF, a multisectoral policy platform with the objective of improving coordination and consultation among forest and landscape management sectors. In August 2015 a 1-day national stakeholders’ workshop involving more than 40 participants convened to identify the corporate private sector (private/plantation owners) and other non-state actors (nongovernmental organizations and apex farmer organizations) that have an impact on forests and community livelihoods. Forty-four such institutions were identified. A further analysis of these institutions was conducted by three selected NFLF members, looking at their involvement in forest and landscape management; technical strength and national coverage; impact on the livelihoods of forest communities; and constraints in fully participating in the NFLF. To follow up on this analysis, four intersectoral policy dialogues were planned at the national level with the involvement of other ministries and agencies (144 participants in total), including apex farmer organizations and private/plantation owners. A preparatory intersectoral policy dialogue was held in August 2015 to identify focal points. A consultant was recruited to undertake a questionnaire assessment and desk study of the policies and strategic plans of the forest and landscape management sectors and the messages generated by diverse dialogues related to the principle of free, prior and informed consent. A first expert panel discussion took place in October 2015 to discuss why natural resource sectoral coordination is key for forest and farm producer organizations.
Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes

Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa

A few representatives of forest and farm producer organizations visited the Gambia and Zambia as part of MA&D. The FDA and FUN represented Liberia at the World Forest Congress, held in September 2015.

An exchange visit to Kenya to participate in a pan-African forest and farm producers’ conference was very useful. It involved the launch of an African knowledge network to support locally controlled forestry (Africonet), and representatives of West African countries also discussed how to decentralize that model, forming the Mano River Union Forest Network. The NACUL representative in particular learned a lot in the exchange visit to Kenya, observing how Kenya had made a great effort in organizing the charcoal trade through the formation of charcoal producers’ associations and promoting efficient charcoal kilns.

Challenges to implementation and Lessons Learned

The shadow and trauma of the Ebola epidemic remain a background challenge as FFF programmes now move forward in Liberia. A further challenge for the FFF in Liberia is to support discussions on Liberia’s new land rights policy and its understanding and popularization among the country’s forest and farm producer organizations.

Farmers and forest producer groups in Liberia have been encouraged to join FUN and NACUL because they believe that the FFF programme is there to improve their livelihoods – and they wish to take ownership of such a positive community initiative. The MA&D tool has proved particularly useful as a business training kit, widening the scope of potential business development for rural communities. The prospect of future small grant funding based on the priorities of producer groups using the MA&D filtering process has helped incentivize producers. Further capacity building is needed, but it will also be necessary to encourage potential entrepreneurs to “have a go” and to learn by doing and by implementing their business plans. Exchange visits with other countries (such as Gambia, Kenya and Zambia) has helped inspire producers about the future.

The imminent implementation of the Liberian Forest Fund – an agreement between the Governments of Liberia and Norway (and executed by the World Bank) to support changes for the benefit of Liberia’s forests, the communities depending on them, and the wider economy – presents an opportunity for the FFF and its partners to make the case for organized forest and farm producer organizations as important vehicles for bringing about these changes.

Key lessons learned, and focus for 2016

Farmers and forest producer groups in Liberia have been encouraged to join FUN and NACUL because they believe that the FFF programme is there to improve their livelihoods – and they wish to take ownership of such a positive community initiative.
Myanmar: producer organizations pave the way to peace and the improvement of their livelihoods

Country coach: Jhony Zapata; national facilitator: Aung Than Zin
Timeline of the FFF programme in Myanmar

Background

Myanmar’s forests cover 47 percent of the land area, but, until recently, control of these forests has rested with the military government, the Forest Department, the Myanmar Timber Enterprise and “crony companies”. The first community forest rights were allowed in 1995 with the issuing of the Community Forestry Instruction (CFI) and, since then, almost 800 community forest user groups have formed. With the landslide victory of the National League for Democracy in 2015, and a revised CFI that, if adopted, would grant full commercial rights over forests to community forest user groups, there may be a rapid shift how the forest landscape in Myanmar is controlled. With a peace agreement the stated priority of the new government, control over and benefits from the country’s large area of forests are likely to come sharply into focus. Expanded economic opportunities generated by local forest and farm producer organizations may be important “peace dividends”.

The FFF launched its activities in Myanmar in 2013. The ambition was to build on the foundation built in 2014 (through support for six non-governmental organizations in the establishment and strengthening of smallholder producer organizations and businesses) by catalysing township and national associations of community forest user groups, built around business interests. There was also a plan to support a revision of the CFIs to grant community forest user groups full commercial rights.

Figure 6. Core Myanmar pillars of FFF activity
Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement

In the formation of township-level community forest product producers associations (CFPPAs) in southern Shan State and southern Rakhine State in 2015 (described below), producers discussed the difficulties they faced in establishing community forestry, and they highlighted areas where current policies could be improved. In a planning meeting for an international exchange visit with producers in Viet Nam in October 2015, representatives of forest and farm producer groups (mostly community forestry user groups) also discussed constraints. Based on recommendations arising from these and other discussions, including those organized by the Myanmar Environment Rehabilitation-Conservation Network (MERN), the Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative (ECCDI, an FFF implementing partner in MERN) presented a revised version of the CFI to the newly established Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG). This revised version is under review by the Forest Department for approval in early 2016; if approved it will grant community forest user groups full commercial rights over their timber. The revision of the CFI will be followed by a revision of the Forest Law.

Selected members of producer groups formed by FFF projects in Shan State and Rakhine State attended the Fifth ASEAN Social Forestry Network meeting in Inle Lake, Myanmar, in June 2015, providing them with an opportunity to compare the progress of their own forest and farm producer organizations with those of other countries.

Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business

A second call for small grants proposals was made in late 2014/early 2015, resulting in the awarding of small grants to four non-governmental groups: 1) the Myanmar Ceramics Society, for the establishment of a township-level association of wood and ceramics producers in Nyaungshwe, Shan State; 2) Friends of Wildlife, for ensuring the sustainability of the Chin Producer Cooperative Association through forest-farm practices and market-led approaches in Gwa Township, Chin State; 3) Ar Yone Oo, for promoting rural livelihoods through community forestry in Chin State; and 4) Social Vision Services, for facilitating the organization of smallholder producer groups into township-level associations in the Ayeyarwady Delta.

Two agreements were also made directly with ECCDI and the Rakhine Coastal Region Conservation Association (RCA) for the establishment of subnational forest and farm producer organizations in Shan State and Rakhine State, where producer groups were formed in 2014. ECCDI formed six CFPPAs at the village level in 2014 and 24 in 2015. In total, these CFPPAs have 3,515 members, of whom 3,143 are male and 372 are female. The ECCDI also formed five township-level associations based on 30 village-level CFPPAs. The RCA formed 42 CFPPAs at the village level in 2015, based on these, a township-level CFPPA and a subregional (southern Rakhine) CFPPA were formed in September 2015. There were more male than female members in these groups: overall, they comprise 80 percent men and 20 percent women.

Four people working for forest and farm producer organizations (mostly community forestry user groups) attended training course for trainers in MA&D, which was run jointly by the FFF and RECOFTC in Hanoi, Viet Nam, in January and June 2015. The trainers then provided training in MA&D to forest and farm producers in southern Shan State in April and in southern Rakhine State in May 2015.
FFF partners with whom formal agreements have been signed

- Myanmar Environmental Rehabilitation and Conservation Network – to support the Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG)
- Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative (ECCDI) – for support to village-level, township-level and national-level community forestry product producers associations (CFPPAs) in Shan State
- Rakhahe Coastal Region Conservation Association with ECCDI and MERN – for support to village-level, township-level and national-level CFPPAs in Rakhine State
- Myanmar Ceramics Society – for the establishment of a township-level association of wood and ceramics producers in Shan State
- Friends of Wildlife – for strengthening the Chin Producer Cooperative Association in Rakhine State
- Ar Yone Oo – for promoting an elephant-foot yam association in Chin State
- Social Vision Services – for facilitating the formation of smallholder producer groups into township-level associations in Ayeyarwady Delta
- RECOTFC – for capacity development to the Forest Department and non-state stakeholders in the assessment and monitoring of extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry in Myanmar

Market linking has become an important feature of the FFF’s work in Myanmar. ECCDI linked CFPPAs with the Rattan and Bamboo Subcommittee of the Myanmar Timber Merchant Association to enable them to produce rattan and bamboo products. Links were also made with the Myanmar Konja Producers and Exporters Association for the sale of elephant-foot yam. The RCA took same approach with Rakhine CFPPAs, liking them with the Ngapali Beach hotel zone. Across the various initiatives, each community forest has a management plan, which includes a harvesting plan. Many groups have also made market assessments and are developing business ideas (e.g. planting coffee, bamboo and rattan for future sale). However, no groups reported creating formal written business plans.

Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms

Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

In 2015 it was agreed that FFF support for the CFNWG – the new national-level political platform for forest and farm producer groups led by the Forest Department – would be channelled through MERN. The FFF Myanmar country coach met with the Forest Department’s Director-General, Deputy Director-General, directors and other senior staff to explain the FFF programme implementation and its support for the Department, and a formal agreement was signed by both parties (FAO Myanmar and the Forest Department) in April 2015. The CFNWG met six times in 2015, the latest to discuss revisions to the CFI.

Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes

Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa

The FFF supported representatives from the Forest Department and MERN to participate in the World Forestry Congress in September 2015, where developments in
Community forestry worldwide were discussed. An exchange visit was made to Viet Nam in October 2015, during which producer groups from both countries shared business ideas. Producer organizations also met and shared information at the Fifth Asian Social Forestry Network regional meeting held in Myanmar in 2015.

Challenges to implementation and Lessons Learned

A challenge in 2015 was the timely provision of funds, through an LoA with the Forest Department, for the strengthening of the CFNWG due to long internal procedures in the government and uncertainty due to the national election. After several attempts, a decision was made to channel the funds for the CFNWG through an LoA with MERN, which is the treasurer of the CFNWG.

Another challenge was posed by the facilitative role of MERN and non-governmental organizations in the process of establishing the producer organizations associations at the township, state and national levels. It is important to ensure that facilitating organizations do not dominate the process, and also that their facilitative role is not long term.

The main reasons for interest in forming community forest user groups around community forests in Myanmar have commonly been to secure land-use rights, gain access to additional land and protect cropland watersheds, among others. With such political ends, men have often dominated participation. As opportunities for economic production in community forests increase, however, women and youth – who often do most of the work associated with alternative incomes at the household level – are more likely to become involved. With full commercial rights, the interest in community forestry is likely to rise dramatically.

Community forest user groups and business are not yet represented directly in the CFNWG; this may come about as local groups associate at the township and state levels and ultimately federate at the national level. There are many ways in which the CFNWG could assist a market-led approach to community forestry. For example, within the FFF, CFPPAs found the training on identifying market opportunities and on managing and assessing the strengths and weaknesses of their own producer groups to be particularly helpful. Exchange visits were also useful, especially as a way of enabling diverse participants from communities, non-governmental organizations, the Forest Department and the CFNWG to interact, thereby improving relationships among them. Involving government staff and CFNWG members is vital: the Viet Nam visit highlighted the need to change forest policies in Myanmar, specifically on small-scale timber production and processing.

Few communities receive direct investments for their businesses because they have semi-informal status. One group has decided to try to register as a cooperative with the Ministry of Cooperatives; if successful they will qualify for loans, but there is a high cost of entry and it takes time. Some community forest user groups have set up revolving funds using membership fees or an agreed percentage of group sales. One group uses its fund for community development, while another gives out loans, with interest, to finance business ideas within the group.

Key lessons learned, and focus for 2016

“It is the closing of our FFF launching ceremony, but it is the beginning of a new venture to begin bringing wellbeing to rural people.”

(Government representative of the Ministry of Environmental Conservation, Agriculture and Forestry)
Nepal: producer organizations push through policy change for forest and farm businesses

Country coach: Sophie Grouwels; national facilitator: Sony Baral

Timeline of the FFF programme in Nepal

Background

In Nepal, the FFF is working with a consortium of forest and farm producer organizations representing more than one-third of the total population (8.5 million of 27 million people). Since the mid 1990s, organizations such as the Federation of community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN) have been lobbying for community forest user rights. Today, almost one-third (1.7 million hectares) of the country’s total forest area is under the control of local communities. Work is still needed, however, to improve the enabling environment for local forest and farm businesses so that rights can be turned into economic opportunities.

Scaling up enterprise development and the participation of women in business are two focus areas for the FFF’s programme in Nepal. There were two major events in Nepal in 2015. In April 2015, a devastating earthquake left parts of the country in ruins. The earthquake prompted the reform of the national constitution, which, after ten years of deliberation, was passed in September 2015. Both the earthquake and the political turmoil that surrounded the constitutional reform caused delays in FFF implementation, but progress was made in important areas, and the FFF expanded from Kavre and Nawalparisi to a third district – Makwanpur.

Key highlight, 2015

In 2015 after a joint effort by a consortium of forest and farm producer organizations supported by the FFF, the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation revised its policy to allow the free transport of 23 timber and non-timber species grown on farmland. This addresses one of the main barriers to the development of forest and farm producer businesses.

FFF partners in Nepal with whom formal agreements have been signed

- Federation of community Forestry Users Nepal – for organizing forest and farm producer organizations and stakeholders at the national and subnational levels and lobbying on key policy priorities.
- Federation of Nepal Cottage and Small Industries – for business development and engagement with service providers and government to support business opportunities for forest and farm producer organizations.
- Four small grant recipients:
  - Center for Policy Analysis and Development
  - Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources
  - Green Governance Nepal
  - National Farmer Group Federation
Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

In 2015, the FFF scaled up its work to strengthen policy engagement at both the national and district levels by working with a consortium of producer organizations, including partners FECOFUN and the Federation of Nepal Cottage and Small Industries (FNCSI). The consortium comprises a network of 18 producer organizations representing forest and farm producers at the local, district and national levels. The role of the consortium is to organize producers at the local, district and national levels to identify policy priorities and bring these to the attention of the government in cross-sectoral platforms.

