



Forest and Farm Facility

Minutes of the Forest and Farm Facility Steering Committee Meeting

Sunday March 24, 2019
Derio, Bilbao, Spain



Participants

Steering Committee: Joji Carino (Forest Peoples Programme), Myrna Cunningham (FILAC), Cecile Ndjebet (REFACOF), Tiina Huvio, Chairperson (MTK/FFD), James Murombedzi (Economic Commission for Africa), Bambang Supriyanto (Department of Social Forestry, Indonesia), Mette Wilkie (FAO), Pacita Juan (International Women's Coffee Alliance) Markku Aho (international Development). Not present: Peter DeMarsh!!

Forest and Farm Facility team: Jeff Campbell (FAO), Zoraya Gonzalez(FAO), Jhony Zapata (FAO), Sophie Grouwels (FAO), Mario Acunzo (FAO), Chris Buss (IUCN), Pauline Buffle (IUCN), Duncan Macqueen (IIED). Not able to attend: Hannelore Beerlandt (AgriCord)

Observers: Emily Goransson, Sida, Sweden, Katharina Backman, MFA, Finland, Patrick Sieber, SDC Switzerland, Herbert Christ, GIZ, Germany, Bernard Worm, BMZ, Germany, Erna Rosdiana, Department of Social Forestry, Indonesia, Auxtin Ortiz, WRF, Spain (not in picture)

1. Opening and Welcome remarks

The Chair, Huvio, welcomed all participants, including observers from current and interested resource partner countries and the government of Indonesia. She then expressed on behalf of all the SC members the great sadness at the passing away of fellow SC member Peter deMarsh.

Minute of silence for Peter de Marsh - "He was a strong defender of the really poor so let's make sure we honour him by working well to support them." Tiina Huvio

Auxtin Ortiz, Director of World Rural Forum (WRF) welcomed the SC to Bilbao and gave a short introduction of WRF with producers' organizations members and research centres with the aim to promote family farming in the world. Surrounded by family farming entities, close to agricultural.

The Decade of family farming that will be launched in FAO in April is the result of a successful year of family farming in 2014. During 2014, producers organizations (POs) started getting more traction with the government for collaboration. With the decade, the aim is for the POs to be empowered to be proactively engaging with different stakeholders. The Decade will not solve all the problems but will be a good opportunity to change public policies.

2. Presentation of the last SC meeting notes

The last SC meeting notes were summarized by Jeff Campbell.

Action: *Correct the spelling of James Murombedzi's name*

Minutes were approved.

3. Update on transition period and launching of phase II

The manager made a presentation (starting with a short video honouring Peter DeMarsh) on the highlights of 2018. Given the significant impacts and results of the first phase, only some selected results were presented. One clear learning is that exchange visits trigger the adoption of new practices. The exchanges are therefore still considered as an important tool.

The selection process for the countries of phase II was explained. All phase I countries were invited to apply but were all subject to same scoring and screening. Some countries of phase I got the sufficient scoring to get selected but didn't make it high enough on the list to receive funding this time. They are called network countries and ways to support them is still to be determined – representatives from Forest and Farm Producer Organizations from almost all core and network partner countries were gathering for a large Exchange meeting to be held the day after the SC meeting and a smaller meeting to discuss how FFF could best support the network as a whole.

FFF is at 20% of the targeted funding.

4. Discussion on transition phase

Clarifying some aspects of the facility to external audience

Some of the numbers demonstrating results are very good but we need to explain and clarify what is behind those numbers. It is important in phase II to present results in terms of potential impact,

numbers of FFPOs reached through apex organizations, and numbers of people through local FFPOs. The same applies for policy influence. Results should indicate impact as a number of people it may influence. (Tiina)

Another recommendation is to emphasise the fact that FFF has a rights-based approach, and that it targets poor/vulnerable people. (Tiina)

Action: FFF team will consider how to better explain and articulate results and present their potential impact on income, policy influence or rights.

Scoping studies

The studies nicely show how implementing partners complement each other. The work on landscape restoration by IUCN has contributed to AgriCord's climate agenda. (Tiina)

Recommendation on fundraising

There are many initiatives in Indonesia to support social forestry incl. GIZ, GEF 15mio, FIP. It would be interesting to see, how can FFF link with the initiative of these and other donors? (Bambang)

Possibilities of looking at of programmes like Invest in Women (funded by Australia) also another initiatives from Canada that could be linked to resources mobilization (e.g. Indonesia, Myanmar), also an ICT programme #keytrends for Latin America, Africa which is now starting in Asia (Pacita).

