

Forest and Farm Facility

Minutes of the Steering Committee meeting
20-21 February 2020, India Room, FAO HQ, Rome



From left to right seated: James Murombedzi (SC member), Katharina Backman (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland -observer); Johannes Petrus Hoogeveen (Ambassador Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the UN Organizations -observer), Ingeborg Leijtens (Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands -observer)

From left to right standing: Andrew Taber (Social Forestry Team FAO), Tatiana Lebedeva (FFF team FAO), Sophie Grouwels (FFF team FAO), Mette Wilkie (Director Forest Resources and Policy Division FAO & SC member), Hiroto Mitsugi (Assistant Director General Forestry Department FAO), Markku Aho (SC member), Cecille Ndjebet (SC member), Jose Diaz Diaz (Social Forestry team FAO), Duncan Macqueen (FFF team IIED), Myrna Cunningham (SC member), Giulia DeRobert (FFF team FAO), Jeffrey Campbell (FFF team FAO), Tiina Huvio (SC Chair), Francesca Guarascio (FFF team FAO), Jhony Zapata (FFF team FAO), David Kaimowitz (SC member), Pacita Juan (SC member), Marguertie France-Lanord (FFF team FAO), Laura Simeoni (FFF team FAO), Bernhard Worm (BMZ Germany – observer), Tony Owusu (Forestry Department FAO), Zoraya Gonzalez (FFF team FAO).

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mr. Hiroto Mitsugi (ADG – FAO Forestry Department) opened the meeting by emphasizing the linkages with biodiversity and the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF). “Since agriculture is a main driver for deforestation and loss of biodiversity, we need good models for future on how the farmers can sustain livelihoods and ecosystem services with agriculture.”, he said.

Discussion of minutes from last meeting and proposed Agenda

Tiina, as SC Chair then began the business meeting. Jeff was asked to read the action points included in the minutes of the previous meeting from March 24 2019. The minutes were approved, and the Steering Committee (SC) members went through the recommendations given. It was decided that those would be analysed during the report session.

Table below shows how the recommendations from the previous minutes were covered.

Recommendations from the previous SC meeting 2019	Conclusions of SC members 2020
Results	The reporting has become more focused, is divided by outcome and has more figures and different graphics. Further work to differentiate the results at different levels was recommended.
Outcome 2	The report underlines well the work on markets.
Gender	There is a separate part on gender that was appreciated.
Indigenous peoples	There is still need to give more attention to the indigenous peoples. This recommendation remains.
Giving voice	FFF has given voice to many local FFPOs which has led to policy changes.
AgriCord	FFF has improved the work with AgriCord and is now preparing a publication on climate resilience and FFPOs.

Summary report on outcomes and impacts from 2019

The agenda point on the highlights reports 2019 started with the presentation by the FFF management team. The SC appreciated the quality, visibility and improved focus of the 2019 reports (see the [Highlights report 2019 on the FFF website](#), and the detailed 2019 Annual report sent by email). They were easy to read and visualized well the achievements. The shorter [Highlights report 2019](#) made it easy to capture the key issues rapidly.

Questions from SC members on 2019 annual report

Markku: How would you interpret these reports? Are the main outcomes in line with what was expected towards the end of 2018? What was the extent of the achievements towards the expected results? In Nepal after the federal reform the Forest and Farm Producer Organizations (FFPOs) were more at risks because of the new taxation reform. How can FFF and FAO work together with government to resolve this issue as soon as possible and what can be learnt from the process? In addition, in Kenya the total ban of the charcoal rate produced a result (a negative one) and affected the work of FFF and the work of the partners on the ground.

Overall, what are the risks in policy faced in Phase I and what is the general lesson that we learnt from these?

James: How are we dealing with climate, policy and institutional risks? For instance the major risk is that the habitat is rapidly changing and might impact the products and agronomic landscape (cashews). For example, in Ethiopia, farmers are cutting coffee plantation and replacing them with charcoal production because it is more profitable and resistant to climate change – this carries its own risks. Will we be working to track quantitative results in terms of carbon sequestration?

David: FFF outcome 4 on cultural and social services is vague. It is not clear how it is linked to the main objective and what is the logic behind that. The results and achievements mix information of very different levels. The mixture of results makes the bigger look small. What is the programme approach/philosophy to training? One objective of the programme is strengthening institutions but it is not clearly mentioned in any of the FFF objectives. There are several levels of consolidation. What is the FFF approach to that?

Answers from FFF on 2019 annual report

Jeff: The questions reflect the complexity of FFF, which is country driven. The objective and achievements levels depend on the specific context. Some of the indicators are more micro and some more macro. By lumping them together we get a varied picture. Any suggestion on how to tweak the reporting to increase clarity and separate different categories of indicators are welcome. In creating the indicators we started by identifying our targets. The challenges and risks in 2019 also influenced the results:

- In Zambia, the seedlings bought did not survive droughts.
- In Bolivia, the civil society faced serious political issues after the fires.
- In Nepal, the redrawing of the boundaries process caused a triple taxation for forest and farm producer organizations (FFPOs)

Stronger FFPOS was originally a stand-alone Outcome in the early planning stages but this was merged with Outcome 1 which now has dual objectives: strong organizations which effectively engage with policy process to produce more enabling policy. Institution strengthening is therefore embedded in this Outcome to show why the stronger institutions are necessary.