Efforts were made in 2015 to increase the participation of women in leadership positions and business within FFF supported groups, nearly doubling the number compared with the previous year (from 38.6 percent to 66 percent). This was achieved mostly by providing gender and social inclusion training; counselling and coaching to encourage producer groups to adopt positive discrimination policies, especially for the incremental increase of women in leadership positions; and leadership development training. Communities were also sensitized to the government’s policy provisions. These activities encouraged many produce groups to change their policies to allocate quotas for the representation of women on committees.

The quality of overall representation of forest and farm producer organizations also improved; 92 percent of organizations reported that representation in policy engagements had increased, compared with 75 percent in 2014. Many producer groups either signed up to, or renewed their membership with, FECOFUN and FNCSI when the two organizations started receiving FFF support in Nawalparasi and Kavre districts.

Two priorities were identified among producers at the local level for policy advocacy and business support: strengthening business opportunities through improved linkages with buyers and government extension services; and capacity-building programmes to improve production and profits. These two priorities were also mentioned as key factors in motivating producers to join forest and farm producer organizations.

Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business

The FFF supported 26 producer groups in Kavre, Nawalparasi and Makwanpur districts in 2015. Half these make farm products (e.g. floriculture, vegetable gardening, goat and poultry farming) and half are forest enterprises (broom grass, bel (a wild fruit) juice, sabai grass rope production, leaf plate-making, and compost-making). Implementation commenced of the first round of FFF small grants (four grants agreements in three districts), and the three phases of MA&D training were completed
with producer groups. Twenty-one business plans had been developed by the end of 2015 with the support of FNCSI, FECOFUN and small grants holders. The majority of producer groups felt that developing a business plan as part of MA&D training had increased their ability to find buyers and to access business development services and finance.

Access to finance remains a challenge, however, especially for group enterprises. This is due partly to a lack of awareness of the funding options available and partly to the poor record-keeping, accounting and auditing procedures of entrepreneurs. Producers who developed their own business plans reported that this had helped them in accessing finance, particularly from cooperatives. Of all members of the 26 producer groups, more than one-third (108) had obtained loans from cooperatives; the number of female and male borrowers was almost equal. As per the Cooperative Act of Nepal, access to finance from cooperatives is only available to individuals and not to groups, which has led many individual farmers to obtain membership in cooperatives. Group savings are increasing, making small loan requirements less bureaucratic. In 2016, more efforts will be made to improve the ability of forest and farm producer organizations to access finance from different service providers.

**Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms**

*Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management*

The cross-sectoral platforms have been instrumental in bringing attention to the priorities identified by the forest and farm producer organizations. Platform meetings are organized by IUCN Nepal, but the agenda and the convening of meetings is done by the forest and farm producer organizations themselves. In 2015, three cross-sectoral platform meetings were held at the national level and six in Kavre, Nawalparasi and Makwanpur districts (two in each); a new platform was established in Makwanpur district. FECOFUN and FNCSI, in collaboration with a consortium of producer organizations, have actively engaged with government agencies on issues related to improving the policy environment and supporting forest and farm businesses.

FECOFUN and IUCN representatives served as members of a steering committee for the formulation of policies related to forestry and natural resources, which includes the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, the Forest Sector Strategy, the Nature Conservation National Strategic Framework and the REDD strategy. In serving on the steering committee they advocated for mainstreaming sustainable forest and farm management into national policies.

FECOFUN lobbied the government to remove bureaucratic barriers that prevent communities from benefiting fully from forest resources, especially those related to the harvesting and sale of forest products such as timber. In parallel, FNCSI advocated for the government to improve its support for small-scale forest and farm businesses, such as by simplifying the registration process, improving governmental technical extension services and supporting rural credit schemes that target forest and farm producers.
This joint advocacy work brought some important results in 2015. The Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation revised its policy to allow the free transport of 23 timber and non-timber species. The Ministry also allowed the harvest of timber in the Churia region (for self-consumption only).

The platform meetings have proved to be an effective space for increasing support for forest and farm producer organizations and increasing collaboration across ministries and with other donor programmes, such as the Multistakeholder Forestry Programme and a European Union-funded bioenergy project. Many stakeholders participating in the meetings – especially government service providers – committed to supporting the issues discussed, and a joint action plan was developed for each of the three FFF pilot districts to ensure that these are followed up in practice. Many of the FFF-supported forest and farm producer organizations (14 of 26) felt that their participation in the forum had increased their understanding of the responsibilities and limitations of governmental organizations – such as the services available to them for free, and how to access other services through different mechanisms.

An ongoing challenge for the smooth operation of platform meetings is the regular changing of government officials in the districts.

**Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes**

*Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa*

The FFF supported the joint secretary of FECOFUN, the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation and the chair of the cross-sectoral platform to participate and contribute to a global meeting of forest and farm producer organizations just before the World Forestry Congress in Durban, South Africa, in September 2015, and to contribute to the pre-Congress declaration arising from that global meeting. A policy brief based on the FFF Nepal experience of policy advocacy in the pilot districts was presented at the World Forestry Congress (http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/fff_policy_brief.pdf).

FECOFUN has since integrated relevant learnings and outcomes from the World Forestry Congress into their ongoing projects, programmes and advocacy work.

Several communication materials (a policy brief, a video and an article) were developed for, and presented at, the World Forestry Congress. Lessons learned from the cross-sectoral platforms were shared at the Congress.

In September 2015, 18 people from the FFF in Nepal participated in an exchange visit to Viet Nam with the aim of learning about FFF activities in that country, particularly those related to forest-based enterprises. The main lessons learned from the visit related to the Vietnamese “value-chain” and “partnership” approaches to enterprise development, and the role of the government in promoting forest and farm producer businesses. After the visit, participants developed action plans for replicating the best practices they had observed in their programme districts – such as the importance of adding value to selected products through technical training and learning visits to companies higher up in the value chain.
Challenges to implementation and Lessons Learned

As in other countries, scaling up pilot-level achievements to the country level remains a major challenge. Efforts are underway to achieve this through policy changes and through horizontal replication via FECOFUN and FNCSI, building linkages with other sector programmes, such as the Multistakeholder Forestry Programme and REDD+ initiatives.

Joint planning meetings between the FFF and government agencies at the regional and national levels have proved efficient in mobilizing extension services and developing collaboration with other programmes to support producers.

Lessons from the Viet Nam field visit show that efficiency could be further improved by building capacity among platform members on the value-chain approach to enterprise development, which is used actively by government agencies in Viet Nam to develop partnerships and support forest enterprises.

Nicaragua: producer organizations supporting indigenous women’s rights

Country coach: Jhony Zapata; national facilitator: Leonardo Chavez

Timeline of the FFF programme in Nicaragua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFF launch</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline study</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market training</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South–South cooperation</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small grants (4)</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National exchange visit</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA&amp;D ToT of SPCC</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Nicaragua is the second-poorest economy in Latin America, but it contains one of the largest intact tropical forests north of the Amazon (3.2 million hectares), much of it falling in the Rosita Autonomous Region of the North Caribbean Coast (RACCN) and the Bosawas Protected Area, which alone covers 2 million hectares. The RACCN is home to indigenous peoples such as the Mayangna and Miskito Indians, who practice low-density shifting cultivation. Yet the forest is under threat, especially from colonists, who have a more sedentary form of agriculture based on ranching, and from logging operations. By the 1990s, the threat was so severe that the Mayangna organized themselves into associations to resolve territorial disputes with colonists. In 2001 they won a case against logging concessions with the Organisation of American States. By 2005 the Nicaraguan government had

Key lessons learned, and focus for 2016

A key learning in 2015 was the need to scale up financial literacy training for forest and farm producer organizations and to organize interactions between producers and financial institutions, especially cooperatives and mobile banks. Those producers who accessed funds from cooperatives mentioned that these kind of interactions had helped them in understanding the requirements for accessing funds. Similar initiatives with service providers are planned.

Key highlight, 2015

The FFF helped organize a south–south cooperation learning exchange between Nicaragua’s National Forest Institute (INAFOR), Mexico’s Forest National Commission and the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. This exposed INAFOR to different models of community forestry, which have now been incorporated into INAFOR’s workplan with FFF for 2016.
taken the progressive step of awarding common property titles to the Mayangna and others. In total, the government now legally recognizes 49 percent of the remaining forests as community-owned – a higher proportion than in any other Latin American country. This political support provides a platform for strengthening forest and farm producer organizations for business and policy engagement.

In Nicaragua, the FFF is working mainly with women’s producer groups – the Mestiza’s producer groups and the Mayangna indigenous women. The Mestizas live in the Bosawas buffer zone and work in “productive clusters” of producer groups. They are quite well-organized, and each cluster has a board of directors and manages its own financial resources. The Mayangna women’s organization is driven mainly by culture and ancestral customs; they are highly productive and skilled in their craftsmanship, which they have managed to turn into economic opportunities.

In the latter half of 2015, the Government of Nicaragua decided that all technical cooperation in the country should be channelled through it. Several meetings were held with the government to adjust the FFF implementation plan to this new context. The National Forest Institute (INAFOR) was selected as the main delivery partner, and FAO Nicaragua will now work with INAFOR to implement FFF activities. Although this change will limit the capacity of the FFF to work directly with forest and farm producer organizations in Nicaragua, it will not change the main focus of the programme or the stakeholders. The change affected the implementation of activities under Pillar 1 in 2015, but activities progressed well under Pillar 2, building the relationship between the Mayangna Nation and the government, and Pillar 3, where a number of successful learning exchanges took place.

Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFF partners in Nicaragua with whom formal agreements have been signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• National Forest Institute – to lead on implementation of FFF activities across the three pillars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement

The FFF continued to work with the Mestiza and Mayangna women’s organizations in 2015, and with the board of directors of the Mayangna Nation, to strengthen their engagement with policy processes. Capacity-building training were delivered to address issues such as food security, domestic violence, and improving production systems, and support was provided to the network of nine territories in the Mayangna Nation. For example, the FFF supported the convening of the first forum of Mayangna women in...
RACCN, which enabled women to share their realities, concerns and proposals and to strengthen women’s organizations in the nine territories.

In preparation for the women’s forum, at least nine meetings were held in each Mayangna territory to discuss how to improve the position of women’s organizations. Increasing internal unity and organization were identified as priorities, as was the need to increase the participation of the women in public institutions and decision-making roles.

About 130 Mayangna women from the nine territories attended the forum, which produced three main outcomes: 1) a declaration by the Mayangna women of the nine Mayangna territories; 2) increased motivation of the Mayangna women to organize a new network of indigenous women of the nine territories; and 3) the establishment of a coordinating committee for the Network of Women of the Mayangna Nation.

Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business

In the first part of 2015, FFF activities focused on helping women’s producer groups to develop business-oriented entities such as cooperatives and enterprises. The training of producer groups in MA&D continued; moreover, 35 members of the regional multisectoral platform on production and commerce (Sistema de Produccion, Consumo y Comercio, SPCC) were trained as trainers so they can deliver this service to producers and support the implementation of business plans.

Access to finance remains an issue, with most producer groups depending on their own savings and assets to generate capital for their businesses. A public–private partnership institution, Banco Produzcamos, has been created to encourage smallholder forest and farm production, but its procedures for accessing finance are complicated; for example, it requires several guarantees in order to grant loans, which the smallholders do not have.

In July 2015 the FFF also supported two exchanges within the Mayangna Nation facilitated by the board of the Mayangna Nation. The first of these was to the House of the Mayangna Nation, Municipality of Rosita, in which 23 Mayangna presidents and vice-presidents from the Indigenous Territorial Government (GTI) participated. The second was to the municipality of Siuna between the Board of the Mayangna Nation and community authorities, which aimed to identify ways of improving decision-making based on the realities and needs of the communities. Both exchanges focused on improving local self-governance capacity, negotiation and conflict resolution. The exchange provided an opportunity to share experiences, realities and lessons learned among producer groups and to develop partnerships.

**Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms**

Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

At the subnational level, the FFF engaged with the SPCC, which provides a forum for government agencies to discuss technical assistance needs and issues related to forest and farm producers in RACCN. The FFF also supported the Mayangna Nation in developing and sharing its new vision and strategy with the GTI and community authorities.

The FFF supported the convening of two meetings to share the new vision of the Mayangna Nation; the first was a gathering of the Board of Directors of the Mayangna Nation and the GTI, and the second was with the participation of community structures.

The SPCC is just for government institutions. The Mayangna Nation is part of it, but producer organizations are not represented. The FFF has been making efforts to resolve
this issue by raising the awareness of MEFCCA (Ministerio de Economía Familiar, Comunitaria, Cooperativa y Asociativa), which leads the platform, on the benefits of allowing the participation of producer groups.

Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes

*Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa*

An important South–South cooperation event in 2015 took place between INAFOR, Mexico’s Forest National Commission (Comisión Nacional Forestal – CONAFOR) and the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. The objective of the exchange was to expose INAFOR to other models of community forestry and agroforestry systems in order to improve best practice in Nicaragua. Experiences were exchanged on Mexico’s and Ecuador’s “Socio Bosque” programmes and helped inform the FFF’s 2016 work plan.

In August 2015, FFF facilitators and stakeholders from the Plurinational State of Bolivia and Nicaragua helped organize and participated in another exchange (*Taller Internacional de Intercambio de Experiencias sobre Gestión Comunitaria del Territorio, Gobernanza Forestal y Vinculación con Mercados*), along with the Mexican Network of Peasant Forestry Organizations (Red MOCAF), AMPB and CONAFOR. The workshop, which took place in Mexico, focused on land management, forest governance and linkages with markets.

Participants included smallholder farmers and representatives of governments, non-governmental organizations and the private sector from the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico and Nicaragua.

FFF supported the Secretaria de Asuntos Indigenas y Afrodescendientes (known as SAAI) to develop a guide to bilingual intercultural learning in Mayangna schools, called “Our knowledge of Mother Earth”, aimed at teachers and students in Mayangna communities. The guide will help strengthen knowledge about the Mayangna way of life, and it will be disseminated through the Ministry of Education’s Indigenous Bilingual Teachers Special Program.

Challenges for implementation and Lessons Learned

The decision by the government in 2015 that all resources are to be channelled directly through government agencies resulted in a delay and reformulation of the programme. The key challenge will be to ensure that sufficient resources reach producer organizations and that their role is ultimately strengthened. A national election in 2016 will present new challenges.

