

MAJOR GROUPS ENGAGEMENT IN THE UNFF: ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Background paper prepared for the MGPoF for Major Groups
Consultation in preparation for the UNFF 2017-2030 Strategic Plan
Development

Mahendra Joshi, PhD

5 SEPTEMBER 2016

Contents

ACRONYMS	2
1. Introduction	3
2. Background	4
2.1 Stakeholder participation and the evolution of MSD in UNFF.....	4
2.2 The post-2015 International Arrangement on Forests related to major groups and other stakeholders.....	8
3. Challenges and concerns on effective Major Groups engagement.....	10
3.1 An analysis of conclusions and recommendations of the Major Groups-led Initiatives (MGIs).....	10
Ghana MGI (26-30 July 2010, Accra, Ghana)	11
Rio MGI (18-22 March 2013, Rio De Janeiro, Brazil).....	12
Nepal MGI (2-6 March 2015, Kathmandu, Nepal)	13
3.2 Other relevant concerns/issues	15
4. Experiences from other UN and other related processes	18
5. Conclusions and recommendations.....	20
5.1 Conclusions	20
5.2 Recommendations	22
Documents and websites consulted	25
Annexes.....	27

ACRONYMS

B&I	Business and Industry Major Group
C&Y	Children and Youth Major Group
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CLI	Country-led Initiative in support of the UNFF
CSD	Commission for Sustainable Development
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
DESA UN	Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations
DSD	Division for Sustainable Development, DESA UN
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF-CSO	Global Environment Facility-Civil Society Network
HLPF	High-level political Forum on Sustainable Development
HLS	High-level Segment
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IGO	Intergovernmental Organization
IPs	Indigenous Peoples Major Group
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (World Conservation Union)
LA	Local Authorities Major Group
MG	Major Groups, as identified by Agenda 21
MGI	Major Groups-led Initiative in support of the UNFF
MGPoF	Major Groups Partnership on Forests
MGoS	Major Groups and Other Stakeholders
MYPOW	Multi-Year Programme of Work (of the UNFF)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NLBI	Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests (adopted by the UNFF)
OLI	Organization-led Initiative
Rio+20	United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (2012)
S&T	Science and Technology Major Group
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SP	Strategic Plan
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (the 1992 Rio Summit)
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UNFFS	United Nations Forum on Forests Secretariat
W&T	Workers and Trade Unions Major Group
WB	World Bank

1. Introduction

Participation of various non-State stakeholders in global forest policy process and national decision-making has been a core element of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF). It has adopted a number of resolutions to commit to a broader and more meaningful engagement of those stakeholders, as categorized by Agenda 21 into nine "major groups"¹. Accordingly, it has institutionalized a number of actions to promote major groups (MGs) involvement in UNFF, in particular, convening multi-stakeholder dialogues (MSD), soliciting inputs (e.g. MG discussion papers), and financial support for participation of MG representatives in the UNFF sessions and intersessional activities. It also has an open participation policy to the session deliberations, except in the closed negotiation sessions. However, the major groups, while appreciative of UNFF efforts, express their frustration at UNFF for its policy and programmes on public/stakeholder participation as insufficient, and even as superficial or "tokenism".

This paper presents an analysis of this very issue - the degree of involvement of major groups by UNFF and how it can be made more effective. For example, how sincere are the commitments expressed by its member States, what actions have been taken by them and the secretariat to make such engagement more serious and productive, what are the shortcomings as perceived by MGs, how do other bodies function and how does UNFF differ, who (which organizations) are the claimants of the representatives of different stakeholders, how widespread is the participation of the MGs, and what about other societal stakeholders, who do not fall under any of the "Agenda 21 Major Groups" groupings and are not represented, etc.

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (aka "Rio+20"), held in 2012 in Rio de Janeiro, underscored a need for participation by broader interest groups (stakeholders) in sustainable development beyond the current nine MG frameworks, and introduced a concept of "Major Groups and Other Stakeholders (MGoS), including local communities, volunteer groups and foundations, and migrants and families, as well as older persons and persons with disabilities. It committed to work more closely with MGoS, and encouraged their active participation as appropriate, in processes that contribute to decision-making, planning and implementation of policies and programmes for sustainable development at all levels (see paragraph 43 of its outcome document entitled, "Future We Want")². The follow-up process of Rio+20 culminated in the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by world leaders in UN Headquarters in September 2015. Moreover, in 2015, UNFF11 also agreed to extend the current international arrangement on forests (IAF), including UNFF, to 2030, with a number of institutional and programmatic changes to address the new global context. This new

¹ Business and Industry; Children and Youth; Farmers; Indigenous Peoples; Local Authorities; Non-governmental Organizations; Scientific and Technological Communities; Women; Workers and Trade Unions.

² UN General Assembly resolution 67/290 established "High-level Political Forum for Sustainable Development (HLPF) and dissolved the erstwhile "Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)".

development on forests is manifested as resolution 2015/33 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC).

Objective

Within this new global policy context, it is highly appropriate to take stock of past experiences both within and outside of UNFF, and build a better and more effective mechanism for stakeholder engagement in the next 15 years of the UNFF mandate. Thus the objective of this paper is to present an overview of the current state-of-play of major group engagement in UNFF, with an analysis of new trends and commitments, and to make a few strategic recommendations as thought-starters for UNFF stakeholders to consider. It is expected to serve as the background paper for the Major Groups Consultation in preparation for the UNFF Strategic Plan Development. The paper is prepared for the Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF).

Methodology and Limitations

The paper is based on a desk review of relevant UN documents on major group participation, including UNFF decisions and practices and the outcomes of three major groups meetings, commonly referred to as “Major Group-led Initiatives in support of the UNFF (MGIs)”.

Due to time constraints, no actual interactions with State and non-State stakeholders could be made and no first-hand data could be collected in preparing this report.

Structure of the paper

The paper is organized in the following way. The next section describes a background of UNFF and public participation, going back to its predecessor, the IPF/IFF process, and the CSD process and lessons learned. Section 3 deals with the feedback from UNFF MGs on their concerns and recommendations for improving major group engagement. It also describes the UN rules under which MGs participate. Section 4 describes how other international organizations and processes, including Conventions, have constituted stakeholder participation, and their comparative effectiveness.

The final section provides a few conclusions and recommendations to the stakeholder groups on practical and strategic actions to improve stakeholder engagement in the UNFF, enhancing partnerships at global, regional and national levels for sustainable forest management (SFM) while advocating group interests.