Duncan: Knowledge survey conducted in 2019 showed that we need more knowledge on pest and disease, and climate change related challenges.

Sophie : In Ghana, the FFPOs are conscious about the challenges coming with climate change. Indeed, diversification strategies are a priority in Ghana. For example, the exchange with other countries are a source of inspiration to adapt existing models at the level of the organizations.

In Nepal, platforms at a number of levels have been convened or are being used to discuss policy change and in particular the triple taxation.

In Kenya, the Letters of Agreement (LoAs) already signed with the FFPOs were pending because of the charcoal ban.

Duncan: FFF Outcome 4 focuses on how FFPOs reach out to their members and include marginalized groups.

FFF approach to training is based on inspiration (through exchange visits), iteration (wide range of trainings) and interaction. Through exchanges, capacity development, and trainings, FFF strengthens the FFPOs. The approach links with and builds on available resources and knowledge. Themes of the training are : why form an organization, market analysis, risk management, business climate resilience. The business package is usually complemented with the tools existing at country level.

Sophie: Firstly we evaluate the needs of training in the countries and what is available.

Marguerite: FFF website will give higher visibility to the trainings package available and the approach.

[Discussion on 2019 annual report](#)

JP Hoogeveen: Positive on the report. Is FFF making any impact? This information is key not only for the donors but for everybody else involved. What is the change on the ground beside the FFF facilitation and support? Impact is needed also to attract more funding. How FFF is working with IFAD? Especially in order to access their loans in countries. The same applies for the World Bank.

How do we intervene in reference to sustainable resource management (deforestation)?

How can FFF participate in other major initiatives, such as UNDP and Rabobank. We risk that FFF has impact on the ground (country) but not at a larger scale. This challenge applies to FAO as an organization.

The Dutch Government is aiming at funding FFF if it will make a difference in terms of impact and numbers and especially want to see change at policy level.

Why is FAO's Biodiversity Framework not talking about trees/forests? We need to see more numbers on more trees and less deforestation. In reforestation: Google and Shell are willing to invest and we need that funding.

Jeff: FFF is focused on leveraging as much as possible other programmes and ongoing within countries, and developing new mechanisms to attract and channel investment. The collaboration with the Forests, Farmers and Agriculture-Sustainable Together (FFAST)

Alliance for Action with many Dutch partners is seeking to demonstrate how such investments can actually have demonstrable impacts at significant landscape scale – beginning in countries like Ghana, Kenya and Zambia. Currently, FFF does not have an indicator on carbon sequestration but on how FFF is linking FFPOS to programmes that are working on carbon sequestration and on hectares of forest and farm which are more climate resilient. Our farmer led tree and product inventory work is just beginning to help us to track carbon sequestration.

FFF has tried for several years to link with IFAD at national and global levels – we are playing an active role in the Decade on Family Farming and our FFPO partners have been vocal in speaking out on the importance of Forestry at the IFAD Farmers Forum – this is new and exciting and was missing from IFAD’s work with farmer organizations. We continue to seek ways to interface with other large funding programmes and welcome suggestions.

A majority of FFF partners are farmers and we see that they are integrating trees into their farms.

Mette: Next week at the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, FFF will have a booth together with the Forestry Department on “Biodiversity for Food Diversity” in FAO HQ Atrium.

Myrna: Climate resilient practices are identified and documented in countries. It will be important to ensure that alternative approaches are included, for example, biocultural enterprise models are important for indigenous peoples.

Duncan: It will be explained how cases studies have been collected on topics such as bio cultural trade and how the geographical branding and denomination of origin, often complementing Indigenous Peoples traditional territorial management systems could help businesses.

Cecile: Gender mainstreaming is getting progressively into practice. We see more synergies between forest and agriculture through a bunch of products in value chain. Seedling is very important. FFF Phase II is linking FFPOs to the banks. This is a good progress compared to last phase.

The issue of tenure of forest and land in some countries is serious to the FFPOs which find it challenging to fit into the right tenure law, and which may not recognize their ownership. This is even worse for women.

Another improvement and value added of FFF is the focus on livelihood development that is linked with impact and to the transformative approaches especially in terms of gender balance in the community and even at household level. It would be important to share information on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)^a and other challenges like climate change with the FFPOs .

Markku: It becomes evident from the country reports that the outcomes of FFF work on access to finance and business incubation are the drivers and the rest will follow. So when there is country level initiative, a genuine one coming from a local idea, FFF should support it and go for it!

David: on the concerns of the ambassador on the scale, the scale depends also on the way the report is presented. There are six ways to go to scale.