South–South cooperation is proving a valuable resource that FFF can facilitate, for example in helping INAFOR to improve its community forestry model and agroforestry systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key lessons learned, and focus for 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The new orientation of the government towards technical cooperation means that government institutions will implement future activities in the field. INAFOR will lead programme implementation, in a close coordination with the FFF facilitator. The key focus in 2016 will therefore be to strengthen the capacity of INAFOR through MA&amp;D and regional exchanges, deliver business training, and improve policies towards forest and farm producer organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viet Nam: Group formation is already helping smallholders gain access to markets and secure better prices

Country coach: Sophie Grouwels; national facilitator: Y Vuley Voan
Timeline of the FFF programme in Viet Nam

Background

As of 2014, forest cover in Viet Nam was above 14 million hectares, 3.4 million hectares of which were under the control of more than 1.4 million smallholders. Almost 50 percent of these households, however, have only 1 hectare of forest, and they cannot obtain high incomes from the forest products produced on such small areas. Organization among farmers is vital for achieving economic scale. In April 2014, the Viet Nam Farmers’ Union (VNFU) approached the FFF, and Viet Nam duly became an FFF partner country.

An inception phase and baseline study in 2014 provided an overview of forest and farm producer organizations and relevant government structures with respect to the FFF vision, working areas, and main outputs. The FFF prioritized disadvantaged households, ethnic minority groups and women in Yen Bai and Bac Kan provinces in the northeast and northwest of the country. A key strategy for helping these groups is to strengthen existing farmer networks such as the VFNU and the cooperative alliance to provide farmers with better services. A multistakeholder platform for policy dialogue was also set up under an advisory committee comprising representatives from 12 organizations (VNFU, FAO, IUCN, MARD/VNFOREST, the North Vietnam college of Agriculture and Rural Development (NVCARD), RECOFTC, SNV, SRD, Forest Trends, Viet Nam Cooperative Alliance, Yen Bai Farmers’ Union and Bac Kan Farmers’ Union).

Communication has been mainstreamed in all activities through the websites of the VNFU, provincial farmer unions and national and local newspapers. By December 2014, the FFF project dossier had been completed and approved by the relevant ministries.

Figure 7. FFF country structure in Viet Nam
Results and learning in 2015

**Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement**

*Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement*

Baseline surveys in Yen Bai and Bac Kan provinces were completed and validated in 2015. Subsequently, nine field coordinators (five in Yen Bai and four in Bac Kan) were assigned to roll out activities in cooperation with local authorities, producer communities and the programme management unit. A 5-day training-of-trainers course on facilitation skills was carried out for 22 field facilitators and producer organization representatives. A further three days of training on project proposal writing skills were provided for 19 local farmers’ union staff and the heads of producer organizations (eight from Bac Kan and eleven from Yen Bai). Focus group discussions were held every six months to track progress. Newly formed producer organizations have started organizing regular meetings to discuss their working regulations and requirements for external help.

These commercial organizations are having an impact on policy. For example, the Chu Huong People’s Committee and the Ba Be District Natural Resource Management Department committed to speeding up the issuing of land-use right certificates for forest areas. The Natural Resource Management Department and agencies in Yen Bai and Bac Kan agreed to review the tax policy for farmers and forest use, and other policies. Through regular meetings and roundtable discussions at different levels, the VFNU and its producer organizations have created a constructive policy dialogue with relevant departments, local authorities, banks and companies on the role of forest and farm producer organizations in sustainable forest development.

*Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business*

Six training-of-trainers workshops on MA&D (phases 1, 2 and 3) were convened in 2015, including field trips, for 24 local facilitators and 28 potential or outstanding entrepreneur farmers. Nineteen representatives of timber and star anise producer organizations received training on growing and processing techniques.

As of end November 2015, the FFF had provided support for the legalization of ten forest and farm producer organizations – four cinnamon groups, two acacia groups, three magnolia groups, and one star anise group – all of which are now registered with the local government at the commune level. Through their organizations they are selecting products and doing business collectively; exploring the most appropriate legal structures for their enterprises; conducting market research; and gathering information in five areas (market issues; legislative requirements; resource availability; social integration; and required technology) to help in developing enterprise development plans. Each producer organization has chosen its most promising product, always combined with other non-timber options (e.g. forest vegetables, herbal trees or honeybees).
Trust and cooperation are stronger – members understand that they will have more product for less effort, better prices, more market information, and greater access to loans if they work in group. For example, the Khuoi Slien collective group in My Phuong commune recently built 450 m of forest road, and the Dao Thinh cinnamon group built 350 m. Confidence is growing among producers in applying to, for example, Agri-bank, Social Bank and the “Support for Farmer” Fund by submitting their business and development plans. Clear examples exist of producer organizations finding partnership buyers. For example, an acacia group in Yen Bai (Mr Hai) established two sawmills and now cooperates with four other nearby sawmills to sell products to the Nam Dinh wood processing company, obtaining prices that are 10 percent higher (equivalent to US$10–15 per m$^3$) for their wood than they would be if they sold separately.

This new-found confidence has in part been created by the organization of three domestic exchange visits for 59 representatives of producer groups, VNFU staff, provincial forest offices and local authorities. Participants visited Hoa Binh Province to learn about forest plantations with FSC certification and beekeeping and combined tea and forest production, and Bac Kan to see timber processing and star anise processing.

Preparations for competitively awarding six small business-development grants across Yen Bai and Bac Kan provinces have been completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFF partners with whom formal agreements have been signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Vietnam Farmers Union at the national and district levels – for business development work with local forest and farm producer groups, policy roundtables to improve the enabling environment, and exchange visits, training and small grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IUCN – Vietnam office provides some valuable local staff time to assist with training and communications as part of the partnership with IUCN and FFF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms**

**Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management**

The FFF worked with the Viet Nam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, the Viet Nam Academy of Forest Sciences, and other organizations, through six-monthly meetings of the Advisory Committee (in which formally appointed staff from multiple institutions participate – including in field learning visits) and by conducting 13 roundtable discussions with all stakeholders at all levels (eight of the roundtable discussions were held at the commune level, three at the district level and two at the provincial level). The agendas of these discussions are focused on how to support forest-farm producer organizations in production and sustainable forest business by creating a more enabling policy environment. They enabled constructive, focused dialogues at each administrative level between representatives of formal producer organizations and government representatives, facilitated by the VNFU.

Agroforestry was examined as a land use and proposals made to improve its business prospects, including that:

- There should be mechanisms and policies to encourage forest commodity development, as already exist for rice and livestock. This issue will be discussed in the provincial People’s Assembly or brought up at the central level through policy advocacy.
• There is a need for better information on forestry development for farmers.
• A longer loan repayment option for forest producers should be introduced under the government’s Decree 55/2015/ND-CP (dated 9 June 2015) on credit policy for agriculture development in rural areas.
• There should be further training on FSC certification for forest cooperatives.
• There should be a review of existing state forest companies and a reallocation of the lands of inefficient companies to forest producers and farmers.
• A provincial industrial and trade department should be created to support especially cinnamon, star anise and acacia groups to participate in trade fairs, both within and outside the province, to introduce their products.
• Quicker land-conflict resolution procedures are needed in Yen Bai Province.
• More support is needed for seedlings and fertilisers in Bac Kan Province.

Such policy advances have been accompanied by improved collaboration, for example with RECOFTC and NVCARD in obtaining trainers and materials for MA&D training; with UN-REDD in Bac Kan Province and FAO in Hanoi in understanding UN-REDD’s activities and how to link them with producer organizations; with We Effect and the World Agroforestry Centre in learning about the experiences of those organizations in developing entrepreneurial skills, and with the Nam Dinh Forestry Company, Woodsland, Hagimex and other small enterprises in improving market outlets for producers.

**Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes**

*Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa*

A number of activities helped link local forest and farm producers with global agendas, and vice versa. For example, leaders of the VNFU and forest and farm producer organizations participated in regional and global forums in 2015, such as the Fifth Asian Social Forestry Network regional meeting held in Myanmar, RECOFTC’s regional workshop in Bangkok, and the World Forest Congress in South Africa. The FFF and the VNFU, in collaboration with RECOFTC, also organized two regional training workshop on MA&D in Hanoi in January and June 2015, with the participation of 22 participants from five countries – Indonesia, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nepal and Viet Nam – and the fourth International Forest Connect Conference in Hanoi, with participants from 22 countries VNFU also met with newspapers, magazines and related units to develop a communication strategy. A communication strategy for the FFF in Viet Nam is in development.

FFF Viet Nam hosted international exchange visits for delegations from FFF Nepal and FFF Myanmar. The VNFU is compiling a list of its members (e.g. full name, ethnicity, contact numbers, age, forest area, promising product, type of organization, existing status, main challenges) to improve national-level assessment and monitoring.

**Challenges to implementation and Lessons Learned**

The FFF programme has moved forward with remarkable speed, with the new approach now being institutionalized in a relatively small pilot area. The VNFU’s huge organizational structure offers tremendous potential. In 2015, the VNFU focused on creating good models for forest and farm producer organizations in a few pilots. In 2016, efforts should be made to share these first lessons learned and to reflect how the pilot approach can be scaled up, initially through the VNFU’s own structures. Remaining challenges include obtaining a more hands-on collaboration with the UN-REDD in Bac Kan, and involving other service providers, such as the provincial cooperative alliances and the Women’s Union.
In Viet Nam it has become clear that newly established producer organizations require close coaching and support on enterprise development and small grant implementation. This justifies the need for FFF intervention and points out the need for greater support. A lack of cross-sectoral support undermines the sustainability of producer organizations; therefore, the role of the VNFU at different levels is important, not only in implementation but also to mobilize and encourage other government agencies, stakeholders and sectors to support producer organizations. Investments are needed to build trust, then cooperation, and, ultimately, successful producer organizations. Local facilitators, including officers of supporting agencies and the VNFU, should be trained in MA&D and the benefits of grouping, and they should have a roadmap for becoming true entrepreneurs in order to provide better services to forest and farm producer organizations. Strategic alliances with stakeholders such as processing companies and experts will create leverage for increasing the benefits for forest and farm producers. Especially in countries like Viet Nam, policy advocacy skills and communication skills should be improved.

Zambia: producer exchanges with Kenya and Liberia inspire new charcoal strategy

Country coach: Sophie Grouwels; national facilitator: Vincent Ziba
Timeline of the FFF programme in Zambia

Background

Zambia has among the highest forest cover in Africa estimated at 49.9 million hectares (66 percent of the land area). However, Zambia's forest resources are declining at a steady rate, due mainly to agricultural expansion and charcoal production. The latter is feeding increasing demand from Zambia's large urban population, which, in the midst of an energy crisis, is turning to charcoal to meet household energy needs. Until recently, part of the problem has been a lack of incentives in Zambia's legal framework to involve local people in the management and benefit-sharing of Zambia's vast forest resources. After many years of deliberation and review, a new Forest Act was approved in 2015, bringing hope for both community forest management and forest and farm producers.

In 2015, the FFF programme in Zambia started implementing activities in Choma District in the Southern Province and Mwinilunga District in the North Western Province. LoAs
were signed with the Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) and the Forestry Department. A strategic stakeholder’s workshop was organized by the FFF, FAO and We Effect Southern Africa in Lusaka to identify opportunities for implementing the partnership in Zambia. Representatives from the Forestry Department and the ZNFU received trained in the MA&D approach and started working to develop business plans with forest and farm producers. The FFF in Zambia also engaged with the national REDD+ process; a new REDD+ strategy was approved in 2015 highlighting the role of forest and farm producers in reducing deforestation.

Results and learning in 2015

Pillar 1. Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement

Outcome 1. Producer groups are strengthened for policy engagement

The FFF Zambia baseline study revealed that local smallholder forest and farm producer groups in the two project areas (Choma and Mwinilunga) are poorly organized and frequently exploited by dominant market actors. Strengthening the organization of these groups at the district level was a key priority in 2015. A key strategy for doing so was to strengthen the capacity of the ZNFU, the national apex body, to better cater to the forest-related needs of producers, in addition to the main farm commodities the ZNFU already supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFF partners with whom formal agreements have been signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Zambia National Farmers Union – apex organization for strengthening the organization of forest and farm producers for both policy engagement and business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zambia Forestry Department – for increasing the participation of forest and farm producers in district-level and provincial-level government platforms and policy review processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first step in the process was to establish a partnership between the ZNFU, the Forestry Department and We Effect to work together at the district level to provide training and information to forest and farm producers in their local information centres (IC) and study circles. Forest products are relatively new commodities for both the ZNFU and We Effect, so the Forestry Department played a key role in providing forest producers with technical expertise and market information. The ZNFU has established a new commodity committee, the Forest and Farm Commodity Committee, to improve its services to forest producers. Since the start of FFF activities, the number of smallholder forest-based enterprise groups under the ZNFU has increased in Choma and Mwinilunga districts.
The second step in the process was to establish local forest and farm platforms (LFFPs) at the sub district level, building on the existing ZNFU information centres, to provide a platform for producers to prepare their engagement with the government on policy issues and to discuss business opportunities. The creation of the LFFPs enlarged the window for the ZNFU to engage with a wider range of government institutions and to adapt their service provision and advocacy to cater for the needs of forest producers. LFFPs will engage actively with district development coordinating committees in policy dialogues.

Progress as also made in organizing the producers of some of Zambia’s main forest products into entities. In Choma, the FFF programme started the process of organizing charcoal producers into a district platform, which can be transformed into an association. In Mwinilunga, the FFF facilitated the formation of a honey association and a timber cooperative. All three of these entities are being established under the auspices of the ZNFU Forest and Farm Commodity Committee at the district level and respond to opportunities for local forest producers emerging in the new Forest Act (No. 4 of 2015). This Act includes subsidiary legislation that will: require all charcoal producers and traders to be formalized into associations and to only trade in designated areas; improve the regulation of the honey industry; and ensure that only Zambian citizens can own cooperatives and companies dealing in primary timber production. The producers initiated these changes themselves, and the FFF is supporting the process through district-level information centres and LFFPs.