2. Background

2.1 Stakeholder participation and the evolution of Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue (MSD) in UNFF

When the UNFF was created in 2000, it inherited many of the practices from the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and the

Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF), including those related to involvement of non-State stakeholders concerned with forest issues. This is due to the fact that the IPF was established under the aegis of CSD in 1995 to further follow-up and conclude the inconclusive discussions at the Rio Summit in 1992 (UNCED 1992) on international forest policy issues, including the question of a legal framework on all types of forests. Since it was established under CSD (which itself was established as a functional commission of ECOSOC and governed by the related rules of procedure, it followed the norms and practices of CSD on the participation of States and non-State stakeholders. That practice continued with the establishment of IFF in 1997, again under CSD, to continue the work of IPF. On the recommendation of IFF at its fourth session in 2000, ECOSOC, through its resolution 2000/35, established a completely new international arrangement on forests (IAF), with UNFF as the main intergovernmental body, as a subsidiary body of ECOSOC and governed by the rules of procedure of its functional commissions.

The fundamental provisions on the engagement of non-State stakeholders were stipulated as follows:

- Stakeholders are those major groups as identified in Agenda 21;
- Major group participation is governed by the ECOSOC rules on non-governmental organizations (NGOs);
- Transparent and participatory practices of CSD, IPF and IFF to be continued;
- “Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue” (MSD) to be organized at each of UNFF sessions; and
- Inputs from MGs to be encouraged.

In response to the intent of ECOSOC Resolution 2000/35, UNFF’s first multi-year programme of work (MYPOW) for the period 2001-2005 made arrangements to engage major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, in the work of UNFF, among other means, by holding a MSD at each of its sessions. The resolution on MYPOW (1/1) also noted (para 27-33):

- The value of inputs from major groups associated with forest management at the national, regional and global levels;
- The value of MSD for furthering the purpose and objectives of the Forum, in particular the implementation of sustainable forest management (SFM), at the national, regional and global levels; and
- The importance of transparent and participatory practices, including multi-stakeholder participation at the national level, for implementing SFM.

Accordingly, the Forum invited the relevant stakeholders to contribute to discussions in each Forum session, including, *inter alia*, case study experience, and to promote balanced stakeholder participation of developed and developing countries.

The Forum requested the secretariat to work to expedite submission of applications for accreditation by major groups to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, in accordance with the relevant rules of procedure of the Council.

In preparing for a mechanism to formally engage with and plan for the MSD, the secretariat, in consultations with the CSD secretariat (Division for Sustainable Development) and its major group network, initiated development of a forest-relevant major group focal points system. Based on a series of consultations with the participants of NGOs and other stakeholders at the IPF and IFF sessions and the first session of UNFF, it built focal points for as many major groups as possible. It was not perfect (nor fully democratic), but was deemed necessary to have some sort of simple focal point system to facilitate the first MSD at UNFF2 in less than a year. UNFF used to convene its sessions annually and UNFF had to hold its first MSD at its second session in 2002 within a year of the adoption of the MYPOW in 2001. The MG participation process and related focal point mechanism are still evolving.

The Forum held the first multi-stakeholder dialogue as a stand-alone event at its second session in 2002, and consistently held such an event at each subsequent session except at the sixth session, due to the special circumstance and agenda it had to negotiate on the future of the IAF. Despite that, the major groups were actively involved in deliberations on those heavy agenda issues of UNFF6.

The outcome of UNFF6 resulted in ECOSOC resolution 2006/49, which extended the mandate of IAF (including UNFF) to 2015. Among many important elements of the resolution³, it further emphasized the importance of effective participation of and contribution from major groups in the work of UNFF.

Accordingly, when the UNFF7 developed the second UNFF MYPOW for the period 2007-2015, it continued the practice of MSD and participation of major groups in the work of UNFF. And the UNFF Secretariat continued its efforts for:

- Stronger coordination among major group focal points and between MG focal points and the secretariat
- Facilitating the organization of MG coordination opportunities and MGIs
- Ensuring MG participation in intersessional activities, including AHEGs and CLIs
- More coordinated and consolidated papers from MGs for stronger inputs and presentations of MG perspectives (compared to uncoordinated and disjointed separate discussion papers by each of the groups)

³ For example, the four global objectives of forests and to develop a non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests at UNFF7.

Table 1 provides a snapshot of MSDs organized at UNFF sessions (Please note that no MSD was organized at UNFF6 in 2006).

Table 1 Multi-stakeholder dialogues (2002-2015)

MSD #	Session/Dates	No. of slots/spacing	MGs not attending	MG papers	Additional information
<u>1</u>	UNFF2/4-15 March 2002	2 on 6 March	C&Y, Women, LA	2	
2	UNFF3/26 May-6 June 2003	2 on 27 May	LA	6	
3	UNFF4/3-14 May 2004	2 on 6 May and in WGs	LA	6	Held in two parts: a policy dialogue on the UNFF4 themes, followed by discussion on capacity-building and partnerships.
4	UNFF5/16-27 May 2005	No stand-alone MSD session	LA	8	MSD was integrated into the plenary discussions of all agenda items, including the high-level segment; A point-of-order was made by Cuba.
5	UNFF7/16-27 April 2007	2 on 18 and 23 April	LA and B&I	6	
6	UNFF8/20 April-1 May 2009	2 on 22 and 28 April	LA and B&I	5	
7	UNFF9/24 January - 4 February 2011	1 on 26 January	LA, B&I and W&T	3	
8	UNFF10/8-19 April 2013	1 on 10 April	LA	1	
9	UNFF11/4-15 May 2015	2 on 5 and 15 May	LA, B&I, W&T, and IPs	1	Integrated with other agenda items

2.2 The post-2015 International Arrangement on Forests related to major groups and other stakeholders

The deliberations at UNFF11 were intense, and were based on a report by the Secretary-General and a number of intersessional preparatory activities, including the two meetings of the Ad Hoc Expert Group (AHEG) on IAF, an independent external assessment by a team of international consultants, a Country-led Initiative (CLI) in China and a Major Group Initiative (MGI) in Nepal. The outcome of those intense deliberations was an acknowledgement of the continuing value and relevance of the Forum and other components of the IAF in the post-2015 world. The Forum agreed to extend the mandate and scope of IAF through 2030 with a number of concrete actions (subsequently adopted by ECOSOC as its resolution 2015/33).

In regard to enhanced, active and effective involvement of non-state stakeholders of society in the work of the IAF, the resolution aimed the future IAF, in particular the UNFF and CPF, to make sustained efforts to encourage active and continued engagement of major groups and other stakeholders in policy development, deliberations and implementations as partners.