1. Through large public finance programmes like those from IFAD.
2. Through large organizations with lots of members, like FECOFUN.
3. By working with FFPOS that cover large area of land, like in Bolivia for example.
4. By affecting public policy that affects the entire country.
5. By accessing private financing.
6. With technological innovation.

FFF is already using four of these ways to go to scale. The main problem is the way it is reported, when the scale is not adequately reflected.

Pacita: Currently in Asia the demand for coffee is high. We promote small scale farmers growing coffee. Coffee can grow in the forest and has an easy and transparent access to market, and a special appeal.

Jeff: FFF appreciates comments encouraging FFF to look for more and alternative business models, especially those proposed by Indigenous peoples that enhances resilience and risk mitigation. One existing example is the Chakra model. The single commodity value systems still predominate in most of the world's work on value chains, but this is not the model that FFF is seeking to promote. We are encouraging integrated value chains for a basket of products to increase resilience, biodiversity, and food security while reducing risks.

Key recommendations for action on reporting and impact

- **Levels of results:** Continue improving the reporting format, in particular categorizing results according to different types and levels: national level, large scale, and local impact.
- **Going to scale:** Can be achieved in different ways and FFF can work with four of them: large public finance programs, large organizations (FFPOs) which cover large geographic areas, by affecting public policies and working with private finance and innovations. We will continue to pursue these pathways and to report on leveraging along each pathway.
- **Climate information:** Collect better numbers related to climate information, weather and climate data allowing FFF to identify linkages between climate risks and land use measures. On the other hand, there is need to translate climate observations to a terminology understandable by farmers. Case studies are fine but there is need for more rigorous data collection. Numbers are needed to attract donors.
- **Traditional practices:** We need to identify traditional practices including those of Indigenous Peoples on climate resilience.
- **Land, forest and tree tenure:** Some countries require advocacy work. FAO is well positioned to take this forward. The same applies to policy issues such as the ban on charcoal in Kenya and Bolivia's forest fires.
- **Linkages with SDGs:** FFF can contribute in highlighting SDG links to FFPOs to let them articulate better the kinds of services they provide but also to reduce risks related to farming. There is need to balance the climate resilience work with livelihood development and linkages to SDGs. Continued effort will be made to

balance between the support to economic activities (Outcome 2) while contributing to climate resilience (Outcome 3).

- **FFF approach** to be clarified: i) training approach and principles, ii) work on institutional strengthening, which is now part of Outcome 1, iii) delivery on the outcomes.
- **Gender:** While gender mainstreaming allows FFF to have results, it is important as well to make sure that there is additional targeted activities for women, especially if mainstreaming is a challenge due to the local context.

Financial report from 2019

Zoraya presented the financial report.

Questions from the participants on the financial report

Do the contracts include only LoAs? Are the salaries of staff according to FAO standards? It was noted that 10 % of the budget allocated for travel is high.

Answer on the financial report

Jeff replied that the in country travels of the facilitators, and exchange and monitoring travels are included in the travel category, because FAO country offices charge all expenses as travel. Zoraya presented how travels are divided. Travel is inline with the Umbrella financial statement.

The Steering Committee approved the technical and financial reports.

Action points on financial report

- SC members encouraged FFF and FAO in general to study how to reduce flights.
- Better record of travel in the budget: distinguishing between travel for training purposes and other travel would clarify the budget division between the budget categories of training and travel.
- Share the budget distribution at the country level as an example.

Strategic discussion on FFF core mission, niche-market, unique and innovative approach

Sophie shared some experience in Togo where a group of women had seen several NGOs proposing and developing things that were not useful for these women. Too many initiatives do not consider that FFPOs could be the primary implementing partner for development.

Tiina: Climate funding can be an opportunity or a threat. They bring a lot of money but often the capacity to manage these funds is fragile. A basket of funds at landscape level can build resilience through diversity but it is going in a different direction than the market that requires specialization. Infrastructure required e.g. for water management is often a challenge.

Pacita: Who are the primary listeners to our message? If donors, we need to see the specialness of FFF. A pitch could be adapted to potential new donors.

Bernhard: Comdev has shown that the organizations are focused and value the opinion of the recipients of FFF communication as well.

Jeff: The recipients of FFF communication are also the policy makers and investors, and the development programmes.

Duncan: We see big development climate change programmes, yet there are big problems on our planet. FFF has an approach to answer that, something that could work at scale, and has showed that it works, and that quickly it could get results at scale.

Kerstin: What is the objective of the discussion? Would the mid-term evaluation define new objectives of the FFF? No. Donors are diversified. FFF has its own niche and pitch to donors but should not be ruled by donors. Climate could be an opportunity, but we need to be honest that it is not an easy option.

Tiina agrees with the above comment and adds that FFF should not favour a top down paradigm dictating the priorities

Myrna: The FFF message can be at three different levels:

- A pitch to donors: to show that scale can be increased.
- The national level, policy level, to explain that there is a way to implement things.
- The local level of producers that needs to be innovative, bring different types of FFPOs together to build relationships.