Outcome 2. Producers are organized for business

Forty-eight producer groups were trained in MA&D in Choma and Mwinilunga. Representatives of these groups also underwent training in proposal writing, and the small grants programme will provide a financial incentive and opportunity for selected producers to access funds (once they have developed their business plans).
The FFF programme facilitated linkages to a micro finance company, CETIZAM. CETIZAM held a training workshop for producers on how to access financing from the company, and it is engaging with the ZNFU on including certain forest-based products in the credit scheme they are running in collaboration with the Zambia National Commercial Bank. Interestingly, the number of smallholder forest-based enterprise groups in farmers’ associations under the ZNFU increased in the FFF pilot districts in 2015. The FFF facilitated the participation of some smallholder forest and farm producers from Choma and Mwinilunga in the ZNFU annual congress; there is a need, however, for the ZNFU to provide further explicit support to the district farmers’ associations in sustainable farm forest management and use.

Pillar 2. Catalysing multisectoral policy platforms

Outcome 3. Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

After the initiation of the FFF programme in Zambia, the Forestry Department and the ZNFU fast-tracked the signing a memorandum of understanding to collaborate on forest and farm activities. The two organizations are working together under the FFF to facilitate the formation of LFFPs. The Forestry Department has a specific role in facilitating linkages between LFFPs and district development coordinating committees (DDCCs). DDCCs are forums in which district government departments meet to discuss the coordination of investments from the public, private and non-governmental sectors. Through the Forestry Department, the FFF has create a dialogue between smallholder farmers and DDCCs. This has been achieved by facilitating meetings between smallholder groups and district commissioners and council secretaries to present their issues and influence the agenda of DDCC meetings. The Forestry Department will coordinate extraordinary DDCC meetings on request by LFFPs. LFFPs in Choma are discussing sustainable charcoal production and the enforcement of regulations by the Forestry Department. Some charcoal producers have had their businesses confiscated and been harassed by government law enforcement officers, even in cases where they had licences issued by the Forestry Department. These kinds of issues need to be discussed and clarified and will be brought up as priorities at DDCC meetings.

Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes

Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the priorities of local producers, and vice versa

In June 2015, the FFF programme supported the Director of the Forestry Department and other senior officials, including a ZNFU manager and a traditional leader from Mwinilunga, to attend the first Africa Farm Forest Producer Organizations’ Conference in Kenya. The conference provided a good space in which the traditional leader could engage with different institutions involved in the FFF and for the Director of the Forestry Department to gain exposure to issues confronting forest and farm producer organizations. The objective of the conference and exchange visit was to share experiences on supporting smallholder forest and farm producers and their need to organize. An African message on forest and farm producer organizations was also prepared for the World Forestry Congress, held in September 2015.

An important outcome of the conference in Kenya was the exchange that took place between charcoal associations from different countries. Representatives of charcoal associations in Kenya and Liberia shared their experiences and lessons as organizations engaging in policy processes and business. This exchange prompted the Zambian Forestry Department to develop a charcoal strategy, which subsequently inspired the formation of the Choma District Charcoal Platform.
Challenges to implementation and Lessons Learned

Implementing the partnership between the FFF and We Effect in Zambia and bringing it to a higher level – including through joint fundraising – will be challenging, and it will need dedicated attention from the FFF facilitator and coach, in collaboration with FAO Zambia. Opportunities were identified during the workshop based on the ongoing work of We Effect and the FFF as well as the endorsed Zambian REDD+ strategy, in which there is space for implementation through forest and farm producer organizations. The concept note should be presented to donors in Zambia to obtain their interest and eventual buy-in.

A key lesson learned in 2015 was the strategic importance of working with the Forestry Department in the context of Zambia. Although the government can be slow in implementing activities as a grant recipient, the partnership with it has proven to be strategic for policy engagement, with the FFF facilitator leading the process.

Another important lesson related to the process of administering the call for proposals and selection of small grant recipients. After the call it became clear that communities had limited knowledge on how to put together a proposal, and in some cases it was mainly the idea of the money itself – rather than the business activities the money could support – that was motivating people to submit applications. To address this it was decided to provide training in proposal writing before issuing a call, and that small grants should be linked to MA&D training so that entrepreneurs developing viable business plans could access funds to implement their plans. Finally the ZNFU represents all farmers both large and small – FFF will need to continue to emphasize and facilitate the empowerment of smallholder farmers and their groups within the emerging farm forestry commodity group and in community forestry management opportunities.

4. Small grants summary 2015

Small grants play an important part in the work of the FFF in providing funding directly to forest and farm producers organizations. Increasingly efforts are being made to link these small grants to the Market Analyses and Development Training programmes to help FFPOs develop enterprise development plans. Though generally smaller in size the small grants have ranged from $2,500 to $50,000 in size depending on the objectives. A few of the larger small grants have enabled medium scale forest and farm organizations to diversify their services to support more members or new products. While the intention is to give the small grants directly to forest and farm producer organizations – there are cases where the FFPOs are not yet legally constituted entities and where their capacity development is still being supported by other groups – where these grants have been given to NGOs. This is viewed solely as a bridging strategy. Given below is a list of the small grants followed by a brief description of the recipients.
## Small Grants in 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Level of intervention</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources (DANAR)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>16,410</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Policy Analysis and Development (CPAD)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Governance Nepal</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>16,985</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Farmer Group Federation (NFGF)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>16,850</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Sub-local</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Nepal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>67,245</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Gambia Forestry Platform</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>9,815</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Sub-local</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brufut Allatentou Association</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanteh Society</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Village group/CBO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture farmers Association</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,136</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Development Organization</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Sub-local</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumana Association for Development (TAD)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>Association of village groups</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureng Adult Literacy Class</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,558</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Poultry Farmers Association</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Against Draught and Hunger in the Sahel (REFESA)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>7,583</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Sub-local</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total The Gambia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>68,030</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative (ECCDI)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>NGO: FFP project ongoing</td>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>300+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Myanmar:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Petén (ACOFOP)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>FO: FFP project ongoing</td>
<td>Sub-local</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Guatemala:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asociacion de Grupos Mancomados de Trabajo (MINGA)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>36,659</td>
<td>Producer Organization</td>
<td>Sub-National</td>
<td>1,400 families (6,300 persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinadora de Integracion de Organizaciones Economicas de Bolivia (CIOEC)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>43,466</td>
<td>Producer Organization</td>
<td>Sub-National</td>
<td>560 families (2,520 persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Bolivia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80,125</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Charcoal Union of Liberia (NACUL)</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>13,584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Liberia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13,584</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>337,983</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Gambia

Rural Development Organization

The Rural Development Organization is a charitable non-profit community-based organization in Farafenni, Upper Badibou District, North Bank Region. The project will support communities in the villages of Chamen, Duta bulb, Kalataba and Jumansar to sustainably manage community forests and mitigate the impacts of climate change. It will provide training to transfer knowledge and skills on business development and access to micro-finance services to village representatives.

All Gambia Forestry Platform

The All Gambia Forestry Platform was established in 2012 by the Ministry of Forestry and Environment to support the implementation of the National Forest Policy. The project will strengthened the capacity of its secretariat and executives in enterprise development planning and help its forest community members to access finance and market opportunities through processing, packaging and marketing of non-timber forest products.

Aquaculture Fish Farmers Association

The Aquaculture Fish Farmers Association is a member-based producer organization comprising several villages. The project will help organize and strengthen aquaculture and responsible fishing, improve business planning skills, and create income among the Association’s members. Executive members of the association will gain knowledge and skills in developing business plans to raise support needs, and villagers will be organized with the aim of forming a regional federation.

Tumana Association for Development

The Tumana Association for Development is a community-based charitable organization in the Tumana District in the Upper River Region. The project will help increase the organizational capacities of community forest management committees and increase the productivity of women vegetable producers. It will train vegetable growers in processing and preservation techniques, train local communities in agroforestry practices, and establish a central community tree nursery.

Bureng Adult Literacy Class

The Bureng Adult Literacy Class is a community-based organization formed by adult learners attending non-formal education. The project will lead to the sustainable management of the community forest by developing a community forest management plan, increase the number of trees in farmlands, and help women collectors of non-timber forest products to get organized.

Brufut Allatentou Association

The Brufut Allatentou Association is a community-based organization promoting horticultural production on eight hectares by its 253 members. The project will lead to improved incomes and capacities by helping family farmers overcome constraints of low productivity in horticulture and to integrate forest and fruit tree farming alongside a community forest in the village.
REFESA Association

The REFESA Association is a regional organization created in the 1970s with the intention of fighting drought in sub-Saharan Africa, with 134 affiliated groups in Gambia. The project will help rural women and youth in four communities to improve their livelihoods based on the sustainable use of non-timber forest products and greater access to finance and markets for their products.

Rural Poultry Farmers Association Central River Region – South

The Rural Poultry Farmers Association Central River Region – South has 250 members from communities in six administrative districts. The project will help raise incomes and improve the quality of production for producers while taking steps to reduce dependency on, and to sustainably manage, community forests by providing production inputs to, and training members in, community forestry.

Japanteh Society

The Japanteh Society, which has a membership of 25, is located in Jamagen Sanjal, an agrarian settlement where livelihoods are centred on crop and livestock production. The project will help households improve their livelihoods, food security and capacity to invest in the production and management of natural resources by provisioning organic manure, establishing tree nurseries and creating awareness on community forestry rights and benefits.

Nepal

Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources

The Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources is a non-governmental organization dedicated to ensuring the rights of Dalits and other poor excluded people in natural resources in Nepal through capacity-development training, advocacy, negotiation and empowerment activities. The project will enhance the capacity of the Dalit community in advocacy and investment, as well as increase the income of a Dalit producer group, by providing training on leadership and business development and forestry and farm management planning.

Center for Policy Analysis and Development

The Center for Policy Analysis and Development is a non-governmental organization that supports poverty alleviation through research and development. The project will lead to increased income and employment opportunities among 50 female smallholder producers in Nawalparasi District by strengthening entrepreneurial capacity and improving access to small-scale appropriate technology, business services and markets.
Green Governance Nepal

Green Governance Nepal is a non-profit organization that disseminates knowledge and promotes research and development on the sustainable management of natural resources. The project will enhance the livelihoods of local communities, particularly poor, marginalized and socially excluded communities, by strengthening the technical capacity of producer groups in agroforestry, establishing agroforestry-based enterprises, and improving access to business services.

Myanmar

Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative

The Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative is a local non-governmental organization founded in 2006 working to restore, conserve and manage natural resources while enhancing national socioeconomic development through environmental restoration and poverty alleviation. The project will support community forest user groups in seven villages in Ywangan Township, southern Shan State, to establish enterprises based on community forest products.

Guatemala

Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Petén

The Association of Forest Communities of Petén (ACOFOP) is a community-based association comprising indigenous farmers and 23 member organizations. ACOFOP is promoting new production chains in the Department of Petén to increase social welfare through the integrated management of natural resources as a strategy for environmental sustainability and poverty reduction. ACOFOP is a member of AMPB, which brings together local authorities in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama. The project will strengthen the technical, legal and institutional capacities of community organizations working with timber and non-timber forest products in the Department of Petén through capacity-development workshops and technical assistance.

Bolivia

Asociación de Grupos Mancomunados de Trabajo

Asociación de Grupos Mancomunados de Trabajo (MINGA) is a member-based organization of indigenous and peasant communities in the Plurinational State of Bolivia’s Chiquitania Region. The project will strengthen MINGA’s organizational capacity for the integrated management of forests and ecosystems as a contribution to the implementation of the country’s Joint Mechanism of Mitigation and Adaptation for the Integral and Sustainable Management of the Forest and Mother Earth. The project will have the following outcomes: strengthened organizational capacities of selected communities in the use and application of tools for the development, implementation, monitoring and certification of the General Integral Plan for the Management of the Forest and Territory; support for the implementation of market strategies and exchange of experiences in integrated forest management; and improved financial management of MINGA and the design of tools for sustainability.
Coordinadora de Integración de Organizaciones Económicas Campesinas, Indígena Originarias de Bolivia (CIOEC)

Coordinadora de Integración de Organizaciones Económicas Campesinas, Indígena Originarias de Bolivia (CIOEC) is a member-based organization for smallholders, peasants, indigenous peoples and communities. The project will strengthen the organizational capacity of CIOEC in the Department of Pando to support smallholder enterprises in obtaining legal status. This, in turn, will give such enterprises greater access to financial support from government and donors for implementing their economic initiatives based on the integrated sustainable management of forests and agroforestry systems. The project will have the following outcomes: support for obtaining legal status and strengthening organizational management for 44 smallholder producer organizations; greater capacities among those producer organizations on market analysis and development and democratic internal management that integrates youth, women and ethnic groups; and implementation of the “School of Leaders” to reinforce the capacities of smallholders and peasants in, for example, participation in policy dialogues and strategic planning.

Liberia

National Association of Charcoal Union of Liberia (NACUL)

National Association of Charcoal Union of Liberia (NACUL) is a member-based organization of charcoal producers and traders at national level. NACUL is deepening its membership with district charcoal associations in Great Cape Mount county and are planning to extend to two more counties adjacent to the capital, Monrovia. NACUL is actively involving women’s groups and participating in policy level decision making processes.

5. Learning exchanges as South–South collaboration in 2015

Learning exchanges have become an important component of the FFF under Pillar 3, providing both expected and unanticipated results. Though mentioned in the country reports it is instructive to share more detail about this work, which resonates very much with new trends towards greater South-South Collaboration within FAO member countries and the evolving development agenda. Producer organizations and representatives of governments in the ten countries in which FFF is operational participated in exchange visits in 2015.
Between countries

Between FFF African countries

An exchange between the African FFF countries – the Gambia, Kenya, Liberia and Zambia – was held on 5–7 June 2015 in Kenya, immediately before the African Farm Forestry Producer Organizations Conference in Nairobi. The exchange included a trip organized collaboratively with FF SPAK and the KFS to Nakuru County in Kenya’s Great Rift Valley, where participants met six groups undertaking various farm forestry activities and had an interactive meeting with representatives of the Nakuru County Government. The exchange also included a 1-day workshop at the KFS office, with participants sharing experiences and engaging in discussions on key issues related to forest and farm producers.

Learnings from the Kenya exchange highlighted by participants included the following:

- **Government support.** Government support is available both at the national and county levels in Kenya. However, most farmers cannot access it because they are not well organized and they lack information. For example, governments may have ongoing programmes to support producer organizations, but the target producer groups are unaware of it.