ECOSOC resolution 2015/33 made references to “major groups and other stakeholders (MGoS)”⁴ in the following contexts:

- *The International arrangement on forests (IAF) involves MGoS as partners (paragraph 1(c)) and its objectives should be achieved through actions of, among others, MGoS as well (paragraph 2).*
- *The UNFF core functions include “strengthening high-level political engagement, with the participation of MGoS, in support of SFM (paragraph 3 (e)). It would also continue to operate according to the provisions specified in paragraph 4 (a) to (e) of ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 which has implications also to the major groups and other stakeholders (paragraph 5).*
- *The restructuring of sessions and intersessional work ..., including by fostering an exchange of experiences and lessons learned among countries, ..., non-governmental partners ... (paragraph 6(b)).*
- *The High-level segments will be convened, as required, during UNFF sessions (max. 2 days), which may include a partnership forum involving the heads of CPF member organizations and leaders from the private sector, philanthropic and civil society organizations and other major groups (paragraph 6 (d)).*

⁴ The resolution incorporated the terminology “major groups and other stakeholders” consistent with the Rio+20 outcome document and GA resolution 67/290. However, there is no consistency in the use of the term. For example, some other terms used to denote the stakeholders include: “private sector, philanthropic and civil society organizations and other major groups”, “major groups and other stakeholders” “non-governmental partners” and “relevant stakeholders”.

- The odd-year sessions would serve as an opportunity for the CPF and its member organizations, regional and sub-regional organizations and processes, MGoS to provide technical advice and input to the Forum (paragraph 6(g)(i)).
- The *UNFF Secretariat* would provide, upon request, technical support country-led initiatives and similar initiatives led by international, regional sub-regional organizations and processes, and major groups in support of the priorities of the Forum (paragraph 19(v)).
- *The UNFF Secretariat* would continue to liaise with and facilitate the participation and involvement of countries, organizations and MGoS in activities of the Forum, including intersessional activities (paragraph 17 (vi)).
- *The CPF and its member organizations* are encouraged to identify ways to actively involve MGoS in CPF activities (Paragraph 22 (d)).
- *Involvement of MGoS* (as a separate section of the resolution):
 - Recognizes the importance of the continued and enhanced participation of MGoS in the UNFF sessions and intersessional activities (Paragraph 29);
 - The provisions of operative paragraphs 14-16 of General Assembly resolution 67/290 apply *mutatis mutandis* to the UNFF (Paragraph 30);
 - Invites MGoS to enhance their contributions to the work of the IAF (Paragraph 31);
 - Invites member States to consider enhancing the participation and contributions of MGoS representatives in country-led initiatives (Paragraph 32); and
 - Requests the UNFF Secretariat to promote the involvement of MGoS in the work of the Forum in particular leaders from the private and non-governmental sectors, including forest industries, local communities and philanthropic organizations, and enhance the Forum's interaction with such stakeholders (Paragraph 33).
 - Invites views and proposals for the Strategic Plan (2017-2030) and the Quadrennial Programme of Work (2017-2020) from member States and relevant stakeholders (Paragraph 45).

In summary, the resolution has reaffirmed the importance of participation and contribution by MGoS to the work of the UNFF. It has deliberately expanded the scope of involvement of all relevant stakeholders, including philanthropic organizations, forest industries and local communities.

The resolution is silent on continuing the practice of multi-stakeholder dialogues. Instead, it decided to organize a partnership forum during the Forum sessions with the high-level segments, where it will involve the heads of the CPF member organizations and leaders from the private sector, philanthropic and civil society organizations and other major groups. During the odd-year sessions of the Forum, MGoS, along with the CPF and other organizations, will get an opportunity

to provide technical advice and input to the Forum. This is an important change in modality of interactions between UNFF and MGoS, considering the fact that the Forum sessions will be shorter (five days) but held annually.

3. Challenges and concerns on effective Major Groups engagement

The involvement of major groups with the UNFF for the past decade-and-a-half has been an enriching experience for both the intergovernmental body as well as forest-related stakeholders. The relationship is evolving with a number of positive experiences. But not all experiences are satisfactory, as with any relationship. This section highlights some of the concerns being raised by the major group partners related specifically to UNFF, followed by some general issues concerning the interaction between non-State stakeholders and the United Nations as a whole, including the now dissolved Commission for Sustainable Development.

3.1 An analysis of conclusions and recommendations of the Major Groups-led Initiatives (MGIs)

Major Groups involved with the UNFF organized three MGIs in past years for coordinating their preparations for upcoming UNFF sessions, as well as for reviewing their engagement with UNFF and strategizing for a more effective role in global forest policy frameworks for major groups. The summary below highlights the concerns related to their current engagement and recommendations for the future.

Ghana MGI (26-30 July 2010, Accra, Ghana)

Although this MGI was in preparation for UNFF2011, it had, by far, the most structured discussion on issues surrounding the major group (MG) participation in the work of the UNFF. It categorically discussed three themes: (i) representation of MGs in UNFF; (ii) the MSD process; and (iii) MG engagement during the intersessional periods. The guiding premises of its discussions were: (a) MG participation has been inconsistent, and (b) governance arrangement (decision-making, accountability, transparency, etc.) among the diverse interest groups will be the key to the future success of UNFF and re-engagement of MGs.

Key messages that emerged from the discussions are:

- (i) Representation:
 - a. Need more consultation processes at national levels between governments and MGs
 - b. Need more funding for consultations and representations
 - c. Need to build global and regional networks
 - d. Need to develop communication strategies.
- (ii) MSD process:
 - a. Current MSDs are very stale with little interaction between governments and MGs; lack of interest and seriousness.
 - b. Take tactical approaches prior to the UNFF sessions to make MSD more engaging.
- (iii) Intersessional engagement (most recommendations are directed to MGs themselves):
 - a. More local level engagement by MGs on SFM activities; governments should also involve MGs in national SFM-related activities
 - b. More consultations
 - c. More awareness-raising activities
 - d. Monitoring of the implementation of UNFI pilot projects, NTFP, etc.
 - e. Capacity-building
 - f. Funding for MG intersessional initiatives should be considered as part of forest financing discussion issues (directed to UNFF)

Rio MGI (18-22 March 2013, Rio De Janeiro, Brazil)

While most of the MG views were specifically in preparations for the MSD at UNFF10 (2013) and what their Groups would like to see in that MSD or what they would like UNFF/governments to do (e.g. greater representation, more funding, etc.), a few MG inputs showed broader strategic analyses and recommendations regarding the MG role in the UNFF process and in improving MSDs (for example, inputs from NGOs, IPs and Farmers MGs).

(i) Representation:

- a. Need more coordination with different organizations of your own MG (e.g. NGOs) from different countries, and develop common positions on UNFF outcomes
- b. Create an advisory group to UNFF, as well as an expert working group on specific group issues (e.g. forests and indigenous peoples)
- c. Solicit reports from governments on inclusion of MG-specific issues in national policies and programs (e.g. rights of indigenous peoples)
- d. Meet periodically (every two years) to assess implementation of UNFF policies

(ii) MSD:

- a. Too short a duration, low participation, symbolic only, and no clear link to the UNFF session outcomes
- b. Need to increase the time allocated to MSDs and participation of MG reps throughout the session period
- c. Increase funding to MG participation accordingly
- d. Create a mechanism for coordination between MGs, the CPF and the Bureau
- e. Conduct consultations at regional levels prior to UNFF sessions
- f. Develop common positions and a joint statement where possible, and individual Group statements for other issues.