FFF is not vague. You bring solutions how to face climate change adaptation and mitigation, trying to improve what FFPOS are already doing. FFF is bringing simple solutions. The language of climate change is difficult and unknown to FFPO and FFF should break this message down for them as well.

James: There is a tension between the impact and the strategy. FFF has the value to work with FFPOs. The challenge of implementing activities to achieve impact is hard as there are external factors hindering this dynamic. We should consider engaging local government. How do we have an impact on local democracy? FFF should consider engaging into local governance forms and strengthen democracy within FFPOs to eventually have an impact.

Markku: We have accumulated knowledge based on successes and risks. Weak financing instruments like those related to the climate change are not accessible to local producers. FFF is not concretely facilitating the access to such financial resources. This is not due to a communication gap but rather due to the objectives of such financial mechanism and the ability of FFF to communicate to donors that they are losing an opportunity with FFPOs.

David: FFF has a number of basic advantages that work. It represents a cost effective way to get out money to the small and medium enterprises supporting inclusion of women and youth. It promotes democracy. It includes women, youth and indigenous peoples. FFF presents itself as a means rather than its end. The danger is that government consider FFPOs as a mean and not as an end as we in FFF do. The end for each government is to mitigate climate change effects. Therefore, FFF should design its message around the end of the problem and build its compelling message depicting FFPOs as the most cost efficient agents to reach this end. Mitigating climate change and increase livelihoods are on donors' agenda, not rural democracy.

Katharina: What are the groups targeted when building markets? Communication is so difficult. How can we ensure that the message is understood? Women need training and information. There is climate change but also other important themes, such as land degradation.

Tiina: There is an urgent need to reconfirm FFF mission. FFF needs to diversify the material depending on the targeted groups. What can be achieved more than the means? Advocacy on livelihoods and climate: need to engage local communities.

Jeff: FFF has a transformational vision way beyond only the FFF mission that is achieving an impact over the medium term. Strong 'FFPOS as a vital institutional element, diversifying the basket of products, focusing on landscapes, tenure, community, gender equality and business are part of the pathway to reach climate solutions, biodiversity, food production and equity. FFF goal is to achieve sustainable institutions of people that can address the global challenges. If people are getting organized the change can happen! One challenge is that SDGs do not have indicators for collective/group actions. It targets only the single human unit. FFF message is **leave no one behind by working together!**

Bernhard: Forest protection, conservation and restoration are an important priority.

Katharina: Plant health is also another major priority.

Summary discussion on FFF core mission

SC members stressed that for the communication on FFF, its core mission and achievements, there are **different audiences** including donors, investors, climate actors and farming communities and FFPOs. All these need **different kinds of communication material**.

The complexity of climate funding which works mainly through larger organizations can ignore local democracy and bypass FFPOs. There is need to support FFPOs to become relevant implementers of **climate activities**. On the other hand, channeling funding through local level can also be done in cost-effective manner. Democratic practices and inclusiveness enhance sustainability and long-term solutions.

SC members reconfirmed the core principles and emphasized the important role of FFF and its **support to FFPOs** to link livelihood development with climate resilience. Tenure+ Community + Business+ Resilience = CO2 reduction.

On the other hand, the approach embracing **diversity can be challenged** e.g., actors that promote yield productivity (IPCC 1.5 degree report). It is important to assess how diversity promoted can be seen from the point of view of productivity.

Getting climate resilience right (Outcome 3)

Myrna: Traditional knowledge is transmitted. The diversification of indigenous products shows that this knowledge is applied by indigenous peoples. Food production is related to climate. Case studies could be identified and shared on local and traditional knowledge platforms.

Jeff: FFF is part of a team that works on Indigenous Peoples within the Forestry Department and FAO. Marta Gruca on the Social Forestry Team works primarily on indigenous peoples. FAO is looking to increase focus on traditional knowledge and how landscape management practices can promote sustainability. There is a working group on Indigenous Food systems at FAO and we are supporting more work on sustainable shifting cultivation systems as one example.

Markku: How difficult it is for a FFPO to actually to access financial resources from the existing funds? Does FFF have concrete tools facilitating access to funds?

Mette: The adaptation fund would work but FAO is unfortunately not accredited. To access it, the FFPOs must go through partners and this is not convenient for FFPOs.

Tiina: In Agricord, we studied such process and no matter what system is used for climate funding, there is a need to marshal the numbers. So FFPOs must have good system to

assess their numbers to ensure that at national level they can be taken into account for access this kind of mechanisms.

Tiina: FAO has a solid knowledge on Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems and different data on forestry and agriculture from the mapping of countries. This could offer an opportunity to explore how to take advantage of this methodology. Also, SEPAL is available and has high potential that could be used to position the results.

James: issues on unrecognized utilization of parts of land in many African countries creates a contradiction.

Cécile: How is FFF linked to AFR100 in Africa?

