



## Presentation on IAF MTR draft Assessment on Involvement of Regional And Subregional Partners

Mafa E. Chipeta

UNFF Expert Group meeting | January 2023 | Bangkok

1

## MTR PURPOSE AND CONTENTS

**PURPOSE:** Assessment is input into 2024 UNFF MTR of IAF effectiveness. Focuses on regional/subregional partners (RSRPs) engagement with IAF. Report highlights engagement facts & analysis and views on effectiveness.

- **Introduction and Methodology**
- **Analysis and Findings**
  - *Profiling Regional/subregional organisations*
  - *Main post-2015 developments regarding their involvement*
  - *Other Related Findings*
- **Conclusions and Recommendations**



2

## INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY I

- MTR mandate - paras 28-31 of ECOSOC resolution 2022/17
- IAF desire to engage RSRPs & other non-governmental entities:
  - *strongly emphasised in ECOSOC Res 2015/33 & often encouraged by ECOSOC and UNFF sessions*
  - *Methodology involved access to & analysis of information from many sources (next slide)*
  - *Report combines presentation of factual information and consultant interpretation*
- Bangkok January 2023 Expert Group Meeting (EGM) needs to react clearly:
  - *to the analysis*
  - *to its conclusions and recommendations*



3

## INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY II

- Information sources:
  - *UNFF and related websites,*
  - *Responses to UNFF 2020 questionnaires to RSRPs,*
  - *The few responses to this MTR's questionnaires,*
  - *Comments/exchanges with UNFFS on successive report drafts*
- Regrettably, only 15 responses to this assessment's specific questionnaires, of which:
  - *9 from Member States and 5 from RSRPs themselves*



4

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS I

- **As evidenced by participation in UNFF sessions and intersessional meetings, RSRPs engagement has been regular, with considerable distribution among regions**
- **For all findings of the assessment, EGM participants to consider how best to seek fuller synergies among themselves as RSRPs of the IAF:**
  - *some are intergovernmental,*
  - *others professional,*
  - *some forest-focused others pan-sectoral,*
  - *some focus on upstream policy/strategy, others on action or combine policy to action*
  - *they face different levels of funding challenges*



5

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS II: PROFILING RSRPs-1

- **Main mission:** *to serve own constituencies, with IAF/UNFF engagement a complement; IAF/UNFF helps networking to access global priorities and experience for domestication.*
- **Geographical:** *UNFF is engaging RSRPs from all regions and forest cover types.*
- **Among largest forests,** *interaction level currently weakest for South East Asia and massive Eurasian temperate forests*
- **Diversity:** *Focus-policy dialogue vs. field action vs. both;*
- *intergovernmental (esp. with 5 FAO Regional Forestry Commissions) vs forest units in pan-sectoral orgs vs. free standing forest-focused RSRPs;*
- **No sign of RSRPs development bank or private sector entities among them.**



6

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS III: PROFILING RSRPs-2

- **Coordination:** *the RSRPs have no shared or deliberately synergised workplans.*
- **Collective Proposals** - at past EGMs, RSRPs jointly proposed:
  - *periodicity & content of UNFF; regional focus segments at annual UNFF sessions; coordination of inputs to HLPF; and action on funding challenges.*
- **Financial independence:** *the non-intergovernmental ones struggle to fund even meetings' participation. High donor dependency.*



7

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS IV: MAIN POST-2015 ENGAGEMENTS WITH UNFF

- **Policy Dialogue:**
  - *Ever-present at UNFF formal sessions (part reciprocated by UNFFS) for oral & written inputs;*
  - *also present at high-level events and intersessional events;*
  - *Attend Expert Group Meetings (EGMs) & similar; Some RSRPs prepare Member State delegations for UNFF and other MEA conference sessions;*
  - *Funding challenges may create some imbalance between developed/developing regions at policy fora.*



8

### ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS III: *OTHER RELATED FINDINGS*

- Compared to RSRPs/UNFF policy dialogue engagement, field SFM action is not prominently reported;
- High tropical forest RSRP entities more prominently report on field SFM action: but they face financing constraints, especially in the Congo Basin;
- The main progress gaps listed in The Global Forest Goals Report 2021 can help RSRPs direct field action efforts better (especially if future issues include regional focus themes).



9

### CONCLUSIONS I

- In RSRP/IAF-UNFF engagement, “success or otherwise” cannot be easily measured in “soft” areas of policy dialogue, awareness-raising, mindset improvements, strategy;
- Success is more easily measurable for field SFM action but so far this is not done enough and is inadequately reported upon;
- Being very diverse in constituency, mandate and geography, RSRPs may not easily adopt a joint work plan BUT even for UNFF-related activities they also lack mutual synergised prioritisation of what they do or synergy with key player CPF.



10

## CONCLUSIONS II

- Most forests work by RSRPs is for their own constituencies and some external activities are NOT under IAF but non-IAF frameworks e.g. climate, biodiversity, land restoration etc;
- The RSRPs suggestions to have focus UNFF session segments on their regions has not yet been acted upon; nor have opportunities been seized for RSRPs sponsored initiatives to focus on their top concerns;
- Funding for RSRP SFM action (sometimes also for meeting attendance) is problematic from traditional sources especially for non-intergovernmental RSRPs.



11

## RECOMMENDATIONS I

- On UNFF Policy Dialogue, RSRPs should consider launching “Regional/subregional-led UNFF initiatives” that focus on regions in rotation and feed in-depth findings into the Forum and undertake related steps in Section IV.2 of the report;
- On Establishment or strengthening of RSRP processes/platforms for SFM forest policy:
  - *Consider building upon FAO regional Forestry Commissions and other platforms to collaborate more in mutual planning and prioritisation of their work with the IAF/UNFF;*
  - *Collectively develop/strengthen practical SFM programmes in their respective regions and attract increased funding from corporate regional or subregional financial institutions, such as regional development/investment banks. If UNFF rules on working with Major Groups prove insurmountable, do this for SFM under other other umbrellas such as climate change, biodiversity etc.*



12

## RECOMMENDATIONS II

Regarding further involvement of RSRPs in UNFF work, as recommendations list is too long to summarise effectively, study and prioritise the list in Para 80. Among these, react to:

- *Find ways for regional and subregional partners to advocate inclusion of region-specific chapters in future issues of The Global Forest Goals Report, to offer in-depth diagnosis for successive regions;*
- *Discover how best to attract the private sector (including regional development banks) to give its financial and operational muscle to the work grouping (not necessarily to be RSRP members)*
- *Consider creating full-time fundraising capacities but where funding comes from the banking community, private sector, or philanthropic donors (which may have own forests frameworks) perhaps avoid insisting that they operate under the UNFF umbrella*
- *Implement the fuller recommendations in the report and consider initiating UNFF "Regional partner-led initiatives" to define steps forward on the above and other key recommendations in the report.*



13



# Thank You!

A copy of this PPT is available on the UNFF website at:  
[www.un.org/esa/forests/events/unff-egm-bangkok-2023/index.html](http://www.un.org/esa/forests/events/unff-egm-bangkok-2023/index.html)

14