Nepal MGI (2-6 March 2015, Kathmandu, Nepal)

Since this MGI was targeted at UNFF11 which was going to consider a future IAF, the discussions and outcome of this particular MGI was more on how to ensure a better role and space in the future IAF with a new body that could replace the current UNFF. (Note: UNFF11 eventually decided to continue the current IAF, including the UNFF through 2030).

(i) Representation/engagement:

- a. It was acknowledged that during the UNFF process, cooperation and coordination among MGs has drastically improved.
- b. However, MG engagement in the UNFF is being watered down and there is less real engagement (“tokenism”).
- c. MG’s interests and commitment on both policy development and implementation are strong.
- d. ECOSOC rules governing MG status and participation are inhibitive to full and constructive engagement of MGs in UNFF.
- e. Currently, there is no incentive for the MG on business and industry to engage with other MGs.

(ii) Specific recommendations:

- a. Recognize the Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF) as a legitimate coordinating body of MG involvement the in post-2015 UNFF process and give it a permanent observer status.
- b. Must involve MG representation at any working group, task force or other mechanism addressing SFM issues at the global, regional and national levels
- c. Increase financial support for MGs, including core funding for MGPoF
- d. MGs should have representation on the governing body of the new UN body on forests
- e. Create an independent mechanism for registering MGs wishing to participate in the sessions to avoid the limitations of the ECOSOC accreditation process
- f. Strengthen communication within and from the UNFFS, particularly with regard to understanding and championing the role of MGs.

The Nepal MGI recommended that the new UN body on forests should be responsible for the high political dialogue on SDGs on forest-related issues, and that Major Groups need to be part of the governing structure of the new UN body on forests. However, it is interesting to note that MGI remained silent about the development from the Rio+20 regarding the broader public participation, in particular, engaging stakeholders other than those in the nine MGs.

The outcome documents of the above three MGIs provided:

- In general, good analyses of forest issues, including on the promotion of SFM.
- Reasonably good justifications for enhanced involvement of MGs in UNFF (and its new post-2015 phase), CPF and SFM-related activities at national, regional and global levels.
- Potential role and contribution of MGs on forest issues, e.g. in (a) policy development (b) facilitating cost-effective implementation (e.g. *community-based forest management*) and (c) monitoring the implementation of SFM policies (e.g. fill the gap in government monitoring).

MG's recommendations included:

- Increase participation opportunities in any UNFF sessions and intersessional activities (as a “must do” thing)
- Increase funding for participation; consultations and collaboration among MGs; and county- and regional-level consultations within a MG or among the MGs
- Recognize MGPoF by UNFF as the central coordination body for MGs
- Provide significant funding for MGPoF
- Avoid ECOSOC rules on NGOS; Adopt an independent flexible rules/mechanism for MG participation in UNFF⁶

There are some concrete suggestions from some MGs, however. For example, recommendations for creating advisory groups, expert working groups, dedicated webpages for MGs within the UNFF website, country- and region-level consultations within a MG and among different MGs, and the potential role of MGs in monitoring actions on the ground.

The MGI report contained some other relevant and strategic “key points” that were raised by participants. One important point in relation to enhancing the engagement of and coordination between Major Groups relates to the Major Groups Partnership on Forests (MGPoF). The

⁶ This is not feasible in the current legal and institutional setup of the IAF and UNFF. As per ECOSOC resolution 2015/33, the UNFF will continue to be governed by the rules of procedure of its functional commissions and that related provisions of General Assembly resolution 67/290 apply *mutatis mutandis* to the UNFF.

participants emphasized a need to improve transparency and clarity of the MGPOF process and governance, which would clearly define what expanded role the Major Groups want the MGPOF to play and what structure and steps would be required for that.

In summary, most concerns and corresponding recommendations seem to be related to more funding, more representation and more attention by UNFF and governments on their interests and concerns. This is understandable, as those elements are crucial in enhancing stakeholder participation. The author felt that it would have been more forceful if the major groups also could have shed some light on governance and interactions among the organizations involved with the UNFF MG system, how they link between the global policy body and their respective national and regional constituencies. They could have presented some concrete cases and proposals on their actions on the ground in implementing UNFF decisions, the UN Forest Instrument and on promoting SFM, in general. Such a two-pronged approach would be more effective in advocating for more attention and resources from the Forum and governments for major groups. Another missing point is the missed opportunity to identify forest-relevant “other stakeholders”, as called for by the Rio+20, and consider ways to bring them in.

3.2 Other relevant concerns/issues

The paper by Adams and Pingeot (2013) had provided an excellent discussion on a number of concerns relating to the State and non-State interface in the context of CSD and the new HLPF. Most of those concerns are relevant to the UNFF context as well, not only because UNFF has been following the CSD interface model, but also because it has to operate under the overall framework of and contribute to the new 2030 Agenda, and the sustainable development and related SDGs and targets contained in that Agenda. In this context, it is worthwhile and essential for the Forum, its secretariat, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), and major groups and other relevant stakeholders to carefully consider those concerns and address them.

Some of the critical concerns raised in their paper that also are relevant to UNFF, and other relevant concerns/issues include the following (it is not an exhaustive list of concerns and some of the MG concerns are already captured in the MGI reports above):

Limitation of the concept of “Major Groups”

Often terms like “civil society,” “stakeholders”, “NGOs,” and “constituencies” are used interchangeably to refer to non-State actors, but the term “Major Groups” remains the more formal term used in the UN. However, while the nine categories of Major Groups helped organize civil society organizations for the past two decades, and established a social identity, it has also been seen by some as an “artificial” categorization. There has been a general feeling that this nine MG framework does not correctly and adequately provide space for many other legitimate interest groups or stakeholders concerned with sustainable development or other societal issues. For example, while Children and Youth have their Major Group, “elderly” do not have any such

Group. Furthermore, in the broader scheme of things, the nine major groups framework includes three distinct groups of stakeholder groupings: not-for-profit organizations, for-profit organizations (Business and Industry), and public sector organizations (Local Authorities). This often creates conceptual and operational tensions in the CSD, the UNFF and other bodies.

As mentioned earlier, the Rio 2012 outcome document broadened the concept of non-State actors by introducing a term “Major Groups and other Stakeholders (MGoS)”, and provided an indicative list of those “other stakeholders”. Paragraphs 14-16 of the UNGA resolution 67/290 on the High-level Political Forum (HLPF) stressed further enhancing the consultative role and participation of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders at the international level. It also indicated the examples of those “other stakeholders” as “private philanthropic organizations, educational and academic entities, persons with disabilities, volunteer groups and other stakeholders active in areas related to sustainable development, ...” Those paragraphs are to be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the UNFF. Therefore, the scope of participation by non-State actors or civil society organizations in the UNFF will be much wider in the coming days. While this is good in terms of recognition of currently unrecognized or dormant but forest-relevant groups in society, it would pose some challenges in identifying, organizing (including) and coordinating with such organizations/associations/groups, at least at the beginning.