Jeff: GIZ support was key for FFF to work in Togo and Madagascar in the restoration area and we have participated actively in regional AFR 100 meetings, bringing FFPOS to share their experiences.

Bernhard: For BMZ the carbon foot print is one of the key aspect that they are very conscious about. FFF is an opportunity for countries. At political level for the people on the ground. They can be in the network already.

Markku: In Sub-Saharan Africa state land is quickly getting into the hands of private companies for agro businesses against which no land tenure or rules can resist. However, there will be a huge increase in land utilization in the future. How will the FFPOs take part in this?

David: In the Annual Report the adaptation-mitigation language is often not clearly pointing at anything concrete. FFF could try providing concrete examples from FFPOs practices. For example, use terminology that is already included in day-to-day life and language that FFPO can understand and then provide results about these. Climate change is the subject that will grow in the next 10 years.

Tiina: There is a balance between pastoralism, seasonal utilisation and livestock. Fires can be used in a managed way to clear land and serve to create fire breaks against larger fires.

Duncan: The value of organization is an important part of the resilience. FFPOs give the right answer for good crops, they test the resistant seeds.

Markku: Since FFF is planned only until 2022, with limited resources and time, we need to see impacts and prioritize actions.

Jeff: One priority of FFF is to try to get more money to FFPOs, to link them to broader opportunities within climate resilience and country programmes to address climate. The other is improving their actual practical resilience as a way to respond to pest, fire, drought,... Giving numbers on these two priorities is good enough for FFF and to focus on. This shows how FFPOs are able to respond. Increased income can be used as an indicator of

climate change adaptation. More efforts will be made to improve our ability to report on climate related impacts.

Business Models for Inclusive livelihoods and Climate Resilience (Outcome 2)

Duncan gave a presentation and showed business models and opportunities linked to Viet Nam. Sophie explained how the way that they built businesses in Viet Nam is inspiring. They developed connections with service providers and linked it to the markets. There are some good examples shown during the field trips.

Tiina: This as a model is very interesting for other FFPOs in other countries, which can be replicated. It provides a model s to FFPOs on what climate resilience is. The challenge for FFPOs is to market their products in the supermarket, because they fail with volume and consistency. The basket of products adds a difficulty to it. How to maintain consistency in quality/volume ?

David: The word incubation: I assumed it means new enterprises, for the first time, with new products, but no, you mean, better services, what is the difference? What is the experience in managing more products? We mean incubation as an element of support, it is additional to start up. Why do you use the term “incubation”?

Sophie: It is the concept to protect them for a while. The Market and Analysis training is for those who have no idea, then we call it business incubation.

Jeff: We could call it business incubation and support services. There is an institutional aspect of help;ing to start and maintain businesses of FFPO members and through this reducing actual risks but also diminishing the perception that it is risky to invest in FFPO businesses. It is a support which gives security to investors and buyers.

Myrna: We need to define the different stages of enterprises and identify the traditional ways they are using. Language is also important: incubation only for growth/profit? As FFF we can do this kind of support but indigenous peoples need to decide what element they want to incorporate. Others should think how to incorporate indigenous peoples’ knowledge into their models. Profit, model and economic institutions are different between structures and entrprises.

Jhony: FFPOs are the players. Collectively they will start businesses as a group They will be stronger. The Apex at national level is the entry point in Kenya for example. Access to market and to finance are what they are trying to achieve. Diversity can be seen as a weakness but as a group you can work better.

Duncan: The processes supported are very rarely something completely new. FFPOs negotiate as a group, to get better quality products and value to it.

Pacita: They usually have one brand with several products. The reputation of one brand is good.

David: There is a long history of diversification out of coffee. It would be nice to summarize the lessons from the production of new products. Need a better definition and explanation of what you are talking about in the title of the Viet Nam conference.

Jeff: We are talking about diversification as a key element in climate resilient businesses though not the only one.

David: It should be explained.

Summary discussion on FFF outcome 2 and 3

The SC emphasized the need to better understand the **traditional approaches** and traditional governance at the landscape level, and how to transfer the knowledge. It was underlined that in addition to agro-forestry, also planted forests, sustainable forest management and fire management can be part of key activities to be promoted.

Possibilities to apply funding from different **climate funds** was discussed. For several of them, a requirement for accreditation makes it impossible for FFPOs to apply directly. FAO is accredited for GCF and GEF. The new publication on access to finance studies also these aspects.

The SC underlined that since in 2020 all the countries need to revise their NDCs, it is an opportunity to mainstream agriculture and the priorities of FFPOs. The focus in Africa is on adaptation and mitigation more as a co-benefit.

There is a massive conversion of land from community to private owners, and on the other hand a non-recognition of seasonal land use practices. The SC recommends FFF to show the **land use models** that enhance ecosystem restoration or link livelihoods with business initiatives.

There is a need to look for **innovative mechanisms** to buffer the risks/consequences (disaster but also economic resilience).