Action: FFF team will follow up with the possible resource partners suggested. SC members requested to continue to share ideas of other opportunities.

Outcome 2

How can we set up communities to link with markets? FFF could create a shopping list with existing farmers and opportunities for market. One example is mangroves: plant mangroves and create ... and then they can export to NL and Japan because they have a standard of quality. This is one of the opportunities to develop first the market and then come to social forestry in the field. (Bambang)

Is it possible to create a benchmark? Present best practices, most successful examples? (Bambang)

What about the possibility of broadening the constituencies, e.g. not only producers but also others in the supply chain? (James) It is complex to engage beyond the primary products producers (Jeff). What about the potential to work on carbon-based forestry? (James)

How could FFF better get private sector investments to benefit farmers' business initiatives? ? (Bernard, BMZ)

Action: FFF team will take into consideration good suggestions on improving links with markets, linking and supporting other value chain actors and investors.

Traditional knowledge

Important not to forget traditional knowledge and keep in mind the bias of the modern knowledge (Bambang)

Action: FFF team will give due attention to traditional knowledge.

Gender

Several discussions took place around gender:

- Too much emphasis on the training of the individual woman, the training has to consider the family and community she sustains (Myrna)

- The SDGs are not a women's only issue. Working on gender is not working only with women. It is not only the woman, but men who are also losing out, the family as a whole also loses when women are not included and empowered. There is something to gain for everybody in equality. Mainstreaming gender means looking at the larger picture. (SIDA comments)
- From an African perspective, there is an increasing number of men leaving the rural areas. Feminization of rural areas doesn't mean better access of women to rights, but also weakening of male-led institutions for managing resources therefore also leading to degradation. To what extent can we use FFF to change gender relation and access to land? Why not focus on women empowerment by easing access of services and resources specifically for women? The idea is to start by access to services that would then lead to gender empowerment and equality. The transformative agenda might be a bit too ambitious and starting with targeted services might be more realistic. (James)
- It depends a lot on local communities and IP. In some communities if we are to support women we need them to increase access, equitable rights to communal lands. They must have same ownership over collective land rights. Therefore, maybe context specific. (Myrna)
- Sub Saharan countries are patriarchal societies. Even though men have migrated they still control the resources. To achieve improved livelihoods and landscape planning, gender relation should be focused on women. The gap is there. The food production for the family and the market is mostly done by women but the input is controlled by men. It is very important to improve and strengthen women's position so they can access the decision making systems. It is really important to strengthen the capacity of women. Outcome 2 is very solid as it is important to develop women entrepreneurship as well as they need to receive a good share of the production. (Cecile)

Action: FFF team will continue to develop and share experiences with the gender equality approach and give consideration to the different inputs provided as well as diverse situations in different countries.

Implementation

Past meetings have involved intensive discussions on how to improve efficiency and effectiveness of FFF and how to improve knowledge through scoping studies. In previous meetings it was concluded a good job of improving the logical framework had been done. The critical challenge is to put it into practice at the country level. (Markku)

Letters of agreement (LoAs) with partner organisations can present some challenges as these are service delivery contracts for specific deliverables, which don't necessarily provide for flexible responses by empowered FFPOs. In addition, global outcomes are not equally appreciated at the local ground level. Therefore, flexibility which would allow better buy-in by the FFPOs supported, is recommended to be able to catalyze change. (Markku)

The importance of FFF to FAO as programme directly supporting FFPOs with concrete implementation was noted. To reach the scale of the activities it is important to link with regional and global opportunities and organizations (e.g. ROPPA, AFA, etc). (Mario)

Action: As the implementation builds at country level, FFF will study outcomes and indicators and if necessary, propose adjustments depending on the country context. The management team will review the effectiveness of outcome based budgeting processes and come back to the SC with suggested changes if needed. FFF will strengthen links to regional organizations.

Restoration

Restoration is very important and BMZ/GIZ support the processes. There is interest in restoration and FFF should better profile its value for restoration. BMZ/GIZ insisted/invited FFF to participate more to those discussions and go to AFR100 mtg in October and GLF. (Herbert)

As FFF wants to link up to national carbon targets. Need to articulate more clearly how the quantitative forest restoration efforts are being tracked and developed (Herbert)

Action: FFF will continue to explore effective ways to link to restoration and track quantitative results also in terms of carbon sequestration.

Representation of local voices

As we give primary importance to family farmers, we need to bring their Voice to the table. A lot of people now understand FFF and conceptually what it does. But they still do not have access to their voices, to their realities. It was disappointing that the FFPOs' voices were last in COFO when most people had left. The voice of family farmers needs to be prioritized! Now that FFF is getting into a more complicated phase we need to continue to make sure that local voices are heard in our continuing efforts for communication, (Joji)

Action: FFF team will foreground community, family farmer and FFPO voices.

Learning and communication

FFF is mostly interested in knowledge so that POs can improve their service delivery. The peer to peer exchanges have been very useful. The risk self-assessment tool has also proven to be very useful for the organizations who can then effectively have an improvement plan. (Duncan)

One of our biggest challenge is how to get people interested in getting organized. It is not intuitively obvious and understanding the individual problems then making the case for organization can be interesting. (Duncan)

At the other end of the spectrum – how can we convince regional/global platforms that all the different activities we are promoting are relevant. In a world of silos it is difficult to profile our work and the need and importance of having an integrated approach. (Duncan)

Some interest to hear more about OCSAT was raised. Could it work with the Indigenous Navigator, an IP based monitoring tool? Is the OCSAT only about the organization or also for the four outcomes? What is interesting for IP communities is how they link with SDGs. Interested to see if we can include the outcomes in the OCSAT. For them it is interesting to understand how they advance themselves in some areas to advance SDGs or other. (Joji, happy to support Duncan)

Action: FFF team will share the OCSAT assessment tool and learn more about other relevant self-assessment tools, including those used by indigenous Peoples.

5. Key challenges

Travel

The air flights are a growing issue for SIDA and something to keep in mind. Decreasing numbers of flights could also be mean more funding (Emily)

Clarifying roles in countries

In Agricord, some country offices are still not really aware of the exact role they can play [similar issue with IUCN]. As AgriCord is working on a service catalogue, it could provide a basis to define the role of agri-agencies as requested by FFPOs (Tiina).

How can network countries find ways to link in other initiatives. Are we going through FAO offices? (Tina)

Action: FFF will seek to increase support/services for network country partners, balancing expectations while opening opportunities to expand resources. Guidelines will be developed for new countries which might be able to leverage their own funding – an example is Brazil. FFF will dialogue with AgriCord/agri-agencies and FFPOs to better define the role of AgriCord in the implementation of FFF.

Budget and work plan

The transition funding helped to keep the team in place to carry out the preparatory work for Phase II. The budget for Phase II in 2018 was underspent because of time needed for the country buy-in and agreements signed. Multi-year funding that is channelled through MUL (multi-donor fund) is reducing administrative cost, which at the moment thanks to the donor support, is the foundation for FFF (US\$ 19.3 Million).

FFF is expecting a smaller contribution of the Netherlands for 100k EUR (the agreement signed as of circulation of these Minutes).

The biggest elements of expenditures are for FFPO grants and the salaries of implementations team. An overview of different budget components was given to SC.

The process is roughly similar in each country: Expression of interest, signature of programme document, FFF in-country facilitator, advisory committee in country, FFPO selection and LoA and grants, training, exchanges, M&L baselines, annual retreats, reports that compile annual learning. Examples given for each country: Bolivia, Ecuador, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Nepal, Vietnam, Togo, Zambia.

6. General discussion

Links with other programmes/initiatives and resource mobilization

SC members made a number of concrete suggestions and

- Gender: Diploma course for women is being offered from April until June by FILAC and accredited by Spain.
- Latin American exchange for youth in different regions to discuss socio-cultural issues.
- In FAO there is support for green climate initiative and Southern organisations could be included into this initiative.
- Climate funding –it is challenging to get communities into carbon markets and climate funding. For smallholders, the best option is to have financially profitable activities to be financially profitable in their own right. Carbon payments are usually much less than the other benefits that FFPOs can get through commerce.
- Perhaps each country could develop criteria to link FFPOs to climate funds. The UNFCCC calculation is at the national and subnational levels while projects are local. Important to

connect local to national. If you do sustainable forestry it brings its own rewards – it should not need additional payments. Important to link to climate systems that can also quantify local impacts (e.g. plan vivo). Emissions reductions at local level can be bought by companies if there are means for verification. There is a need for more flexible verification schemes.