It should also be noted that the 2030 Agenda which was launched by the world leaders in September 2015 (UNGA resolution 70/1) preferred to use terms “all stakeholders”, and “other stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector” rather than to be boxed into the “Major Group” framework. In fact, it used the term “the major groups and other relevant stakeholders” only once in the entire resolution (paragraph 89), affirming its support for the participation of those stakeholders in follow-up and review processes of the 2030 Agenda.

A few possible such groups relevant to forests and in the context of policies and programmes on sustainable forest management could be: recreational sports groups (e.g. hunters, hikers, etc.), local communities, and conservation organizations).

Representation vs. facilitation/lack of clarity and transparency

As with the CSD, UNFF has been using a mechanism of “Focal Points” for each Major Group (“Organizing Partners”, in the case of CSD) as the link between the UNFF and a multitude of national and local groups and organizations based around the world, and for coordination with other Major Groups at the global level. Because of their knowledge and experience at the global level, those focal points can help their constituencies navigate the often complicated and opaque rules of the intergovernmental processes and protocols. However, there are also two potential concerns about representation and transparency. Can a focal point representing a Major Group at UNFF truly represent the breadth and depth of interests of all lower level groups and organizations and is s/he willing or capable of widely disseminating information to constituencies and gathering feedback and ideas from the local, national and regional levels to the global level?

The authors opined that, without mechanisms to promote transparency and accountability, the engagement of only a limited number of actors can lead to undemocratic practices and concentration of power.

Limited engagement of people's movements

Related to the above concern is the practical difficulty in bringing grassroots people and communities to global processes like the Forum sessions. Thus, there is a risk that the Forum may not get direct input of people on the ground and the policies it adopts, and the programmes it implements may not incorporate the insights and proposals of those they are intended to support. Although bringing grassroots voices to the global forum is extremely difficult due to a wide range of institutional and financial constraints, the Forum and the major group representatives (focal points) should not shrug it off as an undoable task if the Forum wishes to remain relevant and valuable to common people. Therefore, it is important to make the available mechanisms and resources more effective and continue to explore innovative approaches. The focal points need to continue improving their interactions with their respective constituencies and the UNFF, and its member States provide support for capacity building of the focal points.

In this regard, it may be worthwhile to consider by the Forum and Major Groups the value of bringing in well-established large NGOs and civil society organizations. For some reason, after the establishment of UNFF, many global-level organizations (e.g. Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, and WBCSD) stopped attending the UNFF sessions. This should be examined. Likewise, the reasons for the Local Authorities Major Group to never participate in the UNFF process and the Business and Industry Major Group and Trade Union Major Group's lack of interest in UNFF indicate the perceived lack of value-added of the UNFF process

Participation vs. influence on the policy process (tokenism v. real engagement)

While Major Groups have been given opportunities to attend the Forum sessions and intersessional meetings, and to provide input into the process through discussion papers, multi-stakeholder dialogues, statements, side-events, etc., these provisions alone do not constitute real, meaningful and healthy engagement with the stakeholders outside of Governments and international organizations. The Major Groups involved with UNFF have been expressing their concerns (see the analysis on the MGI reports above) about the limited impact of their inputs on intergovernmental deliberations and the declining interest of Government delegations in MSDs.

On the other hand, some forest-related stakeholder groups do not find much relevance of the UNFF policy deliberations to their interests. As Chipeta (201) has noted, "UNFF discussions and decisions pose neither incentive nor threat to the economic interests of commercial private sector entities. In fora where decisions of economic significance or which create economic

opportunities, private sector attendance is high as exemplified by several MEAs⁶. Same can be said about the complete absence of the “Local Authorities” Major Group from the UNFF process.

Insufficient respect for expertise

Major Groups and civil society often feel that member States do not show true appreciation for what they do, nor to their expertise.

4. Experiences from other UN and other related processes

There is a growing recognition of the fact that:

- Perspectives and concerns from different segments of society enrich policies and programmes,
- Partnership and collective action between public and civil society organizations, the private sector, communities and groups are more likely to succeed, and
- Governments cannot do it alone or go alone if sustainability is sought.

UNEP has listed the following elements as the added value brought to the sustainable development process by Major Groups and other stakeholders (Adams & Pinget 2013):

- the perspectives they bring to the table
- the valuable research and advocacy functions they perform
- their capacity to raise public awareness and role in helping foster long-term, broad-based support for UNEP’s mission
- their role in disseminating relevant information effectively
- their capacity to implement UNEP’s work programme far beyond UNEP’s capabilities
- their capacity to adapt the global UNEP work programme to national or local realities
- their role as watchdogs to foster accountability

As a result, active public participation and stakeholder involvement in policy formulation, program implementation and monitoring and assessment of development interventions at national, regional and global levels are encouraged across the board, including on forests. All forest-relevant international organizations (inside or outside the UN system), including Conventions, have been keen on stakeholder engagement in their work.

Both the Adams and Pinget (2013) and McAlpine (2015) papers have provided pertinent information on how some of the prominent international organizations, institutions and instruments, both within and outside of the United Nations, have been promoting and managing interactions and cooperation with non-State actors such as NGOs, CSOs, and the private sector, and how prevalent is the use of the “Major Groups” framework of Agenda 21 in their working processes.

⁶ MEA: Multilateral Environmental Agreement

This section tries to collate/ synthesize this information, complemented by additional information from other organizations (e.g. the GEF) in regard to the working modalities of a few such organizations and instruments. The key points are highlighted below:

- No uniform mechanism or clear definition on who those civil society organizations, NGOs or non-State players are. Not all UN and other organizations use the term “Major Group” or use the “Major Groups” framework in interacting with civil society and private sector actors/stakeholders.
- CSD (now dissolved), UNFF and UNEP use the “Major Groups” framework in their work.
- MSD or MSD-like events are very limited. Only UNFF, CSD, UNEP, UNCCD organize such events.
- Participation of stakeholder groups are mostly in the form of sitting in “open” sessions, making oral and written statements, submitting discussion papers, participating in expert groups/task forces as experts, organizing side events or discussion forums, and in some cases, acting as implementing agencies of specific programs or projects.
- UNFCCC and UNCCD built on and/or are using to some extent the “Major Groups” framework in their interface with stakeholders.
- Due to heightened public awareness about climate change and its consequences, UNFCCC attracted the largest number of stakeholder groups and activists (as many as 1600 NGOs are admitted as “observers” to COPs). It has seen a proliferation of more specific sub-groups such as BINGOs, ENGOs, YOUNGOs, LGMAs, etc. based on environmental, economic, social and cultural interest groups.
- UN bodies established as subsidiary bodies of ECOSOC (such as UNFF) and even HLPF are governed by ECOSOC rules on NGOs.
- FAO has a similar rule on its engagement with NGOs. FAO does not use the “Major Groups” framework.
- Conventions have developed their own policies and procedures for engaging with stakeholders. Examples include prior accreditation by online registration, and partnership agreements.
- GEF uses its own system, known as the “GEF-CSO Network” in their interface with GEF-theme relevant CSOs. The Network has an elaborate governance arrangement with a global coordination committee, regional focal points and indigenous peoples’ representatives. As of October 2015, it has about 500 member organizations.
- UNCCD also uses the GEF-CSO Network.
- ITTO has identified two broader groups relevant to its work, namely, civil society and trade groups. Accordingly, it has established two separate advisory groups to efficiently and effectively interact with and to utilize expertise of those groups – the Trade Advisory Group (TAG) and Civil Society Advisory Group (CSAG). ITTO provides financial support for participation by those advisory groups.

- ILO, which deals with its three distinct constituencies - employers, workers and member States, relies on a tripartite system where trade organizations (workers), employers (private sector) and governments have equal voice in its deliberations.
- Very few organizations provide financial support for the participation of stakeholder group representatives to their sessions.
- As an obligation, a number of organizations and Conventions require quadrennial reports from each of the accredited organizations, to prove that they are active in the activities relevant to the work of the international organization or Convention. This is required to maintain their accreditation status. UNFF has not adopted such a requirement, as yet.
- In February 2016, a number of major groups and other stakeholder organizations active in sustainable development issues established an “MGoS HPF Coordination Mechanism” to facilitate coordination among, and promote the participation of, eleven stakeholders that are involved in the HLPF process and want to contribute to it.

Among the organizations reviewed, all UN bodies and Rio Conventions (CSD, HLPF, UNEP, UNFF, UNCCD, UNFCCC and CBD) apply the “Major Groups” framework to a varying extent; some in full like CSD, UNEP and UNFF, while others like the Rio Conventions, as a starting point.

ECOSOC NGO rules are applied in CSD, UNEP and UNFF and a comparable set of rules by FAO to manage accreditation and participation of CSOs. Other organizations (GEF, WB, and ITTO) have developed their own systems. Conventions seemed to have developed their own system building on the UN and other models (e.g. UNCCD utilizes GEF-CSO Network and accepts ECOSOC accredited organizations).

While the realization of a need to ensure participation of many other relevant stakeholder groups has been made at the highest political level (i.e., Rio+20 and the 2030 Agenda), the corresponding rules of engagement and incentive mechanism to attract a wide variety of stakeholder groups in the sustainable development process are yet to come. In the context of the Rio+20 and the 2030 Agenda, UNEP is trying to amend its policy on enhanced engagement of all relevant stakeholders. However, even after repeated discussions by two sessions of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA), no agreement has been reached.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Over the last one-and-a-half decades, MG involvement in the work of the UNFF has evolved significantly. Since its establishment, UNFF has adopted the “Major Groups, as identified in Agenda 21”, framework in establishing a channel for interaction with civil society organizations, the private sector and other non-State players with an interest and stake in forest issues.

Forest-related MGs have gained significant experiences and capacity in organizing and interacting on global forest issues. They have been relatively successful in developing a coordination mechanism among different Major Groups. However, their success in bringing all nine MGs into

the UNFF process is limited. This is not just a failure of the MGs currently active in UNFF, but also a weakness of the whole UNFF process, including Governments and the secretariat.

UNFF was, perhaps, the second UN body (after CSD) in institutionalizing the multi-stakeholders dialogue (MSD) at its sessions since UNFF2 in 2002, to promote interactions between Government and a range of stakeholders from different segments of society. MSD has proved to be a major endeavour of the Major Groups involvement in the UNFF process. The MG focal points and the Secretariat have invested substantial amount of energy in organizing MSDs. Major Groups' inputs to the UNFF in the form of discussion papers, interventions in the Forum sessions and intersessional events have been substantial and noted by Governments. In recent years, its successful organization of MGIs and periodic consultation meetings prior to the UNFF sessions have improved the level of preparation and focused contribution to the UNFF work.

One of the MG complaints is the insufficient time allocated to MSD, and lack of interest from member States for serious dialogue. This problem will most likely continue and may even be exacerbated in the new working modality of UNFF, according to which the UNFF will meet annually but for a maximum of one week. Thus, the issue now is to pay more attention on how to improvise on the interaction mechanism available in the new UNFF working modalities.

UNFF was bound to follow the rules of ECOSOC on NGOs, and will continue to remain so. Nevertheless, depending on the leadership of the Bureaus and secretariat, UNFF has continued to push the envelope further, sometimes with success, to different degrees. This included raising funds for MG consultations, participation support and organizing MG-exclusive events such as the MGIs.

On the other hand, it is also being felt by both MGs and several member States that MG engagement has limited impact on the global policy process, as well as in mobilizing support for SFM on the ground. The potential of MGs have not been fully tapped. Some of the few critical factors for such a state of affairs include the following:

- Insufficient funding and other support for consultation, coordination and participation by MGs.
- Restrictive rules for getting accreditation (consultative status) have inhibited active and effective engagement by MGs. This has dampened the enthusiasm of MG organizations and raised doubts about the commitments of Governments to genuine participation.
- Question on whether participating MGs truly and effectively represent their constituencies and whether there is full transparency in their respective governance.
- UNFF has failed or did not fully entice all nine MGs in its process. Thus, neither the voices from "Local Authorities", "Business and Industry" and "Workers and Trade Unions" Major Groups, as well as other important segments of society, could be heard nor their support be mobilized for the UNFF.

The establishment of a new High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) in 2013, and the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with 17 SDGs and 169 targets by the International Community, have provided a transformative impetus on the post-2015 global development paradigm. The outcome of UNFF11 on the new IAF beyond 2015 has aligned the mandate and working modalities of the UNFF and its interactions with the stakeholders with those landmark global developments.

Three important changes related to the UNFF-stakeholder interface should be noted:

- (i) Expansion of the scope of interactions beyond the Major Groups framework to “Major Groups and Other Stakeholders” (MGoS)
- (ii) While the value of such interactions and contributions from MGoS is well-recognized and more engagement is encouraged, it has also been underscored that UNFF is an intergovernmental body and it would be operating under the existing rules of procedure of functional commissions. This means UNFF and MGoS interactions will continue to be governed by ECOSOC rules on NGOs.
- (iii) The new working modalities of the Forum have no clear provision for MSD, as was in the past. The UNFF will have one-week long annual sessions, some of which may have a two-day high-level segment (HLS), on an as-needed basis. During the HLS, a partnership forum will be organized involving the leaders of the MGoS organizations and heads of the CPF member organizations. Although during the odd-year sessions, MGoS, CPF and other organizations will have opportunity to provide technical advice and inputs, it is clear that the format and time allocation for MGoS will be dramatically different from the previous sessions of UNFF.