It was discussed how to verify the linkages between **business and climate change**; there is a need to think how to classify business as climate resilient. In the same line, there is a need to reflect how the value chain actors could work better with a basket of products. It can be a challenge to reach consistency, quality and volume required by high value market.

Diversification is not the only way to achieve resilience, which leaves it open to other business approaches.

The SC reminded the team that there are lessons learned from **diversification in coffee** production and the support of USAID on non-traditional commodities in how to deal with diversification and businesses linked to diversification.

Work Plan 2020

Key events in 2020

The FFF management team presented a list of different events to identify together with SC members opportunities to promote FFPOs and FFF.

- The SC members reminded that the European Development Days 9-10 June is an important event. FAO will have one booth on deforestation.
- The UN Decades on Family farming and on Ecosystem restoration are initiatives where FFPOs can play a major role.
- The digital Global Landscape Forum provides opportunities for linkages.
- An Extra-ordinary SC meeting should be organized during COFO with the new FFF Manager.

Bernhard: how can the Steering Committees convey messages in attending the events on the decade of eco systems restoration and decade of family farming?

Alberto Troilo (Communication for Development team) explained briefly the role of FAO in the Secretariat for the Decade of Family Farming and the work of the ComDev team in building communications capacity within FFPOs around the decade and other issues of importance to them.

Mette: FAO has a draft strategy that the FFF is requested to disseminate with SC members networks.

List of upcoming key events

Date	Event		FFF Leading Partner/s
March 17	International seminar on smallholder forestry and climate in EU Parliament	Brussels, Belgium	AgriCord and FAO
April	Conference on Forests Farmers and Agriculture – Sustainable Together an Alliance for Action (FFAST-AAA meeting)	The Hague, Netherlands	FFF, Government of the Netherlands, FFAST-AAA partners
May 25-28	International FFPO conference “Saving our future” - Inclusive business models that invest in climate resilience	Vietnam	FFF global and VNFU (+AFA)
June 2 nd	International forestry seminar	Finland	AgriCord
June 5	AgriCord General Assembly	Finland	AgriCord
June 9-10	Indigenous peoples caucus pre congress	Marseille	IUCN
June 11-19	IUCN World Conservation Congress	Marseille, France	IUCN IIED
June 21-26	COFO and World Forestry Week, including a full day on civil society, IP, FFPOs, Family Farmers linked to the Decade – healthy diet	Rome, Italy	FAO
Mid-June	Forestry exhibit and event at EU Parliament	Strasbourg, France	AgriCord
October 5-8	International Plant Health Conference	Helsinki, Finland	FFF/AgriCord
October 15-28	CBD COP15 (preparing post 2020)	China	FAO
November 9-19	UNFCCC COP25	Glasgow, UK	FAO
November	An African regional gathering on wood fuel and charcoal	Zambia?	FFF/CIFOR
November 14-15	Global Landscapes Forum (GLF): Reimagine the Future of Food and Livelihoods	Glasgow, UK	FFF

Note: as of final writing, these dates may have to be re-examined in the light of the impacts of the corona virus pandemic – all events in March, April and May have already been cancelled or postponed.

FFF Work plan and budget for 2020

The Chair proposed and the SC approved the FFF work plan and budget 2020 unanimously.

Mid-term evaluation (MTE): The SC endorsed the idea to keep the mid-term evaluation (MTE) during the latter half of 2020. The extra-ordinary SC meeting during the COFO 2020 could also launch the MTE. The SC appreciated and agreed with the clear expectation expressed in the Donor Support Group meeting that the FAO Office of Evaluation as per the Project Document and agreements with the donors should conduct this MTE. If the FAO evaluation unit, which now focuses on final evaluation, cannot organize the MTE the budget holder and project team can manage it.

Country level implementation:

- Launching Tanzania.
- Monitoring progress in countries + national advisory committees.
- More support to network country – with support from FMM (USD 30 000 per country).
- Lot of time was spent on finance issues: Rabobank, FFAST initiative, Basket of Finance for Basket of Products. This needs to be actualized in countries.
- Different figures were used per countries: FFF will clarify direct beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries.
- Gender equality: 12% of country budget is allocated to Gender in 2019, but 2020 should target more, FFF will target around 20%.

Publications: Lessons learnt on indigenous peoples business should be produced.

Knowledge management: demand-led guidance on climate resilience , on women's entrepreneurship, on mobilizing self-finance.

Budget 2020

The budget 2020 was approved by SC members.

David: Other potential donors on the list? If DFID comes on board, how this would affect the FFF structure? Would the budget just expand?

Jeff: If more donors come on board (potentially: DFID, Germany), that would mean hiring new staff and launching in new core countries. The implications would be: i) deepen the budget (USD 500 000 in all countries), and ii) expand the budget for knowledge management, exchange visits, learning activities, and expand the role of IIED given DFID's interests, iv) additional countries in Africa.

If GEF – 7 Drylands support comes through in 2021, it will not affect directly FFF structure/budget, FFF does not normally receive GEF funds directly to provide contracts or for technical support to train FFPOs, but will leverage support through government and other actors to FFPOs directly in 7 additional countries.