- In Bolivia, there is an ambitious programme well-linked to the national policy programmes. Is it possible to think after a couple of years of implementation of the FFF strategy could be transferred to the responsibility of the government? The strategic plan could shift towards the government itself? Need to monitor how successful the policy work has been. So FFF would support some dialogue etc but release scarce resources to other country programmes.
- The actual ingredients in the formula of REDD+ (tenure, capacity etc) do not feature in the carbon projects. FFPOs need to learn how to calculate their footprint on the land.
- Development funding could be a more effective way of getting climate benefits than climate funding.
- Need to see in workplans the efforts that are being made to link to programmes that can do monitoring – rather than doing it all within FFF – as there are costs associated with detailed monitoring.
- World Bank Landscape programme could be an interesting link..
- Lots of funds are going towards the country level. A challenge is to maintain independent country selection when looking for funding at the country level. However, if FFF had other sources of support – some donors might put money into specific countries. Plus, bilateral funding is often considerably greater than international funding – so need to consider which countries are targeted.

In terms of resource mobilisation, good progress is being made with the Dutch Government. It is interesting to see how FFF could expand in the ASEAN countries.

Even though there is a good justification for raising funds at national level:

- Having a global programme is very important. FFF is trying to make the global case that FFPOs are the integrated solution to climate actions and the SDG's and this needs a global programme. Plus, significant advances to be made through peer-to-peer exchanges (e.g. Asian Farmers Association advances). Those exchanges are a much faster way of getting progress. Plus, there are major efficiencies for having a multidonor fund.
- It is very time consuming to make competitive bids at national level and the thin international team is too stretched already.
- In Guatemala, FFF did raise 6 million from Korean funds but then received no international support and lost direct links with the subsequent programme.

After this lengthy discussion the 2019 work plan and budget was approved.

Action: FFF will continue to explore a wide range of fund raising, leveraging and partnership opportunities at all levels and welcomes ongoing suggestions from the SC members.

IP agenda and FFF

The agendas of IPOs are not harmonised with the FFF. Community organisations and higher level federations are approaching strategy development in a particular way – and FFF is not quite linked up. Similarly, IPOs are not very aware of the FFF. (Joji)

To link producers and indigenous movements that want to achieve policy gains, FFF needs to link the movements at two level. Both national and regional to see real change (Myrna)

One of the challenges in first phase is that local IPO work was not adequately known by regional and global IPO networks. So, question is – are there particular events to which we could go to improve this exchange of information?

Action: FFF will continue to seek improved and closer links with Indigenous peoples' movements and organizations to improve synergy and understanding.

Newsletter

The idea of a periodic newsletter to update resource partners, SC members and others was discussed.

Action: FFF newsletter to be shared every 3-4 months.

7. New SC members

Joji Carino announced that she would be leaving the SC. With Peter de Marsh's passing, now two positions need to be filled in.

- Earlier suggestions for possible members can be reviewed.
- There has been longstanding interest in getting someone to represent youth.
- Keeping same constituencies, e.g. IP and family forest farmers
 - o Since MTK is already represented by Tiina, as an organization of family forest farmers, perhaps youth can be prioritized
- Representing NGO constituencies?
- What about regional balance?
- What about finance representatives? Cooperative banking? Rabobank, German banking?

Action: the FFF team will develop an initial list of possible candidates and request inputs and suggestions from SC members.

Next meeting venue and date was discussed with a tentative decision to move back to February and hold the next meeting in Rome.

An option to have a skype meeting in September was agreed.

Action: Suggested dates will be circulated.

The meeting closed with a round of thanks from the Chair and appreciation for the strong participation of everyone present.

The Following day: Steering Committee members at Decade of Family Farming Exchange



Steering Committee and FFF team members presented Joji Carino with a certificate of appreciation for her sterling service and guidance to the Steering Committee for six years! Thanks Joji!!