5.2 Recommendations

Recommendations in relation to the new developments:

- Consider improving the network of MGoS for forests, develop criteria for engagement, especially for new “other stakeholder” groups (some potential new stakeholders could be poverty- and conservation-focused philanthropic organizations, forest-based sporting groups, and educational and research entities).
- Start thinking strategically on how to make MGoS contributions visible, useful and value-added in the new context. This is especially important in the context of UNFF sessions having less time per session and finding a prominent space at the High-level Segment (HLS) and partnership forum.
- Start working on modalities of the Partnership Forum, which will take place during the sessions with HLS. How to define a Partnership Forum and make best use of it rather than merely imitating others?

- The Partnership Forum could be made a more interesting, engaging and powerful event by bringing eminent personalities from among stakeholder groups such as NGOs, foundations, businesses, scientists, and mayors, to provide their perspectives on current issues relevant to the UNFF.
- Develop a Strategic Plan of its own, or link it to the IAF Strategic Plan that is being developed, and create provisions for MGoS organizations to play a more substantive role in the work of the UNFF, including to become implementing agencies for appropriate implementation activities.

Recommendations related to the concerns of MGs

- Encourage MGoS organizations currently involved and/or willing to get involved in the UNFF process to seek ECOSOC status. It is not known how many of the MGs currently involved in UNFF already have ECOSOC status or have applied for the status, and what kinds of challenges they faced in getting accreditation from ECOSOC. The MGoS focal points and the Secretariat should jointly analyze the challenges and consult with the Bureau for finding solutions.
- Learn best practices from other IGOs such as GEF, and adapt and adopt.
- MGPoF may play a role of a central platform for all MGoS, if the stakeholders so wish. It should be a bottom-up approach, not something to be imposed from the top. It's institutional and governance arrangement should be democratic and transparent. Nevertheless, it will have to gain accreditation from ECOSOC, if it wants to have a formal voice.

Generic recommendations

- The MGoS focal points should do some internal brainstorming and launch a white paper or a series of activities to demonstrate their role, value and potential for the promotion of SFM, and logically present their legitimate demands. Consider what soul-searching the groups may also need to do, other than merely demanding more participation, more funding, and more space in policy-making. Demonstrate what the MGoS do and can do for SFM at local to global levels, and how they can bring knowledge, concerns and voices of different stakeholders to the global body.
- Make efforts to connect with forest-related and relevant CSOs involved in other *fora*. There are many active and well-organized CSOs, private sector organizations/associations

and local government associations that are active in other global and regional processes but are somehow not connected with the UNFF process. It is ironic that some of the influential NGOs (such as Greenpeace and the Sierra Club) stopped participating in UNFF sessions.

- UNFF sessions and intersessional activities are and will always be of limited time and space, and their primary focus will remain on intergovernmental issues. Thus, while seeking more space and resources should be pursued as a tactical matter, it may also be wiser to balance the energy of MGoS between tactical and practical matters. The MGoS should also utilize the UNFF platform for engagement to develop, expand and strengthen a network (or networks) of forest-related civil society, the private sector, rights groups, research and academic entities, recreational associations, city mayors and other stakeholders to promote SFM, to prevent unsustainable and unlawful practices in forests and remain vigilant.

Documents and websites consulted

Documents

Adams Barbara and Pinget, Lou. June 2013. "Strengthening Public Participation at the United Nations for Sustainable Development, Dialogue, Debate, Dissent, Deliberations." A paper Commissioned by UNDESA/DSD Major Groups.

Chipeta, Mafa. 2015. Institutional Framework of the UN ECOSOC: the Case of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF). A paper prepared for the Major Groups Partnership on Forests for the

McAlpine, Jan. August 2015. "Background Paper: Review of the Provisions and Arrangements of 10 Intergovernmental Organizations for Involving Major Groups and Other Stakeholders." A paper

Major-Group Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum. Applying sustainable forest management to poverty reduction: strengthening the multi-stakeholder approach within the United Nations Forum on Forests. Summary report of the major groups-led initiative in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests, Accra, 26-30 July 2010. **{Ghana MGI}**

Major Groups-Led Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests. Forests and Economic Development: Crafting the Path for Forests to Contribute to Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. 18-22 March, 2013. Report of Workshop Proceedings. **{Rio MGI}**

Major-Group Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests Sustainable Forest Management: Designing the Vehicles for Securing the Means of Implementation. Kathmandu, Nepal. 2-6 March, 2015. **{Nepal MGI}**

UN Resolutions

ECOSOC Resolution 2000/35.

ECOSOC Resolution 2006/49.

ECOSOC Resolution 2015/33.

General Assembly Resolution 66/288.

General Assembly Resolution 67/290.

General Assembly Resolution 70/1.

UNFF Reports

UNFF 2001. Report of the organizational and first session (E/2001/42/Rev.1; E/CN.18/2001/3/Rev.1)

UNFF 2002. Report of the second session (E/2002/42; E/CN.18/2002/14)

UNFF 2003. Report of the third session (E/2003/42; E/CN.18/2003/13)

UNFF 2004. Report of the fourth session (E/2004/42; E/CN.18/2004/17)

UNFF 2005. Report of the fifth session (E/2005/42; E/CN.18/2005/18)

UNFF 2006. Report of the sixth session (E/2006/42; E/CN.18/2006/18)

UNFF 2007. Report of the seventh session (E/2007/42; E/CN.18/2007/8)

UNFF 2009. Report of the eighth session (E/2009/42; E/CN.18/2009/20)

UNFF 2011. Report of the ninth session (E/2011/42; E/CN.18/2011/20)

UNFF 2013. Report of the tenth session (E/2013/42; E/CN.18/2013/18)

UNFF 2015. Report of the eleventh session (E/2015/42; E/CN.18/201/14)

Websites

1. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) – <https://www.cbd.int/>
2. Division for Sustainable Development - <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/majorgroups>
3. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, Forestry Department - <http://www.fao.org/forestry>
4. GEF-CSO Network - <http://www.gefcso.org/index.cfm>
5. The International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) - <http://www.itto.int/>
6. NGO Branch, UN DESA - <http://csonet.org/?menu=100>
7. UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) - <http://www.unccd.int/>
8. UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) - <http://unfccc.int/2860.php>
9. United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) - <http://www.unep.org/civil-society/>
10. United Nations Forum on Forests - UNFF. [www/un/org/esa/forests](http://www.un.org/esa/forests)

Annexes

Annex 1. The paragraphs related to the major groups and other stakeholders from the General Assembly Resolution 67/290.

Format and organizational aspects of the high-level political forum on sustainable development

[Note: paragraphs 14-16 below apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Forum, as per ECOSOC resolution 2015/33]

8. Decides that the forum, under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council, shall conduct regular reviews, starting in 2016, on the follow-up and implementation of sustainable development commitments and objectives, including those related to the means of implementation, within the context of the post-2015 development agenda, and further decides that those reviews:

(a) Shall be voluntary, while encouraging reporting, and shall include developed and developing countries, as well as relevant United Nations entities;

(b) Shall be State-led, involving ministerial and other relevant high-level participants;

(c) Shall provide a platform for partnerships, including through the participation of major groups and other relevant stakeholders;

(d) Shall replace the national voluntary presentations held in the context of the annual ministerial-level substantive reviews of the Council, building upon the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 61/16 of 20 November 2006, as well as experiences and lessons learned in this context;

13. Acknowledges the importance of the regional dimension of sustainable development, and invites the United Nations regional commissions to contribute to the work of the forum, including through annual regional meetings, with the involvement of other relevant regional entities, major groups and other relevant stakeholders, as appropriate;

14. Stresses the need for the forum to promote transparency and implementation by further enhancing the consultative role and participation of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders at the international level in order to make better use of their expertise, while retaining the intergovernmental nature of discussions, and in this regard decides that the forum shall be open to the major groups, other relevant stakeholders and entities having received a standing invitation to participate as observers in the General Assembly, building on arrangements and practices observed by the Commission on Sustainable Development, including Economic and Social Council decision 1993/215 of 12 February 1993 and Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, which shall be applicable to the forum;

15. Decides, in this regard, that, while retaining the intergovernmental character of the forum, the representatives of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders shall be allowed:

- (a) To attend all official meetings of the forum;
- (b) To have access to all official information and documents;
- (c) To intervene in official meetings;
- (d) To submit documents and present written and oral contributions;
- (e) To make recommendations;

(f) To organize side events and round tables, in cooperation with Member States and the Secretariat;

16. Encourages the major groups identified in Agenda 21 and other stakeholders, such as private philanthropic organizations, educational and academic entities, persons with disabilities, volunteer groups and other stakeholders active in areas related to sustainable development, to autonomously establish and maintain effective coordination mechanisms for participation in the high-level political forum and for actions derived from that participation at the global, regional and national levels, in a way that ensures effective, broad and balanced participation by region and by type of organization;

Annex 2. Basic Facts about ECOSOC Status

NGO Branch, DESA

<http://csonet.org/?menu=100>

Before your organization decides to apply for consultative status with ECOSOC, please consider the following basic facts

- Currently, 4,189 NGOs enjoy active consultative status with ECOSOC. [See list as of 1 September 2014, PDF.](#)
- There are three types of consultative status: General, Special and Roster. Most new accreditations are in the Special category.
- Consultative status provides NGOs with access to not only ECOSOC, but also to its many subsidiary bodies, to the various human rights mechanisms of the United Nations, ad-hoc processes on small arms, as well as special events organized by the President of the General Assembly. See News and Events for samples.
- ECOSOC accreditation is separate and distinct from NGOs who are associated the UN Department of Public Information (DPI). See list of DPI-associated NGOs [here](#). See website [here](#).
- You can sort and review all NGOs with ECOSOC consultative status in an online database. [Access the database here.](#)
- General and special status NGOs are required to submit a 'quadrennial report' every four years. [Learn more.](#)
- The Committee on NGOs reviews new applications for consultative status twice a year, in January ('regular session') and in May ('resumed session').
- The Committee does not decide but recommends. These recommendations, contained in one report for the January session and one report for the May session, are reviewed by ECOSOC in April and July respectively. [See past reports here.](#)
- In most cases, ECOSOC decides to approve the recommendations. In very rare cases, it does not.
- The deadline for applications is 1 June of the year before the Committee reviews the application. Therefore the upcoming deadline for new applications is **1 June 2016**. The Committee will review those applications in 2017.

(Website accessed date: 24 August 2016)

Annex 3. UNFF Major Group Focal Points

(Source: <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/major-groups/focal-points/index.html>)

<i>Major Group</i>	<i>Focal Point</i>	<i>Alternate Focal Point</i>
Children and Youth	<p><u>International Forestry Students' Association</u> *</p> <p>Ms. Anna Stemberger The University of British Columbia Vancouver BC, Canada Email: annastem.ifs@gmail.com</p>	<p>Ms. Olivia Sanchez Badini Email: olivia.ifs@gmail.com</p>
Business and Industry	<p><u>World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)</u></p> <p>Mr. Matthew Reddy Email: reddy@wbcsd.org</p>	<p>Ms. Uta Jungermann Email: jungermann@wbcsd.org</p>
Forest Workers and Trade Unions	<p><u>Building and Wood Workers' International (BWI)</u> *</p> <p>Ms. Jin Sook Lee Building and Wood Workers' International Carouge, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 827 3784 Email: jinsook.lee@bwint.org</p>	
Indigenous Peoples	<p><u>International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests</u></p> <p>Mr. Hubertus Samangun Jakarta, Indonesia Tel: +62 21 632 7559 E-mail: hsamangun@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Mr. Marcial Arias Kuna Peoples Leader of Panama Email: ariasmarcial@gmail.com</p>
Local Authorities	Not Available	
Non-Governmental Organisations	<p>Friends of Siberian Forests</p> <p>Dr. Andrei Laletin Krasnoyarsk-36, Russia Tel: +7 3912 498404 Email: laletin3@yahoo.com</p> <p><u>Major Groups Partnership on Forests</u></p> <p>Mr. Lambert Okrah Ottawa, Canada Tel: +1-613-236-4763 Email: lambert@mgp-forests.org</p>	

Farmers and Small Forest Landowners	Canadian Federation of Woodlot Owners Mr. Peter De Marsh, Taymouth, New Brunswick, Canada E-mail: grandpic@nbnet.nb.ca Global Alliance of Community Forestry Mr. Ghan Shyam Pandey Kathmandu, Nepal Tel: +977 1 4485263 Email: pandeygs2002@yahoo.com	
Scientific and Technological Community	<u>Asia Pacific Association of Forestry Research Institutions</u> Mr. Gan Kee Seng c/o Forest Research Institute Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia Tel: +60 3 6279 7007 Email: latif@frim.gov.my Forestry Network of Sub-Saharan Africa Mr. Joseph Cobbinah Kumasi, Tel: +233-24440560; +233-5160646; +233-5161378 Email: jrcobbinah@yahoo.co.uk	
Women	African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests Ms. Cecile Ndjebet Email: cndjebet@yahoo.com	

*These organizations have consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council.