Jhony: In Guatemala for example during FFF Phase 1, a 22 million programme was committed for FFPOs, and FFF has therefore stopped providing support in FFF Phase 2.

Transition of Manager

The vacancy announcement was posted one week after the SC meeting for one month. The first screening and reference checked is done by OHR. The selection panel will select, based on minimum requirements, a list of top 6-10 candidates. The final decision lies with the DG to select 3 candidates. A video interview by Skype of 45 minutes-1 hour for each candidate will be conducted by the panel. Even a person based at FAO or in Rome, will be interviewed by Skype. Usually the panel is composed by Mette or the FAO FO ADG, one HR person, one FAO staff from other Department, one external person (in the past this has been a representative of the SC). The interview will be held middle-end of April. Knowing candidate by end of May, and Manager in place in August.

- The SC should share widely the announcement and propose some names and bios.
- Suggestions for panelists : Tiina Huvio already proposed herself. We need to have 2 additional candidates, Tiina will lead the process to find 2 other names.

Overlap between Managers is unfortunately not possible due to contract reasons. Some arrangement can be made for a visit by the incoming Manager through non-staff travel, perhaps to coincide with the ad hoc SC meeting during COFO for *example (depending on the impacts of the corona virus pandemic)*.

Resource mobilization

As requested by several core donors a full time resource mobilization consultant is now supporting a FFF and is scaling-up resource mobilization efforts.

- **BMZ:** good chances to join for a multiple year funding.
- **DFID:** multiple year funding ongoing negotiations. Perhaps need to extend to 2024 or through April 2025 (2 + years extension). For SIDA, a no-cost extension would not be a problem.
- **GEF7:** ongoing discussions with GEF drylands Programme in Southern Africa (FFF component in 7 countries).
- **FFAST Alliance for action:** we spent a lot of time into this during meetings: sharing examples from the ground and bringing investors considering blended finance packages.
- **FMM:** Soft earmarking was USD 1.2 million for 2 years but then it became USD 1.5 million for 3 years. Thanks to good relations and lobbying.
- Jeff recently met with **SDC** evaluation team for evaluation of ASEAN social forestry working group in Indonesia.
- **EU:** Difficult and long process: we have already a large portfolio from Forestry Department with FLEGT. But good to target through EU missions in the countries or at the regional level for eg. integrated land management. Focus on geographic areas. EU sits first with the government and then with agencies.
- **Potential new donors:** Italy: Amazonia Sin Fuego showed interest.

FFF deeply appreciates the support from current and potential donors and acknowledged Mette's support to the donor meeting group.

Steering Committee membership

Tiina, the Chair, thanked the SC members for their valuable contribution during the meeting. FFF has very good suggestions to take forward such as : the different ways and pathways to look at development, the need to be more explicit on traditional knowledge, some reflection on the terminology and narrative and the training approach, the importance of macro level to make impact, micro level examples of interesting initiatives, and how do we measure climate resilience?

2020 will host multiple events for which FFF will provide material, and coaching will continue to make more impact.

New members of the SC were officially announced: David Kaimowitz, Salina Abraham and Elizabeth Nsimadala.

Jeff expressed his deep appreciation for all of the excellent comments and the useful discussion from all of the Steering Committee members and to the Chair for guiding the meeting and helping to summarize the major issues and points for action. These Steering Committee meetings provide actionable food for thought and serve as a compass for the FFF to keep us pointing in the right direction and to correct and improve our course.

Tiina and Jeff expressed deep gratitude to Markku Aho for his continuing wisdom, as one of FFF founders since the start. Markku after two terms of three years has sadly to leave the SC.



Certificate of participation presented to departing Steering Committee member Markku Aho. For more photos from the SC meeting taken by Roberto Cenciarelli follow the link to the flickr Album: <https://www.flickr.com/photos/faoforestry/albums/72157713239725791>

Next meeting: A decision was made to hold an adhoc meeting of the Steering committee which would ideally include both outgoing and in coming Managers and therefore be held before the end of July. Depending on the current crises the idea was raised to hold the meeting at the same time as the COFO during the week of June 22-26th.

The Chair closed the meeting with a vote of thanks to all.