- **Access to credit and other financial opportunities.** Producer organizations could access funding opportunities if they were organized, obtained legal status as enterprises and had more capacity. Most producer groups have challenges in accessing credit and financial opportunities because of their low organizational capacity to generate cost-effective business initiatives and to develop bankable business plans.

- **FFSPAK.** Even though FF SPAK is making efforts in organizing and providing services to forest and farm producers, it still has low visibility and coverage.

- **Legal types of existing producer groups.** The law in Kenya offers various registration possibilities for producer organizations, among them “common interest groups”, “cooperatives”, “community-based organizations”, “associations” and “companies”. However, only cooperatives and companies are legally mandated to do business. Most producer groups operate without business-oriented legal status, hindering their capacity to do business. For example, information from the relevant authorities show that a large number of producer groups are registered as common interest groups and self-help groups. Few are registered as cooperatives, meaning that their capacity in terms of information, production, marketing and even lobbying is low.

- **Weak synergies and cooperation among groups.** Although many producer groups are in operation countrywide, few have come together to establish beneficial partnerships. For example, there are only a few product-based associations. An association of tree nursery producers that formed recently in Nakuru County provides a promising example. Such associations have the potential to create benefits for producers, especially by lobbying and in increasing access and linkages with markets. There is an opportunity to mobilize and organize these groups under the FFF to place them in a better position to generate income and improve livelihoods.

- **Value adding is a challenge.** Producer groups and individual farmers produce timber and non-timber products with low value adding. Most farmers sell their trees as standing wood or rough timber. The situation is the same for other
products, such as honey mushrooms. As a result, producers have lower incomes compared with other players further along the value chain.

- **Kenya has taken significant steps to regularize the charcoal value chain, including the registration of charcoal producer organizations.** Visitors from the Zambian Forestry Department were so impressed by Kenya’s example in regularizing the charcoal sector that they immediately implemented a number of ideas in Zambia to accompany the regulations of the Forest Act (2015). This resulted in a decision by the FFF team in Zambia to focus considerable effort on the formation of a charcoal producers’ platform in one of the two major counties in which they are working.

Participants in the Kenya exchange also participated in the African Farm and Family Forestry Producer Organizations Conference, which immediately followed the exchange and which was attended by more than 100 people from 15 countries. This was a value-adding activity, because it enabled exchange participants to share their experiences with a wider group of people from other African countries and to identify similarities and common challenges. A major outcome of the event was a resolution by African farm family producer organizations, which constituted a major input to the pre-World Forestry Congress event organized by the forest and farm producer organizations in in Durban, South Africa, in September 2016.

**Between FFF Latin American countries**

The FFF in collaboration with the Government of México, CONAFOR, AMPB and Red MOCAF organized a regional exchange of experiences and learning on the management of territories by communities, forest governance and market linkages in Mexico in August 2015. The event was an activity of the FAO Latin American regional initiative on family farming and territorial rural development and was prepared and delivered within the framework of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. About 100 representatives from forest and farm communities, indigenous peoples, small-scale producers and the governments of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Guatemala, Mexico and Nicaragua took part in the event, which included a field trip to Puebla. Participants shared and analysed successful experiences and identified the challenges facing governments in supporting producer organizations. Participants prepared key messages for sharing at the World Forestry Congress and UNFCCC COP 21 addressing community management, rights recognition and the full development of territories; the right to free, prior and informed consent; full and effective participation, and organization development; safeguards against the regression of public policies; and community-based enterprises and the value of local networks.

**Between Nepal and Viet Nam**

Eighteen selected participants from Nepal representing government, producer organizations and community producer groups in Kavre and Nawalparasi districts met with representatives of Vietnamese producers and government in Viet Nam on 27 September–3 October 2015. The objective of the visit was to learn new ways for improving livelihoods by engaging in business-oriented forestry and agroforestry systems, specifically in wood production for commercial and subsistence purposes. The visitors went to Yen Bai Province, where they visited the Yen Bai Farmers’ Union, several acacia groups in Phu Thinh commune, and a cinnamon cooperative in Dao Thinh, all supported by the FFF. Participants also visited a timber processing company and a honey- and tea-processing cooperative, the latter being particularly relevant to
the interests of some Nepali participants. In Hanoi, the group met with the Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST) to understand better Vietnamese forest policies and how they contribute to poverty reduction. Participants highlighted the following learnings:

- Viet Nam is promoting both production and protection forest. The approach to production forestry can be applied in community forests, leasehold forests and plantation forests.
- Working with farmers and forestry groups creates harmony between the sectors.
- It is better when each region specializes in a product, which helps achieve higher production volumes and improves market access.
- There is a need to work through the value chain of selected flagship products.
- Linkages to other sectors – with the support of the government – is helpful.

The exchange visit enhanced the understanding of Nepalese participants on integrated forest and farm management, cooperative and forest-based enterprises, timber processing, and the marketing of forest-based products in Viet Nam. The visit also provided a good opportunity to observe the implementation of the FFF programme in Viet Nam, the support provided to forest and farm producer organizations, and the status of such organizations (in terms of their engagement with the private sector and policy development) in light of the implementation of FFF programme. In consultations with local communities it was observed that, before the implementation of FFF programme in Viet Nam, forest and farm producers did not fully understand the benefits of forest and farm producer organizations. They were unregistered and unknown to local authorities, and they had limited organizational capacity, with no investment in processing facilities. Their products had low value-added and were sold through intermediary traders, resulting in unfair prices. They also lacked technical knowledge and information on seedling selection. After eight months of implementation of the FFF programme and the MA&D training provided by it, the involved forest and farm producer organizations now realize the benefit of group work and have registered with government institutions at the commune level. Now, they are better able to find partnership buyers with better prices and they are capable of developing enterprise development plans focusing on timber processing. The training provided to producer organizations on proposal writing has enabled them to submit proposals for small grants. Moreover, they now understand the benefits of FSC certification and will apply for it, supported by the FFF and local authorities. The Nepalese participants appreciated the work done by the VNFU and FFF Viet Nam team. The experiences and the lesson learned during the 6-day exchange visit will be useful for the FFF program in both Nepal and Viet Nam.
Between Myanmar and Viet Nam

An exchange of experiences between Myanmar and Viet Nam forest and farm producers and government representatives on improving livelihoods through sustainable wood production took place on 25–31 October 2015 in Viet Nam. Twenty stakeholders from Myanmar representing producers from Chin, Rakhine and Shan states, the Ayeyarwady, Magway and Mandalay regions, staff from the Myanmar Forest Department and the University of Forestry, and members of the Community Forestry Working Group and the Myanmar Timber Merchant Association visited northern Viet Nam to exchange experiences and expertise in forestry, agriculture, and agroforestry with Vietnamese farmers. Highlights included discussions with representatives of the VNFU at the provincial, district and commune levels; field visits to planted forests in Bac Kan Province and the wood-processing plants owned by farm producer groups; and the visit to the state-owned, FSC-certified Hoa Binh company, which manages 5 200 hectares of planted forests and 1 600 hectares of natural forest and produces 50 000–60 000 m³ of roundwood per year. The company is a role model for achieving good financial results while simultaneously complying with its social obligations to offer employment and provide seedlings and fertilizer to private households to enable them to start their own forestry businesses on land allocated to them. In general, the Vietnamese farmers confirmed that agriculture (rice, corn, tea, chicken and pork) contributes most to the family income, although a considerable share of the agricultural products is used for subsistence purposes. In forested communities, however, the contribution of forestry to family incomes may reach up to 60 percent. Most forest lands are allocated to families of local communities, groups of local communities, private companies, and semi-government organizations, and the government role is to monitor and evaluate the sustainability of forest management. The Myanmar participants were convinced they could adapt the demonstration models to the situation in their own country, although they emphasized that the framework conditions were different. The topics they were most interested in were the procedures for granting bank loans to farmers; the regulations on land tenure; the establishment and management of forest plantations; the availability of government incentives and subsidies for plantation forestry and small and medium-scale enterprises; and the training of farmers in sustainable land-use practices.

In-country exchanges

Forest and farm producers participated in a number of in-country exchanges in FFF implementing countries. Details of these are provided in the country reports. Larger level regional and global exchanges are described in the Regional and Global Section below.
6. Training

*Market Analysis and Development* training has been one of the key interventions during the first phase of the FFF.

The aim of MA&D is to enhance the entrepreneurial capacities of local communities so they can better access market opportunities and increase their cash income while gaining greater incentives to protect and sustainably manage their natural resource base. MA&D provides important planning and decision-making tools that enable those with direct stakes in forest resources to become part of sustainable forest use, management and decision-making. MA&D encourages the planning and development of business strategies that contribute to community investment preparedness, making it easier for communities to access external capital and donor investments. FFF partners have found MA&D training to be a valuable approach to strengthening the capacity of producers.

In 2015, selected countries in Asia and Africa benefited from MA&D “training of trainers” courses. They were organized in two cycles: the first focused on phases 1 and 2 of the MA&D process, dealing with the assessment of the existing situation and carrying out surveys to select products and enterprise ideas. Trainees then used various tools and methods to test out the lessons learned in their own contexts and brought their practical experiences back to the second training cycle. In the second cycle, participants learned how to prepare enterprise development plan (phase 3) and how to support the start-up phase of an enterprise (phase 4).

In Asia, the training-of-trainers courses were organized in collaboration with RECOFTC. The VNFU hosted both MA&D workshops (in January and June 2015) in Asia, in Hanoi, Viet Nam. Twenty-two selected participants from organizations in Indonesia, Myanmar, Nepal and Viet Nam took part.

Early outcomes from this training in Asia include the following:

- RECOFTC and FFF developed collaborative work plans for Myanmar, Nepal and Viet Nam to follow up on the MA&D training and support the preparation of business plans by forest and farm producer organizations.
- The VNFU has trained 16 lead farmers in Yen Bai and 12 lead farmers in Bac Kan in MA&D. After participating in the MA&D course, the forest and farm producer organizations felt strengthened: they reorganized themselves, and most of the trained farmers and organizations developed work plans for selecting the most appropriate legal structure for their enterprise; conducting market research; and developing enterprise development plans for their selected enterprise. Forest and farm producer organizations in Bac Kan decided on magnolia timber and star anise as final products, and those in Yen Bai chose cinnamon and acacia for their enterprise, combined with non-timber products such as forest vegetables, herbal trees and honey.
In Africa, facilitator training workshops were organized by the FFF and FAO Zambia (May 2015) and by the FFF and FAO the Gambia (October 2015). Twenty-four people from FFF partner organizations in the Gambia, Kenya, Liberia and Zambia were selected to participate in field-oriented training in the MA&D approach for facilitators, designed to build on previous MA&D trainings received by participants. It is revealing to note, however, that business planning was new to the majority of participants and that they lacked methods to systematically help rural entrepreneurs prepare business plans as a simple process.

Implementation of in-country MA&D training has started and will continue in 2016. One result can already be reported from the Gambia, which is more acquainted with the approach: the All Gambian National Platform, one of the small grantees, was trained in MA&D to increase its capacity to deliver business development services to its members, and 24 community forestry committees were trained in using MA&D tools effectively. Through this process, six main products were identified as promising for business development and are included in 50 community forest management plans.

In Latin America, regional training-of-training workshops took place in 2014. In 2015, enterprise development trainings continued as part of FFF country programmes (Outcome 2) in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala and Nicaragua, resulting in the development of enterprise development plans and improved business prospects for participating producer organizations.

Other capacity development and training work for FFPOS and government partners has taken place around: organizational analysis of producer organizations, with a focus on gender equality and governance; first training took place in Kenya (and is planned for Guatemala); self-assessment of governmental institutions' capacity to provide support to forest and farm producer organizations in Guatemala and Kenya; proposal writing workshops for potential small forest and farm producer organization grantees in Kenya, Viet Nam and Zambia.

Finally all FFF programme staff participated in a country capacity development strategies workshop, held at FAO headquarters in Rome (during the FFF retreat).

7. Global and regional programme progress

Within the FFF management team, IUCN oversaw the global and regional programme of work to strengthen the following five global/regional apex organizations: 1) the International Family Forestry Alliance (IFFA); 2) the Global Alliance for Community Forestry (GACF); 3) the Asian Farmers Association (AFA); 4) AMPB; and 5) the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forest (IAITPTF). Following a competitive call for proposals, an inception meeting with regional and global partners took place on 29–30 January 2015 at IUCN headquarters in Switzerland, at which synergies and areas of collaboration were discussed.
Pillar 3. Linking local voices to global processes

Outcome 4. National and global agendas are informed by the knowledge and priorities of smallholders, women, communities and indigenous peoples

Apex organisations channel local concerns into global processes in interesting ways. For example, AFA and AMPB gather forest farmers at the local level in local member organizations, which channel relevant information about the real situations, issues and challenges faced and possible solutions and actions to sub regional and regional nodes of the organization. Personnel at these higher levels then represent farmer and producer organizations to bring their voices to fora at those levels. FFF support has enabled each of the five organizations to strengthen its membership and capacity to influence global agendas.

AMPB organized local consultations through their members to identify priorities and advocacy points in climate-change negotiations (e.g. for COP 20 in Lima, Peru). This informed AMPB’s campaign “If Not Us Then Who”, which called for the recognition of resource rights; free, prior and informed consent; zero violence; and funding. AMPB also organized activities to encourage connections with organizations in Asia, Africa and Mesoamerica – leading collaboration between the Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon River Basin (COICA)–Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest (AIDESEP), the Indonesian Indigenous Peoples Alliance (AMAN), the Sub regional Network for Indigenous People (REPALEC) and AMPB in this campaign.

IFFA organized regional meetings of its members in the Americas in Mexico, its European members in Brussels and its African members in Kenya. These meetings were used to strengthen regional networks and to build member organizations in Mexico and Kenya (e.g. FF-SPAK in Kenya), alongside work to found the Association of Family Forest Owners in Nepal. The regional meetings also produced joint statements used to inform and influence the World Forestry Congress held in Durban, South Africa, in September 2015.

AFA organized consultations at the township level in Myanmar, Nepal and Vietnam and four other countries to assess how forest issues affected its members. At these consultations, AFA informed forest and farm producers about the main national and regional laws affecting their tenure systems and collected information on their situations and challenges; the latter included resource access; eviction and displacement; forest degradation; infrastructure for market access; and fire. The results of these consultations were presented at a regional AFA event in Myanmar involving 52 representatives of forest and farm producer organizations, as well as other partners. To address the challenges facing forest farmers, the following key policy interventions were framed: an enabling environment for community forestry; sustainable adaptive resilience in forest and farm management; fair markets and collective organization of farmer-managed enterprises; and active participation in decision-making. AFA shared these outcomes at the World Forestry Congress and FAO’s Committee on Food Security.

GACF helped convene the Asia Community Forestry Network Workshop in the Philippines in collaboration with RECOFTC and the Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Program Philippines (NTFP-EP). This workshop aimed to provide a broader understanding of

Key highlight, 2015

Statement made at the New York climate change summit: “On behalf of indigenous organizations of the Amazon Basin (COICA), Indonesia (AMAN), the Congo Basin (REPALEF) and Mesoamerica (AMPB), whose forests ... have the highest levels of carbon storage on the planet ... [make a] collective commitment to holistically manage more than 400 million hectares of tropical forest in the service of climate change mitigation and adaptation ... an area roughly equal to the size of the European Union ... that stores close to 70 Gt CO2, equivalent to some 11 years of the United States’ greenhouse gas emissions.”
community forestry and its successes and challenges while strengthening GACF and helping it prepare its strategic plan. The workshop issued a declaration on the need to prioritize community forestry, facilitate market access, increase local participation in decision-making, and award good-quality lands to communities.

IAITPTF focal points met with their global coordinator at the Major Group Partnership Workshop held in Nepal, where they planned how to strengthen the secretariat and improve communication and membership. They also decided to focus their 2015 policy-influencing activities on the World Forestry Congress, the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) – on issues such as forest and tenure rights, the impacts of extractive industries, palm-oil plantations, land grabbing, national legal review processes, indigenous peoples’ voice, and forest and landscape restoration.

IFFA, GACF and IAITPTF convened a planning meeting to strengthen collaboration between the three organizations and maximize the effect of their joint activities. The original G3 members met as a group in parallel with international events, as did AFA and the AMPB. The full list of these meetings follows:

- Lead-up and participation in UN Climate Summit in New York and UNFCCC COP 20 in Lima (AMPB and AMAN, COICA, AIDESEP and REPACLEC, “If not Us Then Who” campaign – the latter involved the placement of many posters around the city, and a film festival organized by AMPB with AIDESEP and Handcrafted Films)
- UNFCCC COP 21 in Paris (AMPB developed a strong “influence” roadmap in collaboration with AMAN, COICA, AIDESEP and REPACLEC, and engaged more directly with GACF. In the run-up, AMPB organized a workshop for about 100 representatives of forest and farm producers, non-governmental organizations and the governments of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico and Nicaragua in Mexico City to exchange experiences on community land and territorial management, forest governance, and market linkages. They targeted Paris with key messages addressing community management rights; free, prior and informed consent; the need to empower organizations to participate fully and effectively in decision-making; the establishment of safeguard systems in mining and energy projects; and the importance of supporting the development of local value chains.
- Indigenous Peoples REDD+ and Financing Workshop in Bonn climate-change intersessions (IAITPTF and COICA – models of financing indigenous forest conservation)
- UNFF meeting of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Ad hoc Expert Group on International Arrangements on Forests and the Major Group Led Initiative on Supporting the UNFF (GACF, IAITPTF, IFFA – pushing for SFM funding and a new multistakeholder UN organization on forests)
- World Conference on Indigenous Peoples in New York (AMPB – reconstitution of ancestral territoriality and territorial climate financing)
- Africa Forest Farm Producers Conference in Nairobi (IFFA, GACF and IAITPTF – how best to strengthen producer organizations in Africa – launch of AFECONET)
- Social Forestry Network in Myanmar (AFA – view of forest farm producer groups)
- Asia Regional Workshop on Community Forestry Rights and Strengthening Forest Associations in Manila (GACF with RECOFTC and NTFP-EP)
- World Bank consultation on its environmental safeguards for eastern Africa regions (IAITPTF)

**XIV World Forestry Congress (all global and regional partners)**

The FFF, its regional and global partners, and many other forest and farm producers had a major impact at events leading up to and at the World Forestry Congress in September. In the two days immediately preceding the Congress, 114 forest and farm producers, indigenous peoples, family smallholders, and experts convened for an event titled *Building Momentum for Community-based Forestry and Forest and Farm Producer Organizations*. Building on regional
dialogues convened by IFFA, AFA, GACF, IAITPTF and AMPB (and RECOFTC), a steering committee of collaborating organizations led by the FFF and IUCN worked together to develop the agenda and to facilitate delivery of a single declaration pushing the following: secure tenure and the upholding of fundamental human rights; access to markets and services; and respect and recognition for the importance of indigenous peoples, local communities and family smallholders in sustainable land and forest management. The bullets below summarize elements of the dramatic and highly visible engagement at the World Forestry Congress.

- The large presence and participation of smallholder family farmers, local communities and indigenous peoples, and forest and farm producer organizations at the pre-Congress “Building Momentum” event, in Subtheme 1 (“role of forests in socioeconomic development and food security) dialogue sessions as key speakers and panellists, and around 30 side-events related to forest and farm producer organizations.

- A global statement by indigenous peoples, local communities and family smallholders was agreed at the pre-Congress “Building Momentum” event and shared widely with participants in the Congress via a printed flyer. The statement calls on government and major actors to engage with indigenous peoples, local communities and family smallholders as equal partners and to support them and invest in them, given that they are a big part of the answer to major global challenges.

- Four leaders of forest and farm producer organizations took part in the plenary session on Thursday to present the major messages arising from sub-themes and special events. This was crucial in ensuring that key messages on forest and farm producer organizations were incorporated in the final Congress outcome documents.
- The main outcome document of the Congress, the Durban Declaration: 2050 vision for forests and forestry, highlights the need for “engagement with indigenous peoples and local communities”. The fundamental role of “forest-dependent communities and indigenous peoples” in climate change is included in the Congress’s Message on Climate Change.
- On the final day of the Congress, a session was held titled “The way forward: building momentum for community-based forestry, forest and farm organisations”, at which key recommendations, an overall strategy and opportunities were discussed. These discussions will feed into the FFF’s continuing work to strengthen local voices at upcoming local, national, regional and global events.
- Two new publications were launched at a side-event: Democratising forest business: a compendium of successful locally controlled forest business models, and Effective forest and farm producer organizations (ETFRN News 57).
- A partnership between FAO and We Effect was launched at the “Way Forward” session on the Friday, with remarks by representatives of We Effect, FAO, Sida, IFFA, FF-SPAK and the FFF.
For these multiple events, global and regional FFF partners produced a range of communication products, including:

- A film festival, “If Not Us Then Who”
- An issues paper, “Seeing the Forests and the Farms Together: Promoting the Rights and Livelihoods of Forest and Farm Producers in Asia”, by AFA
- Declarations from Africa, Asia and Central America, including “Sustainability, certification and producer organizations” by IFFA and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification; “Sustainable development of community, indigenous and family forests” (the African experience by the G3 alliance); and “Forest and farm producers and forest landscape restoration” by IUCN for ETFRN News 57.

All apex organizations used emails, list servers and social media to share information and report on their regional or global events. Partners acknowledged that their members use these tools in different ways and at different paces and it is difficult to monitor their effectiveness. To broaden their reach, some organisations also used community radio programmes or supported the attendance of local stakeholders at regional meetings to ensure that feedback reached the local level. This feedback process has sometimes had impact – for example, some members of AMPB used advocacy in the international arena to firm up the commitment of the Government of Panama to continue its dialogue with the National Coordinating Body of Indigenous Peoples in Panama (COONAPIP) on the implementation of the Plan of Integral Development of Indigenous Peoples. In Costa Rica, discussions were held with the government on the process of redesigning the REDD consultation process.

Learning

Much has been learned from attempts to strengthen regional and global organizations. Here we highlight learning about the participation of women and youth. The following recommendations were drawn from working groups at the World Forestry Congress:

- Motivation – initiatives such as awards, training, education and income generation are key strategies for engaging women and youth in forest and farm producer groups.
- Partnerships – partnerships with government, the private sector and community groups can create employment, mentoring opportunities and capacity building directed preferentially at women and youth and at forest and wildlife management.
- Getting a seat at the table – policies for ensuring that women and youth participate in decision-making include allocating a minimum percentage for the representation of women and youth in elders' councils, project management teams and producer organizations and ensuring that this is reflected in the organization's constitution as well as in village bylaws and policies. The minimum percentage could be set low at the start (e.g. 30 percent for women), with the aim of increasing it (e.g. to 50 percent for women) after a certain time as capacity is built.
- Ensuring that enterprises engage in value-adding activities at the local level to reduce the need among youth to migrate to urban areas in search of employment. Communicating income-generation successes is an essential part of motivating women and youth to engage in forest and farm producer groups (“seeing is believing”).
- Establishing a space for the sharing of experiences and the discussion and resolution of issues between and among women, youth and elders (e.g. youth camps as a way of discussing and finding solutions to youth unemployment).

In terms of learning from one another, all the FFF partners consider that field visits and community exposure are the most useful means for sharing information and experiences. In Indonesia, for example, NTFP-EP was invited by API to participate in a national consultation on sustainable agri-enterprise models. Through field dialogue, the two organizations agreed to a long-term collaboration in Indonesia specifically to support farmers' agro-enterprises.
AFA regularly organizes regional knowledge-sharing sessions to help members learn, innovate and strengthen cooperation and solidarity with each other.

**Declaration at XIV World Forestry Congress**

“We know the forest, and the forest knows us – it’s time to listen to indigenous peoples, local communities and family smallholders, who manage a third of the world’s forests and, together, are the world’s largest investors in forests.

“We are indigenous peoples, local communities and family smallholders – women and men, young and old. Strong evidence backs our assertion that we maintain and restore forests and sustain livelihoods on a vast scale. Combined, we are, and have always been, the largest investors in forests, and our investment goes well beyond money. Given our commitment and scale, without us it will be impossible to achieve food security and nutrition, respond to climate change, conserve biodiversity, and reduce poverty.

“We are ready to work with everyone, and insist on playing our part. Major obstacles continue to stand in our way, however, which could be removed with sufficient political will.”

8. Communications

The main communication activities in 2015 – including the publication of a new brochure – were developed around the regional events convened in the lead-up to the World Forestry Congress and the FFF website.

The FFF communications strategy is articulated around the three FFF pillars and has three objectives:

1) To amplify the core message of forest and farm producer organizations and multisectoral platforms.
2) To strengthen the local capacity of forest and farm producer organizations.
3) To share learning among partners.
To amplify the core message of forest and farm producer organizations and multisectoral platforms

“The Road to Durban”.

The FFF supported a series of events worldwide designed to help local stakeholders generate messages to be fed into the pre-World Forestry Congress event and, ultimately, the Congress itself. A flyer (“The Road to Durban”) was developed for each region to publicize the regional initiatives and encourage partners to join this global movement. Regional webpages were published on the FFF website, with presentations, pictures, interviews and articles around events. The FAO regional office issued a press release on the African regional meeting (held in Kenya) and produced audio interviews.

World Forestry Congress.

The FFF management team implemented a communication strategy for the World Forestry Congress, and FFF partners also provided invaluable communication services in covering relevant events during the Congress. Communication outputs during the Congress included the following:

- IIED issued a press release on the launch of two publications (ETFRN News 57 and the IIED book, Democratising Forest Business: A Compendium of Successful Locally Controlled Forest Business Organisations); these two publications were also well covered in ETFRN News articles, tweets by FAO, and FFF web announcements.
- The declaration produced at the pre-Congress “Building Momentum” event was published on the first day of the Congress as a flyer and distributed widely. A press release on the declaration was also issued.
- Video interviews were conducted of four leaders of forest and farm producer organizations and posted on the FFF website.
- The FFF pavilion was a lively meeting point and information centre. Publications were shared, photos were exhibited, and flyers by partners were distributed.
- Two researchers associated with the FFF prepared a paper on youth (Rejuvenating future landscapes) for the World Forestry Congress, in which they compared various forms of youth involvement in forest and farm producer organizations in the Gambia, Liberia, Nepal, Nicaragua and Viet Nam.
- The communication firm Burness provided support in preparing a press package on the FFF and in organizing interviews around the Congress. Burness and the FFF worked together to:
  - Develop a press statement for the World Forestry Congress.
  - Arrange interviews with key experts/spokespeople from the FFF, FAO, IIED, FFSPAK and FUN. Interviews were conducted via phone, email and in person with the following media: SABC Channel Africa (South Africa), Le Monde (France), Responding to Climate Change (UK), Radio France Internationale, Mongabay.com (USA), ClimateWire (USA), Agencia EFE (Spain), Bloomberg (USA) and SAFM (South Africa).
  - Develop an opinion piece that was released on Thomson Reuters (UK).
A webpage on the FFF website presents the rich outcomes of the pre-Congress and the World Forestry Congress.

To strengthen the local capacity of POs

With support from the FAO Communication for Development team based at FAO headquarters, national communication strategies were drafted and are implemented in the Gambia, Guatemala, Liberia, Nepal and Zambia. In 2015, countries conducted the following communication activities to promote the FFF’s work:

- local translations of the FFF brochure;
- policy briefs;
- local news and media coverage;
- video production;
- Press releases by FAO country and regional offices.

To share learning between partners

Website

Country grant recipients can promote their activities on the FFF website. Country information was updated in 2015 and enriched with details about activities. Details of all LoAs are now available online, and photos from the field and monthly reports are uploaded regularly. Google Analytics shows that the number of visits to the news page increased in 2015; 53 news stories were posted during the year. The website now includes links to the Family Farming Knowledge Platform developed by FAO and other partner websites, and these links are expected to bring more visitors to the FFF website over time. Google Analytics shows that the time spent by users on the website increased in 2015. Challenges for the website in 2016 is to provide website content in other languages and to better synthesize information on country pages.

FORIS

The structure this data base management system was significantly improved in 2015 and most of the remaining data on LoAs, country reports, photos and videos, and M&L elements
has been entered. The FORIS system will be operational for data analysis, once all the information available will be inserted.

Publications

A new brochure, developed with inputs from several partners and Steering Committee members, was published in English, French and Spanish in 2015. The brochure provides an update on the in-country and region implementation of the FFF programme and explains the FFF’s added value (http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4848e.pdf). The FFF published or co-published several other materials in 2015 (as featured above in the section on the World Forestry Congress). To compliment this annual report a series of “FFF Stories of Impact” are being produced that draw from the experience of 2015.

9. Knowledge generation

This year the Forest Farm Facility responded to in-country demands for better information on the ownership and management structures of successful locally controlled forestry business models. A detailed terms of reference was developed for capturing case studies of such success stories from around the world in collaboration with the other co-management institution for the Forest Connect alliance, RECOFTC.

The continuing collaboration with RECOFTC through the Forest Connect alliance enabled the assembly of separately funded case studies from Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. In addition, IIED oversaw separately funded case studies from Brazil, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Mexico. Finally, as part of the FFF Management Team, from Bolivia, Gambia, Guatemala and Nepal. In order to set up the case studies with in-country research teams IIED undertook engagement missions to Bolivia from (18-26 December 2014), Vietnam (13-17 January 2015), the Gambia (1-8 December 2014) and to Nepal (6-14th of February 2015).

IIED staff developed contractual arrangements with national consultants: Victor Hugo (Bolivia), Abdoulie Danso (Gambia), Juan Jose Ochaeta (Guatemala), Nguyen Quang Tan (Vietnam) and Bhishma Subedi (Nepal) – for the completion of the eight case studies on successful locally controlled forestry business models.

A total of 19 learning papers on successful locally controlled forestry business models were received in total. These were published in a compendium of locally controlled forest
business models (“Democratising forest business: a compendium of successful locally controlled forest business organisations”). Learning from this research was synthesised in an article (“Organisation – how it ignites successful, locally controlled forestry business) written for and published by the World Forestry Congress, as well as in an IIED briefing (“Democratic forest business models: a harder but more rewarding path”). The target for the publications was the World Forestry Congress in Durban during September 2015 during which a side event was held to launch the release of the compendium:

- Democratic forest business models: a harder but more rewarding path/IIED & FFF briefing: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17308IIED.pdf
- Organisation – how it ignites successful, locally controlled forestry business/WFC article: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G03969.pdf
- Democratising forest business: a compendium of successful locally controlled forest business organisations/IIED & FFF learning and knowledge product: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/13581IIED.pdf
- Workshop report on Forest Connect/FFF joint meeting: http://pubs.iied.org/G03900.html?c=forest

The main learning from this body of work is summarised in a set of conclusions drawn from analysis of the full set of 19 case studies – which are essentially a set of lessons of what makes for success. At this headline level, some statements are blindingly obvious – others perhaps less so. But there is much in the detail that can only be gleaned from a careful reading of the case studies themselves. Not every case study exemplified all of these conclusions (which shows that businesses can survive without getting everything right!). But most case studies did provide explicit examples in support of these conclusions.

**The enabling environment**

- An enabling policy environment that gives local people secure commercial forest tenure can trigger or scale-up viable and sustainable business models

**The business models**

- Strong local origins and member-based ownership give resilience
- Support for capacity development is enhanced if it includes training in financial administration alongside technical support appropriate to scale
- Investing in market research underpins evolution towards better and also more diversified business
- Finding ways to differentiate products or services in the market is critical for continued success
- Reinvesting some profit towards upgrading the offer to customers helps long-term business prospects
- Establishing second-tier organisations that aggregate products and provide services to first-tier producer organisations provides a longer-term growth trajectory

**The ownership structures**

- Clarity over the organisational structure and roles and responsibilities within it increases business efficiency
- Financial oversight mechanisms assure accountability and help avoid financial abuses that frequently lead to business failure
- Maintaining staff mobility and leadership turnover can help to spread capacity within the business and improve long-term sustainability
How challenges were overcome

- A broad vision within which the pursuit of profit plays a supporting role helps maintain cohesion in a group business
- Finding creative ways to secure finance for investment and cash flow is often essential to success

Key success factors

- Seeking out and taking advantage of partnerships and networking opportunities is crucial to opening up new business opportunities
- Maintaining a strong commitment to staff development and production or service quality wins and keeps customers

10. Reflections and lessons learned

In terms of general reflections, the second full year of activity has to a significant extent provided ‘proof of concept’ for the FFF theory of change (e.g. investing in producer organisation will improve sustainable forest business and forest governance). Compared to various other theories of change (e.g. REDD+ climate change finance will drive adaptive mitigation, or FLEGT trade-based legality assurance systems will drive governance improvements) the emerging impacts from FFF are conspicuous, not only by their credibility within a transparent monitoring and learning system, but also by their scale and resource use efficiency (scarce resources in, major impacts out).

Notable impacts include: Improved forest governance through the role out of long-stalled tenure arrangements (e.g. Gambia, Myanmar), the shaping of significant incentive programmes for forest-farm producers (e.g. Bolivia, Guatemala), the scaling-up of enterprise development and income generation opportunities (e.g. Vietnam, Nepal), the progress in ignored sectors such as wood energy (e.g. Liberia, Zambia), the development of overlooked potential in sectors such as farm-forestry (e.g. Kenya, Vietnam) the conferring of benefits on marginalised groups such as indigenous people and women (e.g. Nicaragua, Bolivia). What is rather striking is that even in the more difficult operating environments (e.g. Liberia with post-conflict situations and Ebola; Myanmar with a democratic transition underway) the approach of supporting forest-farm producer organisations is (i) widely supported (ii) effective at the national policy level (iii) scalable at the local level (iv) relevant internationally.

Lessons Learned from the FFPOS

In addition to these general reflections the various meetings and events which brought together FFPOs and government officials over the year re-emphasized important learning about how to realise the impacts of strong forest farm producer organisations

Pillar 1. Strengthen producer organizations for business and policy engagement

A working group at the “Building Momentum” event prior to the XIV World Forestry Congress in Durban collected lessons on what makes for a “good” producer organization and produced the following list:

- Accountability (e.g. trust, no corruption) built through transparent decision-making
- Representation by those affected by activities
- Respect for all members, and a core group who really “get it”
- Clear procedures, statutes and regulations that everyone understands
• Fair application of rules and regulations
• Conflict-resolution mechanisms in place
• Auditable accounts, which are made available
• Mechanisms for renewing leadership
• Consensus decision-making (preferred to a one-member, one-vote approach)
• An internal system based on democratic decision-making and grounded in local values and traditions, with clear bylaws and clear explanations of roles and responsibilities
• Horizontal benefit-sharing
• Representation and inclusivity (women and men and youth)
• Clear communication.

Pillar 2: Catalyse multisectoral policy platforms

Working groups at the Building Momentum event found that, to influence policy, it is important to:

• Build the capacity of communities to organize and to defend their rights.
• Build platforms at different levels. For example, create a farmers’ platform where various constituencies are represented and can raise issues.
• Identify issues and set the context clearly so as to have a focused strategy with clear messages and requests.
• Do a stakeholder analysis to identify who has the decision-making power, who can be allies, and who has opposing interests.
• Share information with many people, and use media for support.
• Prepare policy options to submit tangible solutions to governments based on strong data to support their claims, which requires credible research.
• Mobilize a wide variety of stakeholders, such as civil-society organizations, farmer organizations, governments, churches, universities and schools in strong, non-violent actions.

Pillar 3: Linking local voices to global processes

In 2015, partners of the global and regional programmes shared the following main lessons learned on linking local voices to global processes:

• Getting organized for more than policy influencing. Several participants at the “Building Momentum” event thought that organizing simply to influence policy was risky; they considered that associations should also facilitate discussions on rights and livelihoods to build common interests, which is critical for motivating members. One participant flagged the importance of associations offering something to governments, such as employment creation or knowledge dissemination.
• Producer organizations can be powerful external evaluators of practices. In consultations in Cambodia it was mentioned that AFA and producer organizations should have a role in monitoring existing legal and administrative land tenure policies so as to compare them against the standards set by the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.
• There is more to do to articulate the power of, but also the structures that enable, collective action. In some countries there is a poor understanding of the power of collective organizations for economic development. Local authorities and aid agencies may encourage farmers to join groups, but local staff lack the knowledge and skills to facilitate such groups. They also lack the vision and understanding needed to communicate effectively to farmers the real value of getting organized in groups. Governmental entities at all levels (even where there is a cooperative alliance, as in Vietnam, or a provincial department of trade) have
limited capacity to provide market information to farmers’ cooperation groups and cooperatives.

- Need to tackle the criminalization of indigenous peoples’ groups. All indigenous peoples’ groups, and some farmers’ groups, put the problem of criminalization high on the list of changes they need. Free, prior and informed consent is also high on the agenda of forest and farm producer organizations; clearly it is not respected in most countries of the developing world.

- Ongoing tensions between “traditional” conservation and market value of trees and non-timber forest products. There was considerable debate at the “Building Momentum” event on to extent to which an economic value should be assigned to forests. Some participants felt that the declaration issued by the event overemphasized market access because many communities have no wish to pursue a market-based approach to forest management. Markets provide the greatest incentive for forest destruction, they said. Ultimately it was agreed that, while non-market access is important, many local communities wish to access markets for forest products and they should be able to do so on a level playing field with other actors. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge ongoing tension between non-extractive forest use and approaches in which forest goods and services are sold in markets. This is a contentious point among indigenous peoples, local communities and family smallholders; rather than dismiss it, it should be dealt with head-on in policy debates to avoid internal conflicts. Appreciating the deeper cultural and spiritual priorities of indigenous peoples governance systems and organizations and other local communities and the special needs of women and youth is equally vital and the use of the term forest and farm “producer” organizations should not imply a purely market oriented approach for the Forest and Farm Facility.

11. Partnerships and collaboration – leveraging impacts and resources

In 2015 FFF actively worked to strengthen partnerships and collaborations both internally and externally to maximize the benefits flowing to FFPOS and increase programme impacts wherever possible. This involved fairly intensive engagement within the Strategic Objectives mentioned early on Reducing Rural Poverty (SO3) and Sustainable Production Systems (SO2) – providing high profile visibility within the FAP in both of these areas. In particular FFF was seen as one of the primary “producers” of results within the SO3 Output 1.1 on strengthening rural organizations, in spite of being an extra budgetary project.

Much of this work was facilitated by the vital partnership between FFF and AgriCord as part of its Farmers Fighting Poverty Programme (see box below). This includes important linkages with AgriCord agri-agency members like the FFD (the Finnish agri-agency for Food and Forest Development). Close collaboration with CoOpequity an FAO programme focused on building the internal governance and gender inclusivity capacity of producer organizations led to work together in Kenya where it became apparent that we shared a common partner: WeEffect (formerly the Swedish Cooperative Centre) another agri-agency member of AgriCord. A series of joint meetings to develop collaboration in Kenya – led to the idea of expanding this to an institutional partnership between WeEffect and FAO under the leadership of FFF and CoOpequity. (A short box describes this partnership below.)

Working within the SO2 Output 2.2 on strengthening multi-sectoral processes and platforms – FFF was gain seen as a leading programme within FAO – and asked to play a major role in a “community of practice” within FAO which brought together colleagues from most of the other major departments to develop case studies of experiences and develop collective strategies. This led to several presentations to a broader set of FAO decision makers by FFF partners visiting from our countries and to the inclusion of FAO within some new communications pieces being developed.
Partnership with AgriCord and the Farmers Fighting Poverty Programme

The 4-year Partnership between FAO and AgriCord (signed on June 23rd, 2014 see photo above) builds on a close collaboration between the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) at FAO and AgriCord since 2012 on various activities related to strengthening of producer organizations and smallholder farmers. These include co-production of a major publication entitled: Strength in Numbers: Effective Forest Producer Organizations and working together to plan and organize the global conference in Guilin China in November 2013 also entitled: Strength in Numbers: International Conference on Forest Producer Organizations.

AgriCord, is a global network consisting of twelve agri-agencies (https://www.agricord.org/). This partnership is based on the strong complementarities between AgriCord’s Farmers Fighting Poverty programme, with its track record of comprehensive support to producer organisations since 2007, and the Facility’s pillar one. AgriCord provides important linkages through its member organisations including the Finnish Agri-agency for Food and Development (FFD) and WeEffect from Sweden and their activities in many FFF partner countries. Further the partnership allows for exchange of strategic approaches and experience sharing, drawing on AgriCord’s experience supporting agriculture producers groups, while the FFF is able to channel resources to producer organizations who are combining forest and farm products. Through the allocation of EUR 1 million over four years from the Farmers Fighting Poverty programme, FFF is able to support a significant number of forest and farm producer organizations with small grant funds to catalyse their enterprises and fill important capacity needs. This contributes directly to FAO’s Strategic Objective SO3 on reducing rural poverty.

The Partnership between the FFF/FAO and AgriCord continues to explore new opportunities to build an agenda of joint work on issues of common interest including organizational assessment and profiling, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, increasing the impact and quality of service provision, improving competencies of farmers’ organisations including their financing and the overall contribution of producer organisations to the Sustainable Development Goals.
In 2015, through the FFF and the CoOPequity programmes, FAO developed a global strategic partnership to support forest and farm producer organizations with We Effect (formerly the Swedish Cooperative Centre), and a Memorandum of Understanding was signed in August 2015. FAO and We Effect have joined forces to strengthen small-scale forest and farm producer organizations in developing countries to improve the socioeconomic development and livelihoods of small-scale and family farmers, thus contributing to poverty reduction and the sustainability of production systems.

Under the partnership, activities are jointly implemented in eight countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia where the FFF, CoOPequity and We Effect already have complementary activities: the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala, Kenya, Malawi, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Viet Nam and Zambia. The partnership is fully embedded in FAO’s strategic framework, contributing to the achievement of the Organization’s Strategic Objective 3 ("Reduce rural poverty") and Strategic Objective 2 ("Improving governance for productive systems") and to relevant Regional Initiatives, with activities fully embedded in Country Programme Frameworks.

The primary objective of the strategic partnership is to develop the capacity of producer organizations, in particular to strengthen their internal governance structures, build the business and entrepreneurial skills of their members, improving access to financial services and develop their capacity to be activists at the grassroots level and in policy debates. The second main objective of the strategic partnership is to undertake joint resource mobilization at the country level to reinforce the efforts of FAO and We Effect at the country level in support of forest and farm producer organizations and cooperatives in Africa, Latin America and Asia, with a multiplier effect.

In 2015, the strategic partnership was launched in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Guatemala, Kenya and Zambia. In Kenya, a series of assessments of the capacity needs of producer organizations and rural institutions was conducted, and capacity development activities were delivered to 12 member-based producer organizations in two counties. A strategy for partnership implementation in the four countries was drafted, as well as a resource mobilization strategy to support forest and farm producer organizations, with a focus on climate-change mitigation and adaptation, as well as sustainable natural resource management. Project proposals were prepared in Guatemala and Kenya and will be presented to donors in 2016. Myanmar and Viet Nam are next in line, with a planning workshop planned in February at the Asia-Pacific Forestry Week to be held in the Philippines.

By Carol Djeddah, CoOpequity, ESP, FAO
The FFF is closely integrated within the Forestry Department at FAO - which provides significant in kind support. In particular FFF has collaborated closely with the Social Forestry Team – particularly around World Forestry Congress – co-planning sub-theme 1 and the Building Momentum Workshop, and food security and nutrition events, and the incorporation of Community Based Forestry assessments – into country programme activities (described in the box below.) Ties to the FLEGT and UNREDD programme, the Forest Landscape Restoration Mechanism, the GEF and the Great Green Wall Initiative and the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure, as well as the inter-departmental committee on Indigenous Peoples, the Knowledge Platform on Family Farming and the Communications for Development team have all helped to bring resources, expertise and coordination to our country programmes.

**Joint work in developing and applying the community-based forestry assessment framework**

The FAO Forestry Department developed an assessment framework to help countries determine the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry in addressing social, economic, and environmental dimensions.

The FFF and the FAO Social Forestry Team helped pilot this framework in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the Gambia, Kenya, Myanmar and Nepal. The results of the pilot assessments further improved the assessment framework and generated important information for the involved countries to help in improving their forest policies and operational practice. To bring the results into concrete action, the FFF and the Social Forestry Team are working in partnership with RECOFTC to engage the Government of Myanmar and funding partners in Myanmar in developing and financing a comprehensive programme on community-based forestry.

Other FFF countries will be identified for the further application of the community-based forestry assessment framework as a basis for initiating broader actions and partnerships.

By Fred Kafeero, FAO FO Social Forestry Team
Our collaboration with IIED and IUCN also leverage significant resources for FFF. This has occurred through the linkages to regional activities of the Forest Connect programme and the Locally Controlled Forestry work that IIED has been doing in a number of countries. IUCN country offices are directly involved in implementation assistance in Nepal, Vietnam and Myanmar and have been very supportive in other countries – bringing attention to FFF programmes.

FFF has participated in planning meetings with the RRI and its new Tenure Facility include some of the events in countries of overlap such as Liberia. In Asia, FFF has been solidifying its collaboration with RECOFTC with joint work plans developed in Nepal, Myanmar and Vietnam and coordination on regional training and other meetings.

The events around the World Forestry Congress were one of the most important examples of working together – as a Steering Committee of many organizations developed the programme together under the FFF’s leadership – creating a strong sense of a shared mission and agenda. This will be followed with collective plans to "keep the momentum building" along with the Social Forestry Team and all of the partners.

At country level – a variety of partnerships and collaborations are being pursued in each country – as the FFF seeks to add value and catalyse existing efforts and not to replace them. The coordination with the German funded private sector forestry programme in Kenya, the Multi-Stakeholder Forestry Programme in Nepal, the FFD and MTK supported activities in Zambia, the Pyoe Pin project on building civil society organizations in Myanmar and many more.

This continues to be a priority for the FFF to seek to extend our impact and generate concrete resources to producer organizations but it takes time and effort – and so far various in-country and joint resource mobilization strategies have come up short.
## 12. The FFF team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFF Team members at FAO headquarters, IIED, IUCN and country facilitators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Manager (FAO HQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Coaches (FAO HQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and Global Team (IUCN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications team (FAO HQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Generation and Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Learning team (IIED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services team (FAO HQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern/Short term consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country Facilitators
### Annex 1: Monitoring and Learning
Aggregate Indicators for 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Reg. / Global</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producers are organized for policy dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output 1.1 Dispersed local producers are organised into effective and gender inclusive groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.1.1: Number of groups formed and active</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Reg. / Global</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 local 1 national federation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 alliance, 11 regional associations comprising 400 community groups, (unchanged)</td>
<td>1 national plus 12 local</td>
<td>2 (35,700 members)</td>
<td>72 (community based plus 6 township and 2 sub-regional associations)</td>
<td>1 national 26 local</td>
<td>13 (9 Mayangna, 4 Mestiza)</td>
<td>1 national 4 local</td>
<td>1 national 48 local</td>
<td>3 global, 2 Regional alliances</td>
<td>3 global 2 regional, 6 national, 218 local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.1.2: Representativeness (e.g. females, youth)</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Reg. / Global</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41% women</td>
<td>55% women</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49% women</td>
<td>55% women</td>
<td>15% women</td>
<td>70% women</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A as represent &gt; 30 million people</td>
<td>15-100% women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.1.3: Overall % of female leaders in organizations</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Reg. / Global</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10% (16% in 2014)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10-70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.1.4: Number of meetings to develop policy priorities</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Reg. / Global</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 processes 30 meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80 (but not all on policy)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 regional processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>At least 5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Output 1.2 Producer groups work together with government and private sector to improve policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.2.1 Number of policy meetings attended</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>6 processes 30 meetings</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Several in 4 processes</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2.2 Number of policies reviewed and/or proposed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (ANR, PAGE, GNAIP, Seed and Gender)</td>
<td>3 policies and two institutional mechanisms</td>
<td>1 (KFS registration of private owners)</td>
<td>1 (rethinking Liberia’s forest policy)</td>
<td>1 (CFI)</td>
<td>3 (SFM, timber transport, commercial rights and safeguards)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 tax reform and land use rights</td>
<td>1 Forest Bill of 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2.3 Number men and women from producer groups hold a decision making position in relevant policy making processes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15 (4 women)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (Still indirect representation only)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 FFPO leaders with VFNU takes decisions</td>
<td>Too early to say</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 2 Producers are organized for business

| Indicator 2.1.1: Perception of improved ability to access markets | Progress in textiles, honey, cocoa, fruit juice, nuts | Progress in handicraft, beekeeping, nurseries, timber and ecotourism | Progress in 11 agroforestry businesses and marketing for 63 SMEs | Progress in timber, honey, tree nurseries, poultry, bamboo | Not yet | Progress in bamboo, rattan, pottery, Elephant foot yam | Progress cardamon, honey, charcoal and many other (26 enterprise groups) | Progress in Tuna craft | Timber, cinnamon, star anise, honey | Timber, charcoal, honey, mushrooms | 0 | Strong progress in all but Liberia |
| Indicator 2.1.2: # of sustainable business plans developed by POs | 7 business plans from 28 in total (from 13 in 2014) | 9 | n/a | 12 in progress | 35 in progress | Many | 20 | 13 groups in progress | 7 business development plans | Call for proposal | 0 | >103 groups in progress |
### Output 2.2
Establishment of services in support of small forest businesses

| Indicator 2.2.1: Resources and actors engaged for service provision to POs | BDS (MINGA) and 1 FS (FONABOSQUE) | 3 new (ADWAC, CILSS and GCP) | BDS and 1 FS (PROBOSQUE) | FS Banks | BDS for market analysis and development | Support NGOs | 7 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BDS (MINGA) and 1 FS (FONABOSQUE) | BDS and 1 FS (PROBOSQUE) | BDS for market analysis and development | Support NGOs | 7 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs |

| Indicator 2.2.2: # and type of service providers actively providing services to POs (disaggregated females and males) | 2 business and financial service providers | 3 finance plus business | 7 service providers in market analysis, organization, business diagnosis etc with inventory of INAB and CADERES | Under discussion | 1 Training | 6 | 7 (3 private, 3 Government, 1 community) | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 business and financial service providers | 3 finance plus business | 7 service providers in market analysis, organization, business diagnosis etc with inventory of INAB and CADERES | Under discussion | 1 Training | 6 | 7 (3 private, 3 Government, 1 community) | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs | 1 BDS for market analysis and development | 6 POs |

### Output 2.3
Experience sharing between producer organizations in-country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.3.1: # of exchange visits taking place involving each country</th>
<th>2 exchanges</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6 national and 1 international</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2 exchanges</th>
<th>1 to Vietnam</th>
<th>1 to Vietnam</th>
<th>1 Forum of Mayangna 3 sub-regional</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1 Kenya</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 exchanges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 national and 1 international</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 exchanges</td>
<td>1 to Vietnam</td>
<td>1 to Vietnam</td>
<td>1 Forum of Mayangna 3 sub-regional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Kenya</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicator 2.3.2: # practices, designs, plans and systems adopted following exchange visits | Agroforestry systems adopted | Intercropping rice new agroforestry fencing and watering techniques | All 7 resulted in adopted practices | 0 | 4 (charcoal production, tree nurseries, NTFPs and collective action) | 2 (timber production, processing) | 1 Value chain approach adopted | 1 new strategy | 2 Plantation technique, FSC certification | 0 | N/A | 17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agroforestry systems adopted | Intercropping rice new agroforestry fencing and watering techniques | All 7 resulted in adopted practices | 0 | 4 (charcoal production, tree nurseries, NTFPs and collective action) | 2 (timber production, processing) | 1 Value chain approach adopted | 1 new strategy | 2 Plantation technique, FSC certification | 0 | N/A | 17 |

### Outcome 3
Cross-sectorial policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Output 3.1
Establishment and coordination of multi-sectorial policy platforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3.1.1: # of fora established and or strengthened at country and regional levels.</th>
<th>1 (MCMA) No progress yet from 2014</th>
<th>1 Platform 6 regional task forces</th>
<th>7 (3 national 4 thematic)</th>
<th>Planning county and national FFPO platform</th>
<th>1 (NFLF)</th>
<th>1 in progress (CFNWG)</th>
<th>4 platforms (1 national 3 district) 3 producer networks</th>
<th>2 (SPCC and Myangna nation)</th>
<th>13 roundtable discussion (8 Commune, 3 district, 2 provincial)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3.1.2: nature and level of representation of FFPOs groups (female and male members) in key platforms</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>35% women</th>
<th>Strong but unquantified (resulted in 4 of 6 proposals included in new Probosque law)</th>
<th>30-40% women</th>
<th>2 (FUN, NACUL)</th>
<th>0 (indirect through ECCDI)</th>
<th>17 (2 at national and 15 at district level)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Always represented</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>&gt;20 (30-40% women)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Indicator 3.1.3: # decisions reflecting FFPO presence and inputs | 0 | 2 CF Program revitalized & FFPO reps on small grants committee | 4 out of 6 proposals | 0 | Not clear | 3 within CFI | 2 Timber transport policy changed; joint action plan for strengthening enterprises | Unclear | 8 clear processes or decisions | 0 | 19 |

### Output 3.2
Increased information sharing results in improved understanding and better policies for producer organisations

<p>| Indicator 3.2.1: Level of increase in understanding of POs participants in platforms of how government operates | Initial | Strong | Strong | Initial | Medium | Initial | Strong | Medium-Strong | Strong | Not yet | Improving |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3.2.2: # of new networks/contacts that results in new opportunities for POs</th>
<th>2 Forest Connect plus velasco honey markets</th>
<th>3 Cashew, Beekeepers and Aquaculture federations</th>
<th>6 regional exchanges</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2 Regional exchanges</th>
<th>1 Asia Social Forestry Network</th>
<th>4 input supply, traders, cooperative finance, gov. services</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>RECOFTC, UN REDD, WE EFFECT, Nam Dinh, IUCN</th>
<th>1 Lima Credit</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 4</strong></td>
<td>National and global agendas are informed about the priorities of local producers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.1</strong></td>
<td>Organizations representing local producers influence global processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.1.1: # of strategies and mechanisms for representative planning and advocacy regionally / globally</strong></td>
<td>2 Bolivian inputs to COP 21 and World Forestry Congress</td>
<td>1 for World Forestry Congress</td>
<td>1 strategy for Alianza plus processes linked to REDD, FLEGT, territorial management</td>
<td>2 for African Farm Forestry Congress and World Forestry Congress</td>
<td>1 under development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 approach at World Forestry Congress</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AFA, World Forestry Congress, RECOFTC</td>
<td>1 REDD</td>
<td>5 (UNFCC, COP20, 21, Mexico, Africa FPPOs, WFC, ACFN, UNFF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.1.2: Extent of reporting back from regional and global levels to constituencies at national and local levels</strong></td>
<td>1 – Strong</td>
<td>Strong (4 times a year)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong (e.g. exchange report)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.1.3: # of examples where global policies and mechanisms vital to POs are shaped by engagement</strong></td>
<td>1 Paris climate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 REDD mitigation-adaptation synergies and forest landscape restoration approaches</td>
<td>Africa FFPO meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 COP21, AFA agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.2</strong></td>
<td>Learning and practices are shared within and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between countries and regions, and globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4.2.1: # of FFF targeted communication material and outreach activities</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 Radio, video and newsletter</th>
<th>6 documentaries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1 radio program</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2 brief and video</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5 sets of brief, videos, etc</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Guatemala and Mexico</td>
<td>2 Kenya and Zambia</td>
<td>1 Mexico (plus hosted one)</td>
<td>Host for Gambia, Liberia and Zambia</td>
<td>2 (Gambia and Zambia)</td>
<td>1 Vietnam</td>
<td>1 Vietnam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Host for Nepal and Myanmar</td>
<td>1 Kenya</td>
<td>5 Mexico, Kenya, Myanmar, Philippines, USA</td>
<td>18 Excluding hosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicator 4.2.2: # and frequency of communication and information sharing and events between POs and countries. | 2 | 2 Guatemala and Mexico | 2 Kenya and Zambia | 1 Mexico (plus hosted one) | Host for Gambia, Liberia and Zambia | 2 (Gambia and Zambia) | 1 Vietnam | 1 Vietnam | 3 | Host for Nepal and Myanmar | 1 Kenya | 5 Mexico, Kenya, Myanmar, Philippines, USA | 18 Excluding hosts |
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