Agenda of the SC meeting, 20-21 February 2020, India Room, FAO HQ

Time	Topic	Moderator/Presenter	Desired Outcome
DAY 1 – Thursday 20 February			
14:00 – 14:30	Welcome and Opening Remarks	SC Chair/(ADG Forestry)	New SC member introduced
14:30 – 15:00	Discussion of minutes from last meeting and proposed Agenda	SC Chair/FFF Manager	Approval of minutes and Adoption of Agenda
15:00 – 16:00	Summary report on Outcomes and Impacts from 2019	FFF Manager and team	Awareness and understanding of activities and results
16:00 – 16:30	<i>Coffee Break</i>		<i>Informal discussion</i>
16:30 – 17:00	Financial report from 2019	FFF Manager and team	Clarity over expenditures and finances
17:00 – 17:45	Discussion of Annual narrative and financial reports	SC Chair/SC members	Clarifications of questions approval of the report
19:30	<i>Dinner with Donor Support Group</i>	All	<i>Informal discussions</i>

Time	Topic	Moderator/Presenter	Desired Outcome
DAY 2 – Friday 21 February			
08:30– 09:30	Strategic discussion on FFF core mission, niche-market, unique and innovative approach – underlining the centrality of FFPOs, inclusive landscape-based livelihoods, climate resilience, business incubation and basket of products value chains	SC Chair/FFF Manager and team	Suggestions on enhancing our communication of core mission and approach.
09:30 – 10:00	Strategic engagement opportunities for FFF and SC members as “ambassadors” at the regional and global level – building the network	SC Chair/ FFF management team	Inputs from SC members on key events and opportunities for FFF Especially where they can play a role
10:00 – 10:30	<i>Coffee Break</i>		<i>Informal discussion</i>
10:30 – 12:00	Getting climate resilience right (Outcome 3) – Current approaches and challenges presented by FFF management team. Discussion and ideas from SC.	SC Chair/tbc	Inputs from SC members on strengthening the work around climate resilience
12:00 – 13:00	<i>Lunch Break</i>		<i>Informal discussion</i>
13:00 – 14:00	Business Models for Inclusive livelihoods and Climate Resilience (Outcome 2) – Discussion of opportunities linked to global Exchange and Conference in Vietnam in May.	SC Chair/ FFF management team	Suggestions on participants, and important networks or innovative projects to link with
14:00 – 15:00	Work Plan 2020 presentation	FFF management team	Awareness of plans for 2020
15:00 – 15:30	<i>Coffee Break</i>		<i>Informal discussion</i>
15:30 – 16:00	Work Plan 2020 and Transition of Manager - Discussion	SC Chair/ FFF management team	Approval of plans for 2020
16:00 – 17:00	Resource Mobilization/Observers depart	SC Chair/ FFF management team	Awareness of resources mobilized in until February 2020 Understanding of funding overview and gaps Feedback on mobilizing further resources
17:00 – 17:30	Wrap up, date for next meeting. AOB	SC Chair	Formalize new members Clarify meeting dates

List of Participants of the FFF SC meeting, 20-21 February 2020

Steering Committee members

- Tiina Huvio – Chair
- Markku Aho
- Mirna Cunningham
- Pacita Juan
- David Kaimowitz
- James Murombedzi
- Cecile Ndjebet
- Mette Wilkie

Unable to attend: Bambang Supriyatno, Salina Abraham.

FFF Team

- Hannelore Beerlandt – Agricord
- Duncan MacQueen – IIED
- Jeffrey Campbell – FFF, FAO
- Giulia De Robert – FFF, FAO
- Marguerite France-Lanord – FFF, FAO
- Zoraya Gonzalez – FFF, FAO
- Sophie Grouwels – FFF, FAO
- Francesca Guarascio – FFF, FAO
- Tatiana Lebedeva – FFF, FAO
- Marco Perri – FFF, FAO
- Svea Senesie – FFF, FAO
- Laura Simeoni – FFF, FAO
- Jhony Zapata – FFF, FAO

FAO

- Hiroto Mitsugi – Assistant Director-General, Forestry Department, FAO
- Benjamin Davis – Strategic programme Leader, SP3, FAO
- Andrew Taber – Team Leader Social Forestry Team, FAO
- Jose Diaz Diaz – Forest Producer Organizations Officer, Social Forestry Team, Forestry Department, FAO
- Maria DeCristofaro, Forestry Department, FAO
- Tony Owusu - Forestry Department FAO (technical support)
- Roberto Cenciarelli – Forestry Department (photographs)
- Alberto Troilo – Communication for Development, ComDev, FAO
- Yuri Kumagai – Associate Professional Officer, Business Development and Resource Mobilization Division, FAO
- Olivera Luketic – Resource Mobilization, SP3 FAO

Resource partners/observers

- Kerstin Jonsson Cisse – Head, Global Programmes Unit, Sida, Sweden (Chair, FFF Donor Support Group)
- Katharina Backman – Desk Officer, Forest and desertification Policy, UNCCD National Focal Point, Unit for Sustainable Development and Climate Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland
- Satu Lassila – Permanent Representation of the Republic of Finland to the UN Organizations
- Neil Fourie - First Secretary and Agriculture Attache, DFID, United Kingdom (Rome)
- Marina Chalaby - Policy Officer, FCO United Kingdom(London)
- Johannes Petrus Hoogeveen – Ambassador Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the UN Organizations
- Ingeborg Leijtens – Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the UN Organizations
- Tommie Williams – Minister Counsellor for Agricultural Affairs, U.S. Department of Agriculture, United States Mission to the United Nations Agencies
- Bernhard Worm – Rural Development, Land Rights, Forests, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany

