

Preparations for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF)

Assessment on actions related to the involvement of Major Groups and other relevant stakeholders

Mafa E. Chipeta

December 2022

Assessment report prepared for the UN Forum on Forests

Through its resolution 2022/17, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), based on the outcome of the seventeenth session of the UN Forum on Forests, decided that the Forum would undertake extensive intersessional activities in preparation for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF). The resolution called for these actions to be implemented in a transparent and independent manner, and in close consultation with Members of the Forum, as well as the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) member organizations and other relevant stakeholders.

To facilitate this process, the Forum Secretariat hired consultants to assist in the preparation of background papers and assessments. These assessments and outcomes of preparatory intersessional work related to the midterm review, will be submitted to the open-ended intergovernmental ad hoc expert group on the preparations for the IAF-MTR, which will be convened in late 2023.

The views and opinions expressed in the assessment reports are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Secretariat. The designations and terminology employed may not conform to United Nations practice and do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Organization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Page
LIST OF ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
I. INTRODUCTION	10
II. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	11
III. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FROM COLLECTED INFORMATION	12
<i>III.1 UNFF COMMITMENT TO PARTNERING WITH THE MAJOR GROUPS AND EFFORTS ACTIONS TO MAKE IT WORK</i>	13
<i>III.2 MAIN DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 2015 REGARDING THE INVOLVEMENT OF MAJOR GROUPS</i>	15
III.2.1 Engagement In UNFF Dialogue	17
III.2.2 Engagement in Field Implementation of SFM and Ancillary Promotional Support	19
<i>III.2.2.1 Overview</i>	20
<i>III.2.2.2 Basis for Follow-up to the Pro-Action Commitment of Major Groups</i>	22
<i>III.2.2.3 Practical Major Groups Actions on Record</i>	23
<i>III.2.2.4 Possible Partnerships with Private Sector Groupings</i>	25
<i>III.2.2.5 Funding Source Possibilities</i>	27
<i>III.2.2.6 What Prospects Specifically for Philanthropies as Funding Partners?</i>	29
<i>III.3 MAJOR GROUPS ATTRIBUTES AND FUNCTIONS RELEVANT TO THEIR UNFF ENGAGEMENT</i>	32
III.3.1 Diversity with Unity among Major Groups	34
III.3.2 Major Groups Governance for Coordination and Operational Performance	35
III.3.3 The Agenda for cooperation with others	39
<i>III.3.4 Mobilising Finance</i>	40
<i>III.4 FEEDBACK THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES</i>	42
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	42
<i>IV.1 CONCLUSIONS</i>	42
<i>IV.2 RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	43
LIST OF TABLES:	
Table 1: Questionnaire responses as of end November 2022	12
Table 2: Major Group Interventions in Report to UNFF16 and UNFF17	24
Table 3: Interest Areas for the World Business Council for Sustainable Development - Forest Solutions Group (FSG)	26
LIST OF BOXES:	
Box 1: UNFF Exhortations to Engage Major Groups and other relevant Stakeholders in IAF work	14
Box 2: Major Groups Proposals to UNFF for Better Collaboration	15
Box 3: Forests and the planted tree industry – a Brazilian example	27
Box 4: Illustrative Possible Funding sources for Major Groups that work with the UNFF	27
Box 5: OECD-Profile of private philanthropy for development	29
Box 6: Key Philanthropies-related Messages from questionnaire responses	30

<u>Box 7</u> : The Bezos Earth Fund – Nature Solutions engagement in Forests	31
<u>Box 8</u> : Suggestions of the Major Groups on Major Groups roles under international arrangement on forests	33
<u>Box 9</u> : MGs/Civil Society actions to institutionalize participation in SFM and avoid predominantly casual/ad hoc approaches	34
<u>Box 10</u> : Major groups governance, Procedures (Example of Children and Youth (MGCY)) – with Coordination Arrangements Included	36
<u>ANNEXES:</u>	
<u>Annex 1</u> : MAJOR GROUP CONTACTS FOR THE SECTION J QUESTIONS	46
<i>Annex 1 (a) : MAJOR GROUPS QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION</i>	46
<i>Annex 1 (b): COVER NOTE FOR THE CONSULTANT COMPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE</i> [03 October 2022]	47
<i>Annex 1(c): FOLLOW-UP ON QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES FROM A SAMPLING OF REGIONAL/SUBREGIONAL PARTNERS</i>	48
<u>Annex 2</u> : POST 2015 EVENTS CO-ORGANISED BY MAJOR GROUPS AND UNFF	49
<u>Annex 3</u> : QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES RECEIVED ABOUT MAJOR GROUPS	51
REFERENCES	67

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
EGM	Expert group meeting
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FRA	(FAO) Forest Resources Assessment
GFFFN	Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network
GFG	Global Forest Goal
HLRT	High-Level Round Table
HLPF	High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
IFFA	International Family Forestry Alliance
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organizations
MG	Major Group
MGI	Major Groups-led Initiative
MGoS	Major Groups and other Stakeholders
MTR	Medium Term Review
POW/PoW	Programme of Work (of the UNFF)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
UN	United Nations
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UNFFS	Secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNSPF	United Nations Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-2030

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This is the report of Assessment “J”; it is one of 10 reports prepared by consultants as part of preparations for the UNFF’s Midterm Review in 2024 of the effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF) in meeting its objectives, as set out in paragraphs 28-31 of ECOSOC resolution 2022/17 on the “Outcome of the seventeenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests”¹. The annex to the resolution elaborates actions to be undertaken in 10 assessment areas, A to J. This report on section J of the annex looks at “Actions related to the major groups and other stakeholders”; it has been prepared by Mafa Chipeta.
2. The report comes against the backdrop of persistent action by the United Nations Forum on Forests (the Forum) to collaborate with relevant Major Groups and other Stakeholders (MGoS), including regarding policy dialogue and to the implementation of the UNSPF and the Forum’s quadrennial programmes of work (4PoW). Like the assessment of the other dimensions of the IAF, this report looks at whether the MGoS engagement with the IAF has helped deliver adequately on the core objective of promoting achievement of sustainable forest management (SFM). The ideal framework of reference for assessing progress must be the United Nations Strategic Programme of Forests (UNSPF) 2017-2030 and its Global Forest Goals (GFGs)².
3. The Major Groups (MGs) listed under Agenda 21 of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED – the Rio Conference) in 1992 include: Business and Industry, Children and Youth, Farmers, Indigenous People, Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), Local Authorities, Scientific and Technological Community, Women, and Workers and Trade Unions.
4. Information for the assessment has come from published material mainly already on the UNDESA website for UNFF; from other websites; and from a few responses to the questionnaires sent out by the UNFF18 Bureau and the consultant. The following have emerged as **findings**, presented under the abbreviated headings of the enquiry.
5. **Assessment Issue No J1: Assess the level of engagement of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders with the work of the Forum:**
 - a. MGs are always present at formal UNFF meetings, although not every organisation is always present at all sessions. Some participants are self-funded while others are sponsored by the UNFFS. The MGoS are also generally present at expert group meetings (EGMs) and initiatives sponsored by member countries, by CPF organisations and even by the MGoS themselves.
 - b. The MGoS wish participation in dialogue to continue and have shared their views on how to institutionalise their participation for better effect (Box 8, Box 9). It is worth recognising that important though attendance at IAF global policy events is, many MGoS *meetings relevant to UNFF and to achievement of IAF ambitions are organised internally for their own members or constituencies – these also need support.*
 - c. At critical stages, the MGoS have provided written inputs into the IAF process including on the in-depth independent assessment undertaken in 2014 under the title “*Future of the international arrangement on forests. Discussion paper submitted by the major groups*”³.

¹E/RES/2022/17

² A/RES/71/285 and E/RES/2017/4

³E/CN.18/2015/6/Add1

- d. The MGoS have increasingly appealed for the IAF to focus more on practical action, a message started at the Major Groups-led Initiative (MGI) in Kathmandu for UNFF11 in 2014⁴; followed up at a 2019 MGoS meeting in Bangkok⁵ then repeated and reinforced in Nairobi 2020⁶ – the latter with specific focus on land restoration. At Nairobi, the MGoS adopted a *Statement of Commitment to Forests Action addressed by the major groups to the UNFF15*⁷ as it considered the *4pow 2021-2024*, which they supplemented with mention of “enablers for action,” including political commitment. As evidence of tracking their own field action progress, the MGoS have published their first “*Progress in the Implementation of UNSPF - Contribution of Major Groups to UNFF 16 & 17 Thematic Priorities*”⁸. It shows their commitment and desire to act under their joint workplan and hopefully can help them attract more funding.
- e. The questionnaire responses also yielded some key messages on practical action, including that(i) it is *a shortcoming of UNFF that it has had limited success in promoting practical action and/or investment into SFM; (ii) that the GFGs should be pursued broadly to also serve desire for global biodiversity, restoration and climate change agendas; and (iii) that as MGs, they have high GFGs ambition, including civil society and indigenous peoples: they propose conservation of 35 million hectares of Amazonian tropical forests and the women MG in Africa plans planting 20 million trees.*
6. **Assessment Issue J2: Assess the efforts made by the major groups to establish and maintain effective coordination mechanisms for interaction and participation in the Forum and other forest-related United Nations bodies.**
- a. Coordination is important both between the MGoS and UNFF and internally among and within MGoS organisations. The UNFF Secretariat has continued to actively keep the relationship strong, partly by organising or co-organising events with the MGoS.
- b. On matters of internal coordination among MGoS members themselves, practicality calls for some “screening, selectiveness and networking” to accompany it because, according to the UN website, there are almost 2000 forest-related groups in active consultative status with ECOSOC⁹. The MGs seen at UNFF events are therefore either only an apex or in any case a very small minority which must invest heavily in networking with a much larger community of forest-leaning entities.
- c. The MGoS have focal points from global level to the grassroots and it is hard to suggest need for efforts to improve on it. Except that the arrangements are so heavy, and the culture of internal consultation is so deeply held that they that they can potentially slow down action. It is possible that low and slow questionnaire responses may partly arise from this.
- d. In the IAF system, the pinnacle of visible intra-MG coordination was when the Major Group Partnership on Forests operated briefly, starting in 2012 – it disbanded quickly with the reasons not fully publicised. Since then, the highest level of coordination was adoption in 2019 of an umbrella workplan¹⁰, although leaving each MG room to have its own detailed

⁴<https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/MGI-2015-Final-Report.pdf>

⁵[DraftSummary-EGM-MGs-Bangkok-Jan-19.pdf \(un.org\)](#)

⁶[MGI_2020_Final_Report.pdf \(un.org\)](#)

⁷[E/CN.18/2020/8](#)

⁸[MGs-UNSPF-Implementation-rpt2020.pdf](#)

⁹[United Nations Civil Society Participation – Forests](#)

¹⁰[Major Groups Workplan for UNSPF](#)

complementary plan. MGs/Civil Society actions to institutionalize participation in SFM are also in the report ([Box 9](#)).

- e. Notwithstanding the very highly complex governance system crafted for MGoS working with the UN, the ones affiliated to the IAF seem to allow much initiative, as evidenced by MG Children and Youth leadership for the aforementioned Nairobi MG-led initiative on *“Cross-sectoral collaboration for inclusive forest landscapes”*¹¹; its high-profile statements at the April 2021 *“High Level Round Table Sixteenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests”*¹² and its *“Youth Call for Action: Work with Us”* at the 2022 World Forest Congress¹³,
7. **Assessment Issue J3: Assess the ability of major groups and other relevant stakeholders to deliver effective representation within their constituencies.**
 - a. There is a strong interface between coordination and effective representation: a governance arrangement that offers coordination structures and focal points can also support effective representation if not overdone. The MG Children and Youth website is the most complete: it reveals a highly elaborate (perhaps too complex?) focal point hierarchy from global to grassroots in [Box 10](#).
 - b. In discussing this report MGs may wish to offer feedback on whether as implied in the analysis, the challenge is not weak representation/focal point arrangements but that the system is so complex that full compliance may lead to paralysis or slowing down of MGoS functioning.
 8. **Assessment Issue J4: Identify potential financial resources that could facilitate the development and implementation of quadrennial meetings of the Major Group-led Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests.**
 - a. Given observed challenges in funding even participation in meetings, let alone substantive SFM development in the field, the question of finance is given much space in the analysis. Although it does so informally, the UNFFS has no procedurally approved way to charge sponsorships to the UNFF Trust Fund or the GFFFN. The short-lived Major Groups Partnership on Forests had proposed to UNFF11 that it should *“...on an annual basis and from a strategic trust fund, to guarantee core funding to the organization”*. Also, *that adequate funding be provided for the active participation of major groups in Forum sessions*. That did not occur. Use of UNFF Trust Fund resources depends on preferences of donors and each of them decides how their funds should be applied; for the GFFFN, the guidelines are decided upon by Member States. In the recommendations, it is proposed that the MGoS seek closure with Member States and concerned donors to secure a clear yes or no regarding access to the Trust Fund and GFFFN resources or assistance.
 - b. During the December 2021 **Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening the Engagement of the United Nations Forum on Forests with Regional Partners, Major Groups, and other Stakeholders**¹⁴ major groups requested that the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network guidelines be revised to include the possibility of enabling non-governmental actors to benefit from its assistance, as they have done in previous occasions. But this time, emphasis also went to *“...requests for support in project conceptualization and capacity building on*

¹¹E/CN.18/2020/8

¹²[HLP Intervention MGCY \(un.org\)](#)

¹³[Work with Us - Youth Call for Action \(fao.org\)](#)

¹⁴[EGM-Regional-MGs-Dec2021-Summary-final.pdf \(un.org\)](#)

accessing financing for implementation of activities/projects in the collective major group workplan". No clear decision from the Forum has been seen.

- c. With no progress on earlier requests to the UNFF, the **meeting proposed that the midterm review consider including revising the [GFFFN] eligibility criterion to major group entities' requests for support** in project conceptualization and capacity building on accessing financing for implementation of activities/projects in the collective major group workplan. *However, this appeal has been floated unsuccessfully so many times by the interested MGs and has made little headway. At this MTR, it may be best for the MGs to seek clear closure— positive or negative – so that repeat vague mentions of procedural bottlenecks do not keep unwarranted hope alive.*
 - d. In section J.3.3.3 "The Agenda for cooperation with others", this report suggests that some financial success could come from further or more effective engagement of MGoS with the commercial private sector and philanthropies. Also, there is a huge community of financial institutions operating at sub-global levels that, if motivated, could probably yield more finance than the global institutions so far targeted. But MGoS may have to be willing to work with parties that may not necessarily wish to come under a UNFF umbrella.
 - e. Questionnaire responses had some useful insights, including (i) *studying why UNFF is not attractive to some important commercial and philanthropic entities; (ii) the need to learn from what explains the apparent very high attraction to the UNFCCC - around which there is reportedly financing of different types; (iii) build MG capacity for development of bankable proposals to attract funding.*
9. The information from desk study, supplemented by the few questionnaire responses that came, has allowed some **recommendations** linked directly to the conclusions and given in detail in section J.4.2. The following are abbreviated recommendations:
- a. In brief, with regard to issue No 1: "**better engagement of the MGoS stakeholders with the work of the Forum**", (i) sustain MGoS participation in UNFF sessions and associated inter-sessional events especially multi-stakeholder dialogues that place forest issues in multi-sectoral context; (ii) mobilise more financial resources than has proved possible so far for SFM action by MGoS including from non-IAF linked private sector and philanthropic sources; (iii) given the lead role of CPF organisations in international support to UNSPF implementation, study what CPF is already doing and also what it is missing out so as to act in a complementary manner; and, (iv) keep tracking non-IAF forests frameworks and identify ways to synergise with them in a more multi-sectoral, livelihoods-linked manner – be ready to use whatever combination of frameworks best "sells the forests agenda" (e.g. climate change, biodiversity etc - even if not under IAF).
 - b. With regard to Issue No 2 "**Assess the efforts made by the major groups to establish and maintain effective coordination mechanisms**", (i) sustain use of the unified MG workplan and use the MG progress report on its implementation to highlight necessary improvements; (ii) respect the UN-linked coordination/ focal points/ democratic systems but find ways to make it nimble in a system that appears extremely complex; and, (iii) take advantage on extra-sectoral links offered by the UN system MG governance framework to benefit forestry activities.
 - c. On matters of "**Assess the ability of major groups and other relevant stakeholders to deliver effective representation within their constituencies**", there is some link to matters

of coordination (above). But again, in addition, consider how to make the heavy structure for representation agile in seizing opportunities, responding to requests for MGoS inputs, and securing resources for dialogue or action, including finances.

- d. Finally, regarding matters of **“Identify potential financial resources that could facilitate the development and implementation of quadrennial meetings of the Major Group-led Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests”** – it is unlikely that financing attendance of meetings can appeal to many donors than those already supporting the UNFFS –the focus should then be on building sponsorship into the existing Trust Fund. Try instead:
- i. MGs should seek funding principally for field action and then finance attendance at meetings by inserting budget lines for this within the action-oriented projects;
 - ii. Much attention in the report has gone to funding for field action, with focus on the private sector and philanthropies. Not all such parties are affiliated with the UNFF or will necessarily want to engage with it and therefore, for the sake of forests, MGoS may need to be pragmatic;
 - iii. Collectively as MGs or separately, consider starting full-time grant fundraising at the field rather than global level (including from philanthropies). Latin American questionnaire responses imply that funding is most easily attracted at local rather than global level, for interventions supporting local community livelihoods, conservation, and indigenous and other marginalised groups’ needs; and
Consider copying the health sector practice of capitalising on high-profile diseases to also fund less “attractive” diseases: try attracting SFM funding for exciting donor darlings like climate change and biodiversity; and seek closure (positive or negative) on whether the UNFF Trust Fund can attract more funds to support MGs and/or Member States will change the GFFFN guidelines to directly address MGs requests.

I INTRODUCTION

10. ECOSOC's Resolution 2015/33¹⁵ decided to strengthen the International arrangement on forests beyond 2015, extend it to 2030 and clarified its functioning modalities; ECOSOC also defined the components of the IAF (para 1 (b)) as the United Nations Forum on Forests and its Member States (UNFF), the secretariat of the Forum (UNFFS), the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network (GFFFN) and the Trust Fund for the United Nations Forum on Forests.
11. Through E/RES/2015/33, the Council decided that the IAF should involve as partners "...interested international, regional and subregional organizations and processes, *major groups and other stakeholders*". Under paras 29-33 "Involvement of major groups and other stakeholders", ECOSOC *recognized* the importance of the continued and enhanced participation of major groups and other stakeholders in the sessions of the Forum and its intersessional activities; *invited them* to enhance their contributions to the work of the international arrangement on forests beyond 2015; also *invited* Member States to consider enhancing the participation and contributions of representatives of major groups and other stakeholders in country-led initiatives; and *requested* the secretariat of the Forum to promote their involvement in the work of the Forum.
12. This Section "J" report is part of the **Midterm Review (MTR) of the Effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests** and assesses how effective the engagement of major groups and other stakeholders with the IAF is, with regard to SFM ambitions as set out in the UN Strategic Programme of Forests (UNSPF) 2017-2030 and its Global Forest Goals (GFGs). The Forum at its 17th session decided to carry out extensive preparatory activities in preparation for the MTR in 2024. The annex to ECOSOC resolution 2022/17 contains ten areas for the assessment, including section "J" on major groups and other stakeholders.
13. The basis of the MTR is ECOSOC resolution 2015/33 paragraph 41, which reads:

41. Requests the Forum to undertake in 2024 a midterm review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests in achieving its objectives, as well as a final review in 2030, and, on that basis, to submit recommendations to the Council relating to the future course of the arrangement.
14. Following discussions at UNFF sessions, the "**Preparations for the midterm review in 2024 of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests in achieving its objectives**" were activated at UNFF17¹⁶. In its coverage of UNFF17, the IISD¹⁷ mentioned the high expectations about the MTR's independence, transparency and inclusiveness to give it legitimacy in the eyes of both UNFF members and other stakeholders.

¹⁵E/RES/2015/33

¹⁶E/CN.18/2022/5

¹⁷IISD (2022): **Summary of the Seventeenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests: 9-13 May 2022.**

II ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

15. The following are among the sources of information used in the preparation of this report:
- a. A review of relevant documents and information posted on the websites of the UNFF, UN-related organizations and other relevant intergovernmental bodies and processes, including all web links contained in this report - of this, the 2020 UNFF questionnaire responses are still “current” when set against the endless timeframe of forest growth;
 - b. Discussions with and information and comments provided by the UNFF Secretariat;
 - c. Responses to a consolidated questionnaire containing questions developed by the consultant to elicit views from UNFF members and partners on the range of actions contained in the annex to ECOSOC resolution 2022/17.
- The questionnaire was circulated by the UNFF18 Bureau Chair on 9 August 2022 to UNFF Focal Points, Member organisations of the CPF, UNFF Regional and Subregional partners, major groups and other relevant stakeholders. The Bureau requested comments by 30 September 2022, later extended to 14 October.
16. The Secretariat facilitated preparation of this report by providing administrative support and relevant documentation and other information as requested, and by providing comments on its successive drafts. However, the views expressed herein, including the conclusions and recommendations, are those of the consultant. Throughout the process of preparing this report, there was open sharing of drafts among the consultants by email and through virtual meetings, with the aim of promoting consistency in overall approach across the assessment reports.
17. Responses to the questionnaires have continued to trickle in as late as December 2022 but regrettably, as [Table 1](#) shows, as of end November 2022, they remain only a few, being 10 Member States (3 Africa, 1 Asia-Pacific, 2 Europe, 2 Latin America-Caribbean, and 2 North America); 0 Regional/Subregional Organisations; and 5 Major Groups).¹⁸ It should be noted that not only MGs responded to questions about themselves; some Member States and regional/sub-regional partners also did. Around mid-October 2022, a re-send of the consultant questionnaire was made by UNFFS and the consultant engaged by email with the NGO and Women groups that acknowledged having received it. In the end, from the NGO group came a joint input from the umbrella NGO focal point, plus two others, an input from one global NGO and another from an Ecuadorian one. The Women group’s acknowledgement was not followed up by a questionnaire response.

¹⁸The extent of responses is not completely out of line with other efforts. According to the UNFF15 Secretariat Note “Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030” [Doc E/CN.18/2020/2] questionnaires were sent out to get feedback on progress. UNFFS received 36 responses from 28 Member States, 4 member organizations of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, 1 regional organization, and only the NGO major group (partly with subsidiary inputs from their members).

Table 1: Questionnaire responses as of end November 2022

[excluding those with no inputs under section “J”]

Major Groups and other stakeholders	Member States	
MG Children & Youth MG Farmers + IFFA “Friends of the Siberian Forests” - Non-Governmental Ecological Organization FundaciónPachamama (Ecuador) - NGO Forest Stewardship Council (an NGO)	EL SALVADOR – only replied to J KENYA MALAWI NIGERIA MEXICO ROMANIA – replied “no opinion” on J	PANAMA SWITZERLAND THAILAND – no opinion on J USA

III ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FROM COLLECTED INFORMATION

18. The essence of the assessment is to look at the effectiveness of engagement between the IAF and the Major Groups. Partnership involves policy dialogue as well as action to achieve SFM. The first is “soft” and success or effectiveness is therefore not easily measurable. The second is more measurable, but in a process that has few “landmark achievement levels” against which to measure progress those that exist being global goals (such as 3% increase in global forest area), “success” is hard to declare for a diverse number of entities that are working individually. It is not possible to say what share of the global ambition can be set against their performance so they can be judged “successful” or otherwise.
19. The analysis will start with assessment for the policy dialogue roles, both under the UNFF annual sessions and intersessional activities that feed into them. Then it will cover action in the field including on enabling elements for them, such as capacity and financing. Finally, it will look at the MGs and how they are organised for their functions in both the policy and action domains of their engagement with the UNFF – with particular interest in how this might affect effectiveness of the engagement with the IAF.
20. There is an additional challenge: indications from reading the literature and some of the questionnaire responses suggest that most of the work that major groups and other stakeholders do is earmarked for their own immediate constituencies and not the IAF. The IAF should be content to record many of the MG achievements as being compatible with its ambitions and goals. One is therefore tempted to adopt the “least common denominator” attitude: whatever MGs do, so long as they do something for SFM, is a plus for the IAF.
21. There is also the temptation to grant greater weight to field action on SFM than to policy dialogue. However, effort well spent on policy/strategy, planning, on information and its analysis can lead to better prioritisation and scheduling of action so improving efficiency and return to effort invested. MGs also undertake much work on defending or promoting rights at all levels in their countries or regions: the full effect can be huge but is not easily measurable. All the above can be attenuated by doing some or (preferably) all the following:
 - a. Developing workplans that clearly state expected achievements;

- b. Inter-MGoS collaboration in both work planning and action, so that individual entity achievements leverage each other and have more chances of achieving significant visibility.
22. The scope of engagement between UNFF and MGoS has not been defined with precision apart from the convention so far of including both policy dialogue and action on SFM. There have continued to be proposals. One example is MG ideas on how they see themselves contributing best to the IAF as communicated during the multi-stakeholder dialogue *“Future of the international arrangement on forests. Discussion paper submitted by the major groups”*¹⁹. The MGoS have also shared their views on how to institutionalise their participation in dialogue for better effect (Box 9). It is worth recognising that important though attendance is at IAF global policy events, many MGoS *meetings relevant to UNFF and to achievement of IAF ambitions are organised internally for their own members or constituencies – these also need support.*

III.1 UNFF COMMITMENT TO PARTNERING WITH THE MAJOR GROUPS AND EFFORTS TO MAKE IT WORK

23. ECOSOC resolution 2015/33 called for enhanced collaboration among relevant MGs and the Forum. Before and after that decision, the Forum and various events under it have continued to call for close collaboration on matters of policy dialogue and action by Major Groups and other stakeholders on the IAF/UNFF agenda. Box 1 gives a non-exhaustive set of examples. The importance to the United Nations of contributions from players beyond member states was highlighted well by the General Assembly which in paragraphs 14 to 16 of Resolution 67/290²⁰, adopted on 9 July 2013, decided that the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development would be open to the major groups, other relevant stakeholders and entities that have a standing invitation to participate as observers in the General Assembly.
24. Through E/RES/2015/33, ECOSOC further decided that the IAF should continue involving major groups and other stakeholders, among others. Under paras 29-33 *“Involvement of major groups and other stakeholders”*, ECOSOC *recognized* the importance of the continued and enhanced participation of major groups and other stakeholders in the sessions of the Forum and its intersessional activities; *invited them* to enhance their contributions to the work of the international arrangement on forests beyond 2015; also *invited* Member States to consider enhancing the participation and contributions of representatives of major groups and other stakeholders in country-led initiatives; and *requested* the secretariat of the Forum to promote their involvement 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 to enhance the interaction of the Forum with such stakeholders”*.
25. Implementation of UNFF ambitions is undertaken by governments of the Member States, by the global group Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) and its members, Regional and Subregional Partners, and by major groups and other stakeholders. A convenient and relatively recent point of departure for presenting MG engagement with the IAF because based upon it, the MGs prepared the previously mentioned **“Progress in The Implementation of UNSPF - Contribution of Major Groups to UNFF 16 &17 Thematic**

¹⁹E/CN.18/2015/6/Add.1

²⁰A/RES/67/290

Priorities". This document is not comprehensive but is a useful indicative report on many engagements, without necessarily quantifying either the investment or the output/result.

Box 1: UNFF Exhortations to Engage Major Groups and other relevant Stakeholders in IAF work

The exhortations are repetitive and so it serves the purpose just to mention where they were made without reproducing the text:

1. In the UNFF15 Report: Under **Engagement and contributions of partners, includes:** - Para 17 and Para 18.
2. Inclusion in the UNFF 17th and 18th session agendas of: **Major Groups and other Stakeholders.**
3. From the **UNFF 17 report** [Ref 1]: Para 10 and Para 11.
4. In UNFF 17 report **Annex: Actions in preparation for the midterm review, in 2024, of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests**, included section "J": "Actions related to the involvement of major groups and other relevant stakeholders".
5. Under draft agenda for UNFF18: covered contributions of and enhanced cooperation with partners to achieving the thematic priorities including specifically contributions of major groups and other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and philanthropic community, to achieving the thematic priorities, and progress on major group workplans.
6. The UNFF16 Report [Doc E/2021/42-E/CN.18/2021/8] confirms as agenda items under UNFF17, 2 "Updates by stakeholders and partners on activities in support of the thematic priorities", including again mention of the private sector and philanthropic community.
7. For the 18th Session: the same repeat as at UNFF16.
8. In the UNFF15 Report [Doc. E/2020/42-E/CN.18/2020/9]: Under **Engagement and contributions of partners, includes: *Emphasis on* the Forum secretariat actively **engage major groups** and other relevant stakeholders, including at the sixteenth session of the Forum.**
9. From the **Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening the Engagement of the United Nations Forum on Forests with Regional Partners, Major Groups, and other Stakeholders**, 16-17 December 2021: The EGM objective was **to mobilize and strengthen engagement with major groups (among other partners)**, in support of the implementation of the UNSPF, and to prepare for the forthcoming UNFF17 session.

26. The Forum's events consider its various constituencies, including in high-level occasions. For example, the UNFF 16 High-level Round Table's "**Concept Note**"²¹ describes as the event's main objective "...to provide an opportunity for senior officials from governments, United Nations entities and other international organizations, as well as representatives from the private sector, industries, and civil society to discuss the most effective policies and actions for curbing current global crises." More specifically, the speakers and participants were encouraged to share their views on (a) forests being part of the solution to current global crises, in particular climate change, biodiversity loss, deforestation and land degradation, inequalities and poverty in the post COVID-19 era; (b) how to attract the private sector to engage and contribute more effectively to addressing global crises.
27. One development in the regional/subregional partners community has implications for the MGoS: FAO has greatly activated its Regional Forestry Commissions and is increasingly using them to strengthen the involvement of various stakeholders which is expected to improve effectiveness in multiple areas, due to stronger ownership and commitment. The power of stakeholder involvement can also be triggered using FAO's ongoing practices such as the activities of the Forest and Farm Facility or can result from collaboration with MG Children and Youth (MGC&Y), as demonstrated in the context of the XV World Forestry Congress. Deepening and expanding partnerships with stakeholders is one of the pillars of FAO's reinvigorated business model, and this may bridge to the MGoS.²²

²¹Microsoft Word - UNFF16 HLRT Concept Note_31 March 2021

²² From FAO response to UNFF August 2022 questionnaire.

28. UNFF16 called for identifying barriers to obtaining support from philanthropic organizations, realising that participation of all relevant stakeholders, in particular, women and youth, in addition to the private sector and philanthropic organizations, was critical to achieving the goals. It invited countries to support MGs activities and to consider involving youth in their delegations at international meetings. It is understood that MGC&Y has successfully fundraised for a range of projects (including from CPF members FAO and IUFRO), which also help cover participation in meetings.

III.2 MAIN DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 2015 REGARDING THE INVOLVEMENT OF MAJOR GROUPS

29. Since resolution 2015/33, UNFF sessions have persistently encouraged and facilitated participation in sessions of non-Member State actors, even though the character of the Forum remains intergovernmental. No boundaries have been set regarding what type of activities major groups can engage in; nor is their planning decided for them by the UNFF process or any component of the IAF.

30. Involvement of the MGoS has continued in all activities of the UN Forum on Forests (the Forum). There is strong MGoS messaging and exhortation to all IAF players to prioritise practical implementation of SFM; but there is less ready documentation on such MGoS activities in field action to implement SFM. Evidence later in this report comes from the MGoS themselves regarding their achievements in this latter sphere – but achievements are often modest and localised, given the challenges of funding that MGoS face even to participate in policy dialogue activities.

Box 2: MGs Proposals to UNFF for Better Collaboration

In order to advance collaboration with relevant stakeholders and partners, the Forum may wish to consider the following actions:

- Welcome the written inputs voluntarily submitted to the fifteenth session of the Forum by the **major groups** in preparation for the session, and encourage these stakeholders to continue to advance the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030 and the achievement of the global forest goals and targets;
- Welcome the **participation of the private sector** in the fourteenth session of the Forum and its input towards the outcome of the fifteenth session;
- Emphasize the need to **further strengthen multi-stakeholder engagement** in the work of the Forum during the implementation of the quadrennial programme of work for 2021–2024;
- Request the secretariat to **continue to explore and pursue** ways and means to actively involve **philanthropic** organizations and the **private sector**²³ in the work of the Forum.

Source: ECOSOC (2020): **Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, including the contributions of the Forum’s regional and subregional partners and major groups, as well as involvement of its secretariat in major meetings. Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF15, 4-8 May 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/6

31. As already stated, major groups at the multistakeholder dialogue of 2015²⁴ established associations and networks to ensure their full participation in the general discussion, facilitate the

²³Source: ECOSOC (2022): **Preparations for the midterm review in 2024 of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests in achieving its objectives - Note by the Secretariat.** United Nations Forum on Forests Seventeenth session New York, 9–13 May 2022. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2022/5 // UNFF17 Message: Since the twelfth session of the Forum, representatives of the Forum’s major groups have consistently engaged in the work of the Forum. More specifically, the participation of the private sector has been enhanced through its active participation in technical discussions, high-level panels and round tables at the sessions of the Forum. To ensure their continued active engagement, a specific agenda item on the contributions of major groups and other relevant stakeholders has been included for each session of the Forum in the quadrennial programme of work for the period 2021–2024.

exchange of experiences among members and promote capacity-building. They had a joint discussion paper and presentation based on common concerns. From regular attendance of the same meetings and events by MG focal points, it is believed that good personal networking has developed among them, and they can collectively mobilise with ease if need be. At most times, however, the business and industry and local authorities' major groups are absent. Recently, the International Council of Forest and Paper Associations (ICFPA) took over as the MG's focal point for business and industry; it plans to be active; in this regard, the UNFF 18's Bureau agreed that a private sector conceived panel discussion to take place during the Forum's 18th Session.

32. **Successes:** In view of the caveats that preceded this, and bearing in mind the key messages in the "conclusions and recommendations", it is safe to declare the following (all qualitatively) as collective pro-IAF successes for the major groups and relevant stakeholders' community:

- a. Remaining collectively committed to attending UNFF meetings and events so ensuring their voice is heard;
- b. Contribution to and continuing engagement in publicising the UNFF and using it to encourage attention to forests;
- c. Convincing society and its institutions (both formal and traditional) to take up field action on SFM and its value-chains;
- d. Using the UNFF as a conduit for global interaction with like-minded organisations outside each entity's own constituency for purposes of exchanging best practice but also partnerships that can give access to SFM investments or to funding for own corporate technical and policy/capacity building non-investment operations;
- e. In the case of entities in developing regions, attraction of external funding for IAF-compatible SFM investments or technical assistance in member countries;
- f. Exposure through UNFF and in processes complementary to it to the full range of forest-relevant multilateral environmental or environment and development agreements so hopefully helping the countries that have signed off on them to benefit more from them;
- g. Adopting the spirit of working and planning together, as exemplified by an umbrella workplan and mutual support by the other Major Groups when one of them organises a major event, such as an MG-led initiative;

Reinforcing the above successes must be at the core of the "future" agenda but combined with field action on SFM.

33. **Shortcomings:** Again, bearing in mind the preceding caveats, the following could be considered shortcomings (mostly financial), which are reflected in the need for sponsorship to attend UNFF sessions²⁵ and events as well as the perceived small and localised scale of MG field interventions:

- a. The relative failure of MGoS (other than for the commercial private sector) to attract adequate funding for their use in practical achievement of SFM. As evidenced by continuing attendance at UNFF sessions and many intersessional meetings, MGoS can secure sponsorship for that but not for significant investment in field action;
- b. Failure to persuade Member States to allow amendment of GFFFN or UNFF Trust Fund guidelines to allow them to formally fund MGs meetings attendance or to help them adequately build their capacity to mobilise funding;
- c. No reports of substantial success have been found for securing substantial technical assistance or investment-scale funding from entities in the regional/subregional development banks or philanthropies, despite both also falling into the MG category;

²⁴ E/CN.18/2015/6

²⁵ It is understood that the UNFFS has often come in to sponsor MG participation.

- d. Apparent inability of national-level MGoS to benefit in funding from levies/taxes on domestic forest industries, forest tourism etc, being non-governmental, they would in any case not be automatic beneficiaries of such revenues (except for the Local Authorities MG).

Correcting the above shortcomings must also be at the core of the “future” agenda.

III.2.1 ENGAGEMENT IN UNFF DIALOGUE

34. The material in this section, dealing with engagement of MGoS in UNFF policy dialogue, largely responds to the MTR’s interest in assessment of the level of engagement of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders with the work of the Forum, including their contributions to the achievement of the global forest goals and targets and their interactions with the Forum and the Collaborative Partnership on Forests.
35. By design, the UNFF global events fall under “policy” and “technical” categories: both are of interest to and attract participation/contribution from MGs. Essentially, both policy/strategic and technical dialogue involve exchange of knowledge, views and best practice for all parties to potentially adapt to their specific needs. Hence the value of the diversity that non-state players bring to the gatherings Box 2 has summarised the many ways the MGoS contribute to the policy forum roles under the IAF; the MGoS have also shared their views on how to institutionalise their participation in dialogue for better effect (Box 9).
36. The presence at actual UNFF sessions is the culmination of a larger process including preparatory events within the MG community, often co-organised with the UNFFS as Expert Groups; interaction with their governments and civil society; and at times, consultation to arrive at common MG community positions where UNFF meetings require that choices be made. MGs presence at formal UNFF meetings is always assured, although not every organisation is always present at all sessions. Funding for participation is not always assured and Major Groups raise this issue very often, also mentioning that budgets are also lacking even for substantive forest management on the ground.
37. At critical stages, the MGoS have provided written inputs into the IAF process including on the in-depth independent assessment undertaken in 2014, the previously mentioned “*Future of the international arrangement on forests. Discussion paper submitted by the major groups*”. Key documents the MGoS have submitted have been listed and extracted messages highlighted. The MGs attend a large variety of UNFF meetings at which MG inputs are not only spoken interventions: there are also written materials, prepared by either the UNFFS or by the MGs for Expert Group Meetings or for UNFF sessions. Many are on the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030 or the UNFF quadrennial POW or on MGoS own plans for the UNFF. Three consecutive ones – for the EGMs in Ottawa 2016²⁶, Nairobi in 2017²⁷ and Bangkok in 2019²⁸ – focused on MG workplans and contributions to better support the IAF.
38. Most recently, the appeal of the MGoS for the IAF to focus more on practical action was highlighted at both that 2019 MGoS meeting in Bangkok and in the 2020 Nairobi one– the latter while specifically highlighting opportunities to restore vegetation on the land.

²⁶<https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/EGM-report-MGoS-IAF-2016.pdf>

²⁷https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/MG_Report_workplan_May2018_final.pdf

²⁸[DraftSummary-EGM-MGs-Bangkok-Jan-19.pdf \(un.org\)](https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/DraftSummary-EGM-MGs-Bangkok-Jan-19.pdf)

39. These sentiments are expressed in many other reports, including (only as examples) in the May 2015 discussion paper submitted by the major groups at UNFF11 (Doc E/CN.18/2015/6/Add.1). ECOSOC extended the welcome to the MGs and other stakeholders in 2015 in resolution 2015/33 (Doc. E/2015/42 and Corr.1), as stated in its report (ECOSOC Official Records, 2020 Supplement No. 22 Doc E/2020/42-E/CN.18/2020/9), and in UNFF11 paragraphs 10 -11, [ECOSOC Official Records, 2022 Supplement No. 22. E/2022/42-E/CN.18/2022/8.Para 11]. The latter report made the explicit addition in particular of private actors like forest industries, local communities and philanthropic organizations, small-scale landowners, micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises, as well as local communities and indigenous peoples in SFM. UNFF17 expanded the list to include a category “... academic organizations, the private sector, including small, medium and large forest-based enterprises....”.
40. The IISD reported²⁹ on the agenda item “*Update on the activities of Major Groups and other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and the philanthropic community, and progress on Major Group workplans*” at which the MGs NGOs (on COVID 19), Children and Youth (on career development) and Women (on MG Women’s’ 2020-30 planned planting of 20 million hectares in Africa) made interventions. The EU highlighted the need for more direct inclusion and participation of Major Groups and other stakeholders in concrete actions on forests and the important role the private sector and philanthropy can play in engaging civil society. Major groups urged more work to identify and collect best practices and to provide capacity building to Indigenous Peoples, women, and other vulnerable groups. The above also featured in the official UNFF17 report.
41. While protecting the intergovernmental nature of the UNFF and IAF, almost all sessions of the forum have encouraged and facilitated participation of non-governmental entities (such as MGs and regional/subregional partners) at policy and strategy dialogue sessions. They have encouraged them to present their opinions, often in written form; to organise inter-sessional events (often in cooperation with the UNFF Secretariat) at which they interact internally and with outside partners; to prepare work plans that ensure synergy with IAF/UNFF plans and priorities; and have encouraged (in the case of MGs) those who can do so to secure financial resources for their activities, including participation in UNFF sessions.
42. The formats for dialogue are many: participation in substantive official global meetings of the UNFF; in inter-sessional expert groups; in events that are country-led (member government-sponsored or co-sponsored) or partner-led (e.g., by the CPF or its member organisations, or by MGs); by civil society of other formats; by academia etc. Possibilities are nearly endless. Many *MG meetings relevant to UNFF and to achievement of IAF ambitions are organised internally for their own members or constituencies.*
43. During UNFF17 the Workers and trade Unions MG³⁰ made a presentation regarding livelihood and the economic dimension of SFM; this MG submitted an individual input to the High-level Round Table. It mentioned job losses during the Covid19 pandemic, the roles of governments in cushioning the impacts of such job losses, the need in future to retain attention to decent work, and the need for include full and in person participation of MGs in UNFF sessions, since this will ensure that the voices of the forest dependent people represented by the major groups continue to be heard.

²⁹IISD (2022): **Summary of the Seventeenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests: 9-13 May 2022.** Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 13 No. 222 Monday, 16 May 2022. Online at: enb.iisd.org/un-forum-forests-unff-17

³⁰[UNFF17-HLRT-Workers-Trade-Unions.pdf](#)

44. The importance of science and technology in understanding the dynamics of forests and for the achievement of sustainable forest management and forest-related Sustainable Development Goals is often highlighted by MGs and the Forum. The need for an evidence-based framework for monitoring, assessing and reporting on the implementation of sustainable forest management and for knowledge to inform policy has been stressed on several occasions. The MGs proposed that the Forum raise the discourse on the role of science and technology in sustainable forest management and the science-policy interface and seek support for the scientific and technological communities for the GFGs as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
45. A good example of private sector participation has been the **Brazilian Tree Industry**, a private association engaged in the industrial cultivation of trees reported generating nearly 5,000 types of products, emphasized the industry's contribution to the development of a low-carbon economy, and importance for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals through the involvement, knowledge and best practices by the private sector alongside other players within and outside governments. The already mentioned MG-led Initiative held in Nairobi in March 2020 had as objective the strengthening of the capacity of major groups and other stakeholders to effectively engage in advancing implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030 and the work of the Forum, in particular regarding their contribution quadrennial programme of work for the period 2021–2024.
46. Given its importance in the implementation of the UNSPF, cooperation between the MGs and the CPF is fundamental, including in policy dialogue. The CPF appears to have been open to get participation of MGoS in its meetings – this is something for which the latter had pushed in the days of their short-lived “MG Partnership on Forests” through a formal partnership. It is understood that MGoS already interact collectively with some members of the CPF. For example, IUFRO always partners closely with the Science & Technology (S&T) and Children and Youth (C&Y) MG's; FAO also together with IUFRO does the same. For the MG S&T, IUFRO nominates the focal points (who are also members of IUFRO) and supports their participation in Forum sessions by registering them since it is an accredited ECOSOC NGO. MGs can also reach out to other non-intergovernmental members such as CIFOR/ICRAF and IUCN as additional opportunities of working with the CPF community.
47. The MGs attend many CPF member organisation meetings but in addition, CPF has established the “CPF Dialogue”, a specific means to further engage MGs in the respective activities of the Partnership. For example, at the margins of the World Forestry Congress in Seoul, a high-level dialogue between the heads of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) agencies with representatives of Major Groups was organised on May 2, 2022. The topic was “Climate change, conflicts and food insecurity - forest solutions to tackle effects of crises”³¹.

III.2.2 ENGAGEMENT IN FIELD IMPLEMENTATION OF SFM AND ANCILLARY PROMOTIONAL SUPPORT

48. Practical contributions of GFGs are reported mostly under this section III.2.2 to reduce duplication. The background to such action includes preparations starting in 2015, the

³¹[CPF Dialogue - Climate change, conflicts and food insecurity forest solutions to tackle effects of crises \(fao.org\)](https://www.fao.org/)

same year as adoption of resolution No 2015/33 titled “International arrangement on forests beyond 2015”, the Secretariat, through the Note by the Secretariat on the Multi-stakeholder dialogue³², expressed the view that “The Forum has made significant progress in enhancing the participation of stakeholders in its work”.

III.2.2.1 Overview

49. Given the large numbers of Member States, it is not very practical to identify areas of improved coordination with MGs at a global level via the fast-turnover PoWs. Instead, in matters of field action, MGs could usefully link to the stable Global Forest Goals under the UNFF Strategic Plan of Forests (UNSPF) as reference point. For groups such as the CPF and Major Groups that have a joint workplan, matching with MG engagements was informally attempted for this assessment. For MGs, from this partly completed annex, three messages emerge:
- a. All players at levels beyond Member States are addressing the ambitions of the UNSPF in a selective, perhaps patchy manner by their ongoing interventions;
 - b. It is already apparent that for MGs, a very diverse community, the presence of a joint workplan gives them some advantage regarding internal coordination.
50. The **“Global Forest Goals Report 2021”** has revealed some progress but also quite significant shortfalls in action that require renewed commitment to action by all. It is easy to see from it what each party (including the MGoS) can select as gaps to fill. The UNFF and partners (including the MGoS) may wish to give careful attention to four things that, if acted upon, may improve synergies for interventions in SFM action:
- a. MGoS entities act on forests not only under the IAF umbrella but under whatever umbrella can attract the communities and partners they work with at that level: the Climate change umbrella is an example, biodiversity is another;
 - b. They love forests but do not deal with them in isolation – they often blend tree/forest activity in the broader livelihoods of their communities;
 - c. They benefit from IAF/UNFF forest messaging but also make use of whatever other pro-forestry messages are attractively packaged, such as from climate change, biodiversity or from international NGOs they partner with locally, even when they do not use the IAF as selling point;
 - d. Entities of the commercial private sector and philanthropy have used the attractive SDG messaging to promote their own associations’ agendas on forests. Apart from the UNFF Focal point organisation “International Council of Forest and Paper Associations (ICFPA), they are practically absent from the MGoS group that works with the UNFF. But the commercial private sector outside ICFPA is investing billions in forests under the SDG mantra: IAF/UNFF may gain from capturing this energy. Hoping or insisting that they will come under IAF may not work, but co-opting their efforts and selling them for the benefit of IAF ambitions may be worth pursuing;
 - e. At the same time, both the ICFPA and the other large-scale private associations are far above the concerns and missed opportunities faced by the numerous artisanal scale and informal wood and forest enterprises that abound in many developing countries and regions.
51. In 2020, the UNFFS reviewed MG (and other partner) roles in implementing the UNSPF, through the Note by the Secretariat on *“Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, including the contributions of the Forum’s regional and subregional partners and major groups, as well as involvement of its secretariat in major*

³²E/CN.18/2015/6

*meetings*³³. The focus is on regional/subregional groups inputs but most interesting is that field action by these involves MGs as mobilisers of civil society for field interventions.

52. The UNFF 17 Note by the Secretariat on “Policy discussions on the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030: activities in support of the thematic priorities for the biennium 2021–2022” under the section titled “**Update on the activities of major groups and other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and the philanthropic community, and progress on major group workplans**”³⁴ states that *the major groups continued to appeal to donor organizations, development partners and the United Nations system to support their ongoing efforts on capacity-building and resource mobilization*. It was also mentioned that at the time that the UNFFS continued to strengthen engagement with the business and industry major group through its collaboration with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and the FAO Advisory Committee on Sustainable Forest-based Industries, as well as other business and industry entities; finally, it is said that the secretariat was not able to secure input from philanthropic partners but continues its efforts to engage them. In this regard, it is interesting to note that, during the UNFF 17 High-level Round Table, Mr. Andrew Steer, President and Chief Executive Officer, Bezos Earth Fund, addressed the meeting.
53. Key players in the field are again governments and corporate private investors. Externally aided interventions could be managed by members of the CPF but also so many other partnerships funded by global and regional/subregional development banks. There is not much reporting on the extent to which partnerships between any of these key players and MGs are prospering or if they offer an area of expanded future opportunity.
54. The strong MGoS interest in field intervention was already revealed when already for UNFF11 the MGoS organised the previously mentioned Kathmandu Major Group-led Initiative in support of the 11th session of the United Nations Forum on Forests under the theme “*Sustainable Forest Management: Designing the Vehicles for Securing the Means of Implementation*”. At all times, the MGoS field interventions are complemented by strong exhortation to the same for all other IAF parties, such as through their statement from the March 2020 Nairobi major groups-led initiative meeting on “*Cross-sectoral collaboration for inclusive forest landscapes*”³⁵. The MGs signalled that “*“restoration” is not enough: the world needs to also increase the net area of forests, woodlands, and trees in the landscape*”.
55. The MG *Statement of Commitment to Forests Action addressed by the major groups to the UNFF15 as it considered the 4POW 2021-2024*: The MGs “Declaration” committed themselves to their inputs but also set out priorities and called for the action of all stakeholders including member state governments, intergovernmental actors (within or outside the Collaborative Partnership on Forests) and non-state actors in the commercial private and non-profit domains. It **reaffirmed commitments from Bangkok meeting via key pro-action messages to UNFF14 that included:**
- a. MGs can help to mobilize society to act, build capacity for smallholders, indigenous peoples & local communities to demand and implement prior informed consent and grievance redress mechanisms, and communicate best practices and lessons learnt regards SFM;

³³ E/CN.18/2020/6

³⁴ E/CN.18/2022/2

³⁵ E/CN.18/2020/8

- b. Ideally, any structured engagement with governments must involve playing watchdog on accountability matters;
 - c. MGs are constrained from being active on many fronts and must mobilise funds for their own work plans to build up capacity and to achieve visibility for themselves among potential partners;
 - d. MGs have special attributes enabling them to domesticate (adapt to local circumstances and insert into local plans) international agreements at the local level in society and must structure their engagement at all levels: global, regional, and national. They should also engage with other non-governmental entities whether fellow MGs or profit/non-profit actors on forests and forestry.
56. The Nairobi MG meeting also **highlighted “enablers for action” and exhortations in their key messages to UNFF15:**
- a. Participants felt priority should be granted because an issue is or remains important, even if old and not merely because it is new or emerging;
 - b. Loss of political commitment to already-agreed multilateral environmental agreements, especially the Paris Agreement on climate change: some important forest countries, both developing and developed have expressed readiness to leave the Paris Agreement;
 - c. Ambitious targets on forest restoration based upon widespread adoption of the landscape approach – how to achieve them and – how to best synergise them with the UN Strategic Plan on Forests and the GFGs;
 - d. How to address three major failures at national level, leading to inadequate action on forests:
 - i. failure to excite political will to protect forests;
 - ii. failure to secure inter-sectoral cooperation in combating deforestation and forest threats of powerful external origin (mining, infrastructure, agriculture, etc); and
 - iii. paralysis in anticipating and combating increasingly frequent extreme weather events affecting forests.
 - e. Invited the *Local Government* and *Business and Industry* Major Group that has not been present at the MGI (and at UNFF events for a very long time) to come forward and appealed to Member State governments to provide incentives for such participation both in dialogue and practical action.

III.2.2.2 Basis for Follow-up to the Pro-Action Commitment of Major Groups

57. The desire of MGs to engage in action and enabling interventions for it is demonstrated by the report on their activities presented above. In looking to the future, for MGs, as for all other parties seeking to implement the ambitions of the IAF, it will be important to study the main gaps in progress highlighted in *The Global Forest Goals Report 2021*³⁶) and its successor versions. This flagship publication was launched on 26 April 2021, during the sixteenth session of the Forum. It offers a good base for each MG or the MG collectivity to self-diagnose areas of GFG achievement that remain most challenging by region and by theme.
58. It can be expected that the findings of the report may eventually influence adjustment of priorities already agreed among IAF members for the period till 2024 (for their PoW) but also till 2030 (for their Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-2030). Any areas of additional effort would apply as much to major groups and other relevant stakeholders as to substantive IAF members.

³⁶[Global-Forest-Goals-Report-2021.pdf \(un.org\)](https://www.un.org/forests/forests-goals-report-2021)

III.2.2.3 Practical MG Actions on Record

59. Regarding practical action on SFM on the round, there is little structured documentation. The ambitions of the MGs are reflected in their umbrella workplan but also in the individual plans of each MG where they exist. Following adoption of their shared umbrella workplan in 2019, the MGs released a trial report on its implementation titled *“Progress in the Implementation of UNSPF - Contribution of Major Groups to UNFF 16 & 17 Thematic Priorities”*. The review starts by presenting the efforts of the MGoS themselves, which they have published as a progress document. It is an affirmation that they are making use of their umbrella workplan and is a first attempt that can only improve in future as the MGoS develop their own systems for having all their membership submit reports, record performance and assess progress on their interventions, many of which are under their joint workplan and are implemented in member countries and regions.
60. In their report, the activities of only four MGs feature, which are as follows: NGOs = 33 interventions; Science and technological community = 13 interventions; Children and youth = 11 interventions; Women = 20 interventions. Interventions by the rest of the MGs were not reported upon, including from Local Authorities and Business and Industry that are almost always missing. From a tabulation of the 77 interventions, the following emerges:
- a. Of the total interventions, **12 still awaited funding confirmation (about 15%)**, the rest being completed (32%) or ongoing (52%);
 - b. GFG 1 had 19, GFG 2 had 24 while GFGs 4-6 had 34 interventions;
 - c. Effort spread by main theme of the MG umbrella workplan was as follows (consultant allocation):
 - d. 40 interventions = Information in support of capacity for advocacy;
 - e. 22 interventions = Engaging in localisation of the UN Strategic Plan on Forests and translating global UNFF decisions to the people on the ground (a few being actual resource management; many being local community capacity building for SFM);
 - f. 8 interventions = Promoting mutual accountability for commitments made and statements of intent in the UNSPF and the Agenda 2030 (many being information-based and capacity building for securing rights of women or other disadvantaged groups in society);
 - g. 7 interventions = Strengthening MGs’ own Capacities and Resource Base for Effective Action (this included funding proposals preparation and training of MG personnel for it; also, advocacy for the GFFFN to be a potential funding source or to train MGs for funds mobilisation).
61. It can be expected that the findings of the report may eventually influence adjustment of priorities already agreed among IAF members for the period till 2024 (for their PoW) but also till 2030 (for their Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-2030). Any areas of additional effort would apply as much to major groups and other relevant stakeholders as to substantive IAF members.

Table 2: Major Group Interventions in Report to UNFF16 and UNFF17

MG responsible	Stage of implementation	No of Projects				Totals
		Information in support of capacity for advocacy	Engaging in localisation of the UN Strategic Plan on Forests	Promoting mutual accountability on UNSPF and Agenda 2030	Strengthening MGs' own Capacities & Resource Base	
GFG 1						19
NGO	C*	1				
	A	3	2			
	S	1				
	P		1			
S & T	A	2				
	P	1	1			
C & Y	C	2			1	
	A				1	
Women	C					
	A		1			
GFG 2						24
NGO	A	2	7	2		
S & T	C	2	1			
Women	C	6				
	A		1			
	P		1	1		
C & Y	C	1				
GFG 4, 5, 6						34
NGO	C					
	A	4	5	4	1	
S & T	C	2				
	A	1			1	
	P				2	
Women	C	5				
	P	3	1	1		
C & Y	C	3	1			
	A	1			1	
Totals		40	22	8	7	77

* Note: C – completed; A=active/ongoing; S=starting; P=pending

62. Overall, it can be said that the many MG activities are somewhat dispersed; that many interventions are at local community scale except those involving information or promoting rights and accountability, where several countries were at times involved; many are on awareness raising, advocacy and support to rights; those on community capacity building or planning have been credited to localisation of UNSPF. The publication does not declare to which workplan theme each intervention belongs. Also, that countries of intervention were not always declared but there is some apparent bunching, with Ecuador, for example, often mentioned. Few interventions involve establishment or management of forest resources. The missing business sector may also lead to weak financial muscle of MGs as a group.
63. It is unfortunate that the value of the projects is not disclosed. The nature of the projects, however, suggests relatively small local-scale interventions, with a modest collective total cost. An interesting finding is that although funding is a challenge, only 15% of the

projects reported upon were in the pipeline awaiting financing, which is very low. Such a level, in entities that have no assured resources of their own, suggest an unambitious pipeline.

64. The question for the MGs to answer is whether the subjects they are promoting are bankable or if it is not the content but the presentation, i.e., “selling” that limits easy take up. It is also possible that projects focusing on “rights” and “transparency” and “local governance” - the very frequent subject of MG projects reported by at least one MG in the progress reports – may scare away some donors or that the MGs themselves prefer little funding with freedom than more funds with their hands tied by donor concerns. There is a fourth possibility - that the fundraising capacity is inadequate: e.g., do the MGs have adequate (even full-time in some cases) fundraising capacity either collectively or individually? Are the beneficiaries able to put in even tiny “seed” funding to attract interest of donors?
65. The MG progress report does not refer to project partnerships with large-scale players in the IAF domain, e.g., the CPF organisations. The CPF is a very key player in assisting member states and their organisations to implement the UNSPF and GFG agendas – and therefore a useful convergence point around which MGs also build their engagement. A quick look at the CPF areas of engagement revealed many areas of the UNSPF that it and its members do not cover in their programme to 2030. Any potentially interested MG can identify from the listing areas of possible partnership opportunity or of complementing the CPF in areas it is not prioritising.

III.2.2.4 Possible Partnerships with Private Sector Groupings

66. As a UN process, the IAF follows accreditation procedures for partners. There are around 2000 forest-related groups with active ECOSOC consultative status, obviously including the MGs working with the UNFF; the question is whether the MGs are already trying to identify some of the forest-related entities that are inactive with the UNFF but would be ready to partner.
67. A first line of opportunity would be members of the *International Council of Forest and Paper Associations (ICFPA)* (<https://icfpa.org/who-we-are/>) that is focal point for the Business and Industry Major Group. ICFPA is a forum of global dialogue, coordination and co-operation with 18 pulp, paper, wood and fibre-based associations that cover 28 countries and counts as members many of the top global pulp, paper and wood producers. Its members are interested in commercial forest plantations; climate smart forests and forest products; carbon neutrality; sustainable forest programmes and SFM certification; recycling; combatting illegal logging and on forest management generally. What appears to miss from membership is adequate participation of developing country businesses (only Brazil, Chile and South Africa feature) and total absence of the small, informal and artisanal forest businesses prevalent in the poorer developing countries.
68. Then there is another type of commercial enterprise: would some MGs be interested in partnering private sector groupings that already have forestry credentials but do not have UN credentials? They are entities already interested in forestry, they would not need to be sold as a new adventure and if they are well resourced, could boost MG capacities on the ground. A prime example would be the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)³⁷ that emerged after the 1992 UNCED summit in Rio. WBCSD claims to be motivated to address the climate emergency, nature loss and mounting

³⁷<https://www.wbcsd.org/Overview/About-us>

inequality. It presents itself as having member companies from all business sectors and all major economies, representing a combined revenue of more than USD \$8.5 trillion and 19 million employees. For easy accessibility to MGs, the WBCSD has the advantage of having a global network of almost 70 national business councils along and across many value chains.

69. Most important for forestry is that the WBCSD has a **Forest Solutions Group (FSG)**, a global platform where leading businesses in the forest products sector build and share solutions for sustainable development. The FSG promotes growth of an inclusive circular bioeconomy that is rooted in thriving working forests. FSG is motivated by the forest sector being at the heart of transition to a low-carbon, circular bioeconomy due to the ability of forests and forest products to capture and store carbon. MGs and any other IAF potential partners can see if their interests can match any of the WBCSD/FSG's interests, shown in [Table 3](#). The WBCSD, no less than the ICFPA, misses from membership the small, informal and artisanal forest businesses prevalent in the poorer developing countries.

Table 3: Interest Areas for the World Business Council for Sustainable Development - Forest Solutions Group (FSG)

WBCSD FOREST SOLUTIONS GROUP PRIORITIES
Implementation Report for the Forest Sector SDG Roadmap [+New roadmap to maximize the forest sector's contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals]
Forest Sector Net-Zero Roadmap (Phase I)
Announcements of most interest:
Road to COP 15: Aligning business action with the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and 2030 Action Targets
Why investors should put working forests at the heart of the net-zero transition.
The time for ecosystem restoration is now. Collaboration is imperative.
Members of WBCSD's Forest Solutions Group mark their support for the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration
New report provides a data driven description of the forest sector's many contributions to the realization of the SDGs
The circular bioeconomy is a USD \$7.7 trillion opportunity for business and a key element in the fight against climate change, biodiversity loss and resource scarcity.
Forest Sector steps up to mitigate climate change through increased forest cover and use of forest products

70. The **Global Investors for Sustainable Development (GISD)**³⁸ has also been mentioned. Of very recent significance is the **Bezos Earth Fund** which, under its "Nature Solutions" currently has some \$440 million committed to forests-related projects. Of this, some \$123 million is for a range of global pursuits; \$51 million for restoration (\$36 million for the US, \$15 million for Africa); \$106 million for the Congo Basin; \$152 million for the Tropical Andes; and \$31 million for "other Africa". As a follow-up to the UNFFF CoP27, the Bezos fund has announced another \$110 million in funds mostly for land restoration in Africa ([Box 7](#)). At a national scale, an example of potential partners is a Brazilian group profiled in [Box 3](#).

³⁸<https://gisdalliance.org/>

Box 3: Forests and the planted tree industry – a Brazilian example

Regarding the global challenges to sustainable development and thematic priorities for UNFF16, The Brazilian Tree Industry can act on most areas of the Global Forest Goals, including GFG1 (expansion of forest cover) and GFG2 (improving livelihoods), and the three cross cutting GFGs (GFG4, GFG5, and GFG6), as follows:

- **For GFG1:** The 9 million hectares of planted forests in Brazil are responsible for stocking approximately 1.88 billion tons of CO₂eq. The 5.9 million hectares of native vegetation preserved by companies in the sector store roughly another 2.6 billion tons of CO₂eq. In 2019, member companies were involved in projects to restore native vegetation over a total of 32,700 hectares. All forest-based products store carbon and prevent greenhouse gas emissions.
- **For GFG2:** In 2019, the planted forest sector generated 1.3 million direct jobs. The total number of forest-related job posts is estimated at 3.75 million (direct and indirect) throughout the entire production chain. In 2019, they invested approximately R\$ 828 million in social and environmental programs that benefited 6.9 million people. Another 1.6 million people benefited from tree outgrower programs.
- **For GFG4,5,6:** In 2019, member companies made investments of R\$ 4.6 billion: R\$ 3 billion in industrial investments and R\$ 1.6 billion in forest production. An increase of 2 million hectares by 2030 is expected.

Source: Brazilian Tree Industry (BTI) (2020?): **The planted tree industry is essential for the fight of COVID-19.**

III.2.2.5 Funding Source Possibilities

71. There is an array of public and private sources, for which any MG would need to learn more in-depth the history of funding forest activities of particular interest. Networking is important but open-source funding search facilitators also exist, such as **Terra Viva Grants Directory**³⁹ which floats project funding from various - mostly northern - public or private/philanthropic sources. It and other potential sources are presented in Box 4; essentially, a most important need is to have capacity in the MG community (collectively or perhaps in each MG operating with the UNFF) to permanently engage with potential funding partners⁴⁰. Offers of funding are often limited to a fixed period during which beneficiaries can apply for grants.

Box 4: Illustrative Possible Funding sources for Major Groups that work with the UNFF

JAPAN FUND FOR GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT — ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION GRANTS 2023

- The Japan Fund for Global Environment makes grants to non-profit organizations in Japan and developing countries for field projects in environmental conservation (for example [Biodiversity](#), [Conservation](#), [Wildlife](#)). Grants are for grass-roots projects and range from 500 thousand to 3 million JPY.

THE GEF SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

<https://sgp.undp.org/>

- IAF-relevant **Areas of work:** Biodiversity, Climate change, Land degradation and SFM.

IKI CLIMATE INITIATIVE

<https://iki-small-grants.de/>

- The German Federal Government through the International Climate Initiative (**IKI**) internationally supports projects on climate change mitigation, adaptation as well as forest and biodiversity conservation. Over a 5-year period, about 11 million Euros will be provided to approximately 100 selected projects.
- Since 2022, IKI is implemented by the Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) in close cooperation with the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection (BMUV) and the Federal Foreign Office (AA).

³⁹https://terravivagrants.org/funding-news/?gclid=CjwKCAiAmuKbBhA2EiwAxQnt71I1jc4fvj1-xy4YyW10IMYaM1pII5J6VibgxQgNJH24ev2ZNw6ARoCeX4QAvD_BwE

⁴⁰ This capacity building for fundraising is a prominent element in the MG joint workplan.

GLOBAL CONSERVATION FUND (GCF)

<https://www.conservation.org/about/global-conservation-fund>

- GCF has helped to create or expand **135 protected areas**, spanning **81 million hectares** of vital terrestrial and marine ecosystems in **26 countries**.

JAPAN FUND FOR GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FOR NGOS/NPOS ENGAGED IN ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES

<https://concoursn.com/japan-fund-for-global-environment-for-ngos-npos-engaged-in-environmental-activities/>

- **Fields of Activity (IAF-relevant):** Nature protection, conservation and restoration; Forest conservation and greening; Prevention of desertification; Formation of a decarbonised society and climate change countermeasures; Formation of a circular society; Comprehensive environmental conservation activities; Restoration support, etc.
- **Funding Information:** Requestable amount: 500,000 yen to 3,000,000 yen (per year).
- **Eligibility Criteria:** Non-governmental, non-profit, unincorporated associations that satisfy all the requirements.

THE NORWEGIAN CLIMATE AND FOREST FUNDING TO CIVIL SOCIETY

Norway's International Climate and Forest Initiative (NICFI) for the period of 2021-2025. **Projects funded under this grant scheme address one or more of the five following categories (all are IAF compatible):**

- Indigenous peoples, local communities and environmental defenders
- Deforestation-free supply chains and financial markets
- Reduced forest crime and improved forest monitoring
- Mobilising ambition and support for forest friendly policies
- Groundbreaking ideas to reduce deforestation

UNDP CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

- UNDP shares information on country-led programmes and projects financed by the Global Environment Facility Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF), Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), Green Climate Fund, Adaptation Fund (AF), bi-lateral donors and through decentralized cooperation supported by UNDP's Down to Earth: Territorial Approach to Climate Change (TACC) project. It is not clear to what extent each of these focuses more on non-government parties such as the Major groups.
- **Under Ecosystem-based adaptation comes "FORESTS, CLIMATE & SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT": FORESTS.**

AFRICA CLIMATE CHANGE FUND (OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK)

<https://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/initiatives-partnerships/africa-climate-change-fund>

- The ACCF was established by the African Development Bank in April 2014 with an initial contribution of € 4.725 million from the Government of Germany to support Africa in building resilience to the negative impacts of climate change and in transitioning to sustainable low-carbon growth. To date, the ACCF has approved 15 small grant projects in over 16 African countries for a total of about USD 8 million.
- The Fund offers in the range of \$250,000 – \$500,000 to support their activities. The IAF-compatible area in the current demand Driven Window is: (iii) Land restoration in collaboration with farmers especially in the Sahel.

THE BEZOS EARTH FUND - Nature Solutions

<https://www.bezosearthfund.org/our-programs>

Emerged relatively recently. It currently has some \$440 million committed to forests-related projects, of which some \$123 million for a range of global pursuits; \$51 million for restoration (\$36 million for the US, \$15 million for Africa; \$106 million for the Congo Basin; \$152 million for the Tropical Andes; and \$31 million for "other Africa".

III.2.2.6 What Prospects Specifically for Philanthropies as Funding Partners?

72. Much forestry investment for the GFGs is not highly revenue-generating. Accordingly, first resort for seeking funding is public money. This will not suffice and therefore development banks from global to national levels come next (being para-statal), and then the private sector (including presumably banks). Satisfying the profit motive of such entities will be a challenge and so MGs cannot consider this the most likely opportunity for partnership. Philanthropic organisations and individuals of high net worth are often mentioned as a possible financial saviour.
73. The prospects for this can be judged from their track record as supporters of environment-dominated investments. OECD data gives some insights; According to the publication “**Global Private Philanthropy for Development - Results of the OECD Data Survey as of 3 October 2017**” gives the profile in [Box 5](#). The key message from this is that philanthropy is unlikely to be a major saviour of the IAF agenda⁴¹ through any of its main channels, including through the major groups. However, the Bezos Earth Fund is recent emerging philanthropic player in environment generally and forests in particular.

Box 5: OECD-Profile of private philanthropy for development

Total giving: Philanthropic giving for development amounted to US\$ 23.4 billion in 2013-15 (or US\$ 7.8 billion per year on average), broken down as follows:

- **By source region:** 77% USA and Canada; 18% Europe; 5% other.
- **By objective:** 54% to health and population (74% of which came from BMGF); 9% education; 9% agriculture; 7% government % civil society.
- **By beneficiary region:** 28% to Africa, 16% Asia, 8% America, 2% Europe. But 46% had global or multi-continent spread.
- **By beneficiary country:** India (6.7%); 5 of top 10 were from Africa (Nigeria, Ethiopia, Kenya, S Africa, Tanzania).
- **By beneficiary income category:** 2/3rds went to middle-income countries (of which 38% LMICs, 29% UMICs); 28% LDCs, 5% other LICs.
- **By channel name:** Gavi (the Vaccine Alliance), was the main channel of delivery, followed by WHO, UNICEF, PATH International, Rotary International and University of Oxford.
- **Channel types:**
 - 68% through NGOs, research institutes, think tanks, universities, networks, PPPs or private enterprises (of which 9% as core support);
 - 18% through multilateral organisations (of which 38% as core support);
 - 14% (remainder) to specific activities implemented by the foundations themselves (including direct charitable activities), programme-related investments and unspecified.

Source: OECD (2017): **Global Private Philanthropy for Development - Results of the OECD Data Survey as of 3 October 2017.** [oecd/philanthropysurvey](http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/beyond-oda-foundations.htm) or <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/beyond-oda-foundations.htm>

74. The OECD report featured in [Box 5](#) shows that environment is not a favourite destination for philanthropic giving. The Rockefeller foundation gives art-witness to this: as part of the “Partnership of the Goals” it pays great attention to non-environmental SDGs in line with the objective to ensure that “no one is left behind”. The Foundation has published a manual⁴² for designing interventions in which it reveals a preference to use teamwork instead of stand-alone interventions.

⁴¹ Especially at the global level.

⁴² Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors (undated): **Philanthropy and The SDGs - Practical Tools for Alignment.** Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors Philanthropy Roadmap.

Box 6: Key Philanthropies-related Messages from questionnaire responses

- *It would be good if UNFF could establish closer link between Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network with the Global Investors for Sustainable Development (GISD) to engage investors to promote in SFM.*
- *Engage philanthropies (as other donors) on important indigenous and other marginalised community challenges: this may interest them.*
- *explore the barriers to obtaining support from philanthropic organizations for Major Groups programs.*

Source: in response to Question J-3

75. **THE BEZOS EARTH FUND - Nature Solutions**⁴³ is a fast-rising pro-nature philanthropic entity (see [Box 7](#)). Currently the Fund has some \$440 million committed to forests-related projects, of which some \$123 million are dedicated to a range of global pursuits; \$51 million for restoration (\$36 million for the US, \$15 million for Africa; \$106 million for the Congo Basin; \$152 million for the Tropical Andes; and \$31 million for “other Africa”. In December 2022, “the Bezos Earth Fund has committed \$110 million in grant funding to organizations developing climate research and working to restore deforested and degraded land within the African continent and in the United States. The new grants are part of the 10-year, \$10 billion pledge Amazon founder Jeff Bezos made when he launched the Earth Fund in 2020” – ([Box 7](#)).

⁴³<https://www.bezosearthfund.org/our-programs>

Box 7: The Bezos Earth Fund – Nature Solutions engagement in Forests

The Fund has some \$440 million committed to forests-related projects, of which some \$123 million for a range of global pursuits; \$51 million for restoration (\$36 million for the US, \$15 million for Africa; \$106 million for the Congo Basin; \$152 million for the Tropical Andes; and \$31 million for “other Africa”. Its scope is revealed with the current projects:

SUNDRY

- Safeguarding Nature to Stabilize Climate
- Mangroves for Community and Climate
- The Emerald Edge: Protecting Living Carbon Resources
- Accelerating restoration in Kenya, Madagascar, and Mozambique
- Building Support for the 30x30 Target
- Preparing for Scale-Up of African Landscape Restoration

CONGO BASIN

- Innovative Finance for Conservation in Gabon
- Expanding protected areas in the Congo Basin
- Support for indigenous peoples and local communities in the Congo Basin
- Advancing Key Biodiversity Areas in the Congo Basin
- Expanding protected areas in the Congo Basin through local and indigenous stewards
- Scaling-up collective land rights and locally led conservation in the Congo Basin
- Advancing implementation and finance for Congo Basin conservation
- Monitoring protected areas of the Congo Basin

TROPICAL ANDES

- Declaration and management of protected areas across the Tropical Andes
- Creation of protected areas while supporting Indigenous Peoples and local communities
- Accelerating Inclusive Conservation in Ecuador and Bolivia
- Support for indigenous peoples and local communities in the Tropical Andes
- Advancing Key Biodiversity Areas in the Tropical Andes
- Indigenous peoples’ guardianship in the Tropical Andes
- Expanding protected areas in the Tropical Andes through local and indigenous stewards
- Creating and maintaining conservation areas at scale in Andean countries
- Scaling up recognition of collective land rights and locally led conservation in the Tropical Andes
- Monitoring protected areas in the Tropical Andes

RESTORATION

- Restoring Urban Environments in the United States
- Accelerating restoration across the U.S.
- Advancing restoration in Africa

DECEMBER 2022 ANNOUNCEMENT: Bezos Earth reveals \$110M in new grants for climate, reforestation

By *Stephanie Beasley* // 14 December 2022

https://www.devex.com/news/bezos-earth-reveals-110m-in-new-grants-for-climate-reforestation-104653?access_key=&utm_source=nl_newswire&utm_medium=email&utm_term=article&utm_content=cta&mkt_tok=Njg1LUtCTC03NjUAAAGitKM1X2vnOgOQgRiUYKivMv3AmmLyzlUi1jFJ7Q7uD3QoM46uz80Mvf-astQLBikWpRN4jWP9YEdFEagZ-SWSN8sXR6-8TJDZQJWqzWnk8wZEvuQ

The [Bezos Earth Fund](#) has committed \$110 million in grant funding to organizations developing climate research and working to restore deforested and degraded land within the African continent and in the United States. The new grants are part of the 10-year, \$10 billion pledge Amazon founder Jeff Bezos made when he launched the Earth Fund in 2020. The organization said in a statement on Wednesday that this latest batch of funding continues its commitment to “fight climate change, conserve and restore nature, and advance environmental justice and economic opportunity.”

The \$110 million pledge includes a \$50 million allocation for African restoration projects that the Bezos Earth Fund revealed at last month's 27th United Nations Climate Change Conference in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt. The funding will help support [AFR100](#), a country-led African initiative that wants to restore 100 million hectares (about 250 million acres) of land by 2030. [One Tree Planted](#), [One Acre Fund](#), [World Resources Institute](#), and [Realize Impact](#) will receive \$27.2 million of the total for their restoration work in the Greater Ruzizi Basin region of the larger Congo basin and in Kenya's Great Rift Valley.

Other funding will be distributed as grants and loans to small businesses and community projects to support restoration efforts and help them scale up, according to the Bezos Earth Fund. Working with local groups is "central to achieving global restoration goals," Andrew Steer, the organization's president and CEO, said in the statement. Work with AFR100, in particular, is focused on removing "three critical barriers to locally led restoration." First, we must build capacity, drawing on the expertise that exists within African institutions and beyond to help restoration projects scale. Second, we must ensure that finance is intermediated more effectively to reach frontline groups. Finally, we must ensure that best in-class monitoring systems are used to track progress on the ground," he said.

The Bezos Earth Fund will also provide \$30 million to the U.S.-based [National Fish and Wildlife Foundation](#) to restore land and forests in the U.S. in collaboration with conservation groups, non-profits, and Indigenous groups. The other major commitments include a \$10 million pledge to support groups developing research and tools to show the links between human activities and extreme weather events. Another \$11 million will go toward two initiatives that provide some governance models and best practices for voluntary carbon markets: [The Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market](#) and the [Voluntary Carbon Market Integrity Initiative](#). A full list of all the grantees can be found [here](#).

As Devex [previously reported](#), the Bezos Earth Fund has developed a philanthropic strategy over the past two years that relies on partnering with other groups to tackle climate change issues. The organization recently updated [its website](#) — which had been rather scant — with new details about how it organizes its work, as well as information about its growing staff.

III.3 MAJOR GROUPS ATTRIBUTES AND FUNCTIONS RELEVANT TO THEIR UNFF ENGAGEMENT

76. MG activities reflect norms in their interaction with the Forum. The current reality of MG engagement at the Forum has been arrived at over time through discussions of proposals made by Forum members. In 2015, UNFF11 considered the discussion paper on the future of the IAF prepared by major groups detailing their views on the achievements and weaknesses of the IAF and on the role played by the major groups (see Box 8).
77. [Box 9](#) provides an update on Major Group views on the topics that were crystallised through the EGM held at Bangkok in 2019 Bangkok EGM on the same topic. For Major Group engagement with IAF to be effective, the organisation and working practices of Major Groups should be adapted to the agreed functions and to evolve as the circumstances require.

Box 8: Suggestions of the major groups on MG roles under international arrangement on forests

Perception of MG roles: Six major groups, facilitated by the Major Groups partnership on Forests, jointly provided their views on the achievements and weaknesses of the international arrangement on forests and on the role played by the major groups. Their perception of MG roles is:

- civil society raises the awareness of Governments and others about local forest-related social, economic and environmental realities. People in local communities in or near forests are keenly;
- Civil society actors exchange information about experiences of progress and regress, both within countries and globally, through networks that help to identify critical issues and seek to raise awareness about them;
- In particular, civil society contributes a cross-sectoral perspective on the broad implications of forestry practices and sustainable forest management;
- Civil society organizations can help to mobilize support for policy initiatives and can contribute directly to reducing the costs and increasing the effectiveness of some aspects of policy implementation. For example, the involvement of local communities in the protection of forests has led in many cases to better protection at a lower cost;
- In practical terms, civil society organizations play a valuable role by assisting in monitoring the implementation of sustainable forest management policies, in parallel with official monitoring and reporting procedures.

Selected MG contributions to the IAF:

- In general, civil society complements the role of Governments in the development and implementation of effective sustainable forest management policies.
- civil society raises the awareness of Governments and others about local forest-related social, economic and environmental realities.
- civil society contributes a cross-sectoral perspective on the broad implications of forestry practices and sustainable forest management - because people do not live and work mostly in discrete "sectors".

Major groups observations on their own efficacy in the IAF process:

- The space given to the multi-stakeholder dialogue during Forum sessions has gradually increased;
- The capacity of major groups to present a more cohesive voice in Forum sessions has increased as well. In 2011 and 2013, seven of the nine major groups contributed joint discussion papers and established the Major Groups Partnership on Forests to strengthen the coherence and clarity of their input.

MG proposals for "Increasing the effectiveness of their own contribution":

- **General:** Efforts must be continued to ensure the full involvement of all major groups, including business and industry and local authorities, for a more complete expression of the views of civil society and the increased legitimacy that will bring to the groups' message. [+ other details]
- **Specific:**
 - Recognising their umbrella organisation (no longer exists);
 - Easier accreditation;
 - Better MG Partnership (no longer exists) work with the CPF;
 - Institutional funding – to participate in Forum meetings but also to "global level in support of the Forum and to support the implementation of the international arrangement on forests by major groups organizations".

MG/CPF partnership?

- At the time the MGs had the Major Groups Partnership on Forests, they there be a formal partnership arrangement with the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. This never came to pass but there is already cooperation in place, some involving specific MGs and individual member organisations of the CPF.

Source: ECOSOC (2015): **Future of the international arrangement on forests - Discussion paper submitted by the major groups.** UNFF11, New York, 4-15 May 2015. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2015/6/Add.1

Box 9: MGs/Civil Society actions to institutionalize participation in SFM and avoid predominantly casual/ad hoc approaches

At their 2019 EGM in Bangkok, Major Groups adopted work plans and intended that they would structure their engagement at all levels (global, regional, national). They also intended to structure their engagement with other intergovernmental bodies, such as the CPF, non-governmental entities, profit/non-profit, or philanthropic actors on forests and forestry. Among other actions, the MGs decided in Bangkok to:

- a. As a next step, further strengthen the relation of their work plans to the GFG and associated targets as well as the relation to the SDGs. This should include looking at the bigger picture while remembering special MG attributes enabling them to domesticate international agreements at the local level in society;
- a. With the latter in mind, MGs use outreach and communication (mainstreaming) to reach people on the ground, at the same time to encourage governments to take local communities and civil society into account in planning processes;
- b. In engaging with global institutions for policy and programme coherence, institutionalise engagement in promoting SFM through fora such as side events & relevant meetings such as MGI (Major Groups Initiative) during international events all contribute. Corresponding initiatives are required at national & local levels involving collaborate with national and local governments, the corporate world and local communities.;
- c. Push for political will to be high enough to drive practical action. MGs believed that in setting up multi-stakeholder structures that can prompt action and press for accountability, governments should be able to count on MGs to help mobilize society to take action, build capacity for smallholders, indigenous & local communities to demand and implement free prior and informed consent and grievance redress mechanisms, and communicate best practices and lessons learnt regards SFM. MGs could also lobby for incentives that mobilise domestic resources alongside current appeals for international funding, such as through incentives for the private sector at all levels including small forest owners and communities;
- d. In their structured engagement with governments, MGs wished to play watchdog roles to hold governments accountable as they make legislation for SFM, promote implementation of SFM, and apply criteria and indicators at national and operational levels. MGs also wanted to press for creation of dialogue platforms to develop contextualised shared visions and common understanding of SFM for all stakeholders at various levels; to enhance policy dialogue for action on SFM, as well as for policy and programme coherence.

III.3.1 Diversity with Unity among Major Groups

78. Any review of MGs engagement needs to recognise the diversity of members of this group. There are 1,395 forest-related civil society organisations in “active consultative status” with the ECOSOC. However, not more than 30 generally attend and participate in Forum sessions. Whether the relationship between these regular attendants at UNFF meetings and the many absent ones is that of apex MGs needs clarification. Whatever the relationship, the indication is that there may be many MGs that go about their own business without visible effort to be active in the UN partnership, including in the UNFF main sessions or related intersessional or side-events.
79. There is also some contrast between MGs with significant government links and those without. The Scientific and Technological Community must have high government involvement because of the high government engagement in research and development, while others are less likely to be so. Two major groups, Local Governments/Authorities and Business and Industry have been the least present in the IAF’s work. The Business and Industry Major Group, particularly commercial private sector including banks and philanthropic entities could have been a source of funding had they been present.
80. The diversity of MGs automatically causes them to have diverse interests and areas of focus. Prior to UNFF11, MGs created an umbrella for their activities in the form of “Major

Groups Partnership on Forests” (MGPOF) to speak with a collective voice and to coordinate action. MGPOF’s main outputs include:

- a. Provided unified MG comments on the report of the 2014 Independent Evaluation of the UNFF titled *“Future of the international arrangement on forests - Discussion paper submitted by the major groups”*⁴⁴;
- b. The report of the Major Group-led Initiative in support of UNFF11 held in Kathmandu, Nepal from March 2-6, 2015. Its report was titled *“Sustainable Forest Management: Designing the Vehicles for Securing the Means of Implementation”*.

81. More recently, in January 2019, the inter-major group consultation process culminated in a draft joint major group Workplan⁴⁵ adopted at their meeting in Bangkok alongside specific work plans for Children and youth; Scientific and Technological Community; and Women. The Workplan does not list participation in Forum meetings, rather focuses on substantive activities in member countries, regions or globally. The Major Groups reported on implementation of their joint workplan through the already mentioned document *“Major Groups on Forests (2021): Progress in The Implementation of UNSPF - Contribution of Major Groups to UNFF 16 &17 Thematic Priorities”*.
82. In the MG constituency at global level, *local authorities/governments* have also been conspicuous in their absence. Given that they are in the public sector, Member States may be key to motivating them. The Forum should consider organising an event in each region⁴⁶ at which Member States can exchange experiences about what policy incentives and administrative arrangements best encourage local government engagement in forestry can be discussed.
83. The UNFFS already has ideas on the table for attracting more potential partners to achieve UNSPF ambitions, for example from the UNFF16 document *“Contributions of major groups and other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and the philanthropic community, to achieving the thematic priorities; progress on major group workplans”*⁴⁷.

III.3.2 Major Groups Governance for Coordination and Operational Performance

84. This sub-section responds largely to Assessment Issue J2: **“Assess the efforts made by the major groups to establish and maintain effective coordination mechanisms for interaction and participation in the Forum and other forest-related United Nations bodies”**.
85. A scan of Major group governance documents reveals that, if complied with, the structures and procedures under their agreement with the UN would ensure a lot of coordination and little additional effort to improve it. Indeed, the arrangements are so heavy that for productivity and speed of action, efforts could lean towards making lighter the coordination and structured reporting burden within the system.
86. The Children and Youth Major Group⁴⁸ has the most complete presentation of governance arrangements, including the procedural provisions for coordination. This is followed by

⁴⁴E/CN.18/2015/6/Add.1

⁴⁵https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/MG_workplan_May2018.pdf

⁴⁶ Could be an MG-led initiative possibly jointly with a CPF member or sponsoring member state.

⁴⁷United Nations, (2021): **United Nations Forum on Forests -Report on the sixteenth session**. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 2021 Supplement No. 22 Doc E/2021/42-E/CN.18/2021/8

⁴⁸CHILDREN AND YOUTH - Mandate and Governance:<https://www.unmgcy.org/mandate-and-governance>

the Women Major Group governance arrangement. The essence of Major group governance is offered from the Children and Youth example in Box10.

87. The pinnacle of intra-MG coordination in the IAF was when MGPOF (now deactivated) served as the Major Groups Coordinator as mentioned earlier. Nevertheless, the desire for coordination for better coherence of their messaging remains strong as reflected in the 2019 Bangkok EGM proposals (see Box 9).

Box 10: Major groups governance, Procedures (Example of Children and Youth (MGCY))
– with Coordination Arrangements Included

EXAMPLE OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH (MGCY)

<https://www.unmgcy.org/mandate-and-governance>

- **Mandate:** Primary mandates directly from Agenda 21, GA Resolution 67/290 on the HLPF, and the 2030 Agenda. The major groups also have bilateral agreements and/or terms of reference with specific entities (such as UNDESA) in the UN system.
- **Governance:** Process and Procedures give the major group reporting obligations towards the UN system: the MGCY is required to submit periodic reports to UN DESA, and as per paragraph 89 of the 2030 Agenda to the HLPF. Processes and Procedures: the **original was agreed April 2011** and several revisions have occurred or been subjected to other interventions in October 2014, December 2014, January 7th February 2015, March 2015 until **updated version was adopted in July 2020**.
- **Coordination is affected by the MCY on:** (a) Logistics of young people’s participation in UN processes. (b) Formal inputs into UN processes. (c) Equitable allocation of resources which are received to enable their participation in processes. (d) Regular communication and correspondence with the UN MGCY assembly, the UN system and related partners.
- **Working Structures that manage functioning:** (a) **Assembly**; (b) Children and Youth International [hereinafter “CYI”], as well as the CYI Board of Trustees/UN MGCY Board; (c) Secretariat; (iv) Constituencies and/or Working Groups; (v) Regional Caucuses; (vi) **National Platforms/Caucuses**; (vii) **Platforms**; (viii) Grievance Redressal Mechanism; and (ix) Advisory Group. Constituency/Working Groups directly facilitate and coordinate formal engagement and participation in respective UN processes and/or avenues along the UN MGCY’s areas of work. Reportedly, *each UN process, entity or clusters of UN processes has a corresponding working group as the formal constituency of that specific process/avenue*.

Respective examples of thematic and hierarchical structures are (a) Platforms – **for example** Science-Policy Interface Platform (SPI); (b) **Grassroots Youth Entities Platform** (International Alliance of Grassroots Youth Organisations).
- **Coordination Structures:** For the purpose of effective coordination of its mandate and work areas, the UN MGCY has the following: (a) UN MGCY Coordination Team (b) Constituency/Working Group Coordination Team (c) Regional Caucus Coordination (d) National Caucus Coordination (e) Science Policy Interface Platform Coordination Team (f) *Youth Entities (International, Regional, National and Grassroots) Platform Joint-Coordination Team* (g) *All Focal Points Group* (h) Focus Group.
- **System of Focal Points:** at full elaboration, it includes: (a) Global Focal Points (GFPs) (b) Regional Caucus Coordinators (RCCs) (c) National Platform/Caucus Coordinators (NPCs/NCCs) (d) Children’s Platform Focal Points (e) Science Policy Interface Platform Focal Points (SPI Platform-FP) (f) Regional Focal Point (RFPs) (g) Thematic Focal Points (TFPs) (h) Science Policy Interface Focal Points (SPI-FPs) (i) Board Members (BMs) (j) UN IANYD Youth Caucus Convenor(s) (xiv) Youth Entity (International, Regional, National, Grassroots, ECOSOC accredited, Youth Mechanisms of UNGA Observers) Platform Focal Points / Liaisons.
- **Representation of IAF-interest areas on UN MGCY Coordination Team** (total of 50members, including):

- No 18 Climate Change YOUNGO- Youth NGOs in UNFCCC
- No 21 Forests UN Forests Forum Major Group for Children and Youth UNFF
- No 22 Desertification Global Youth Caucus on Desertification and Desertification / UNCCD Youth Caucus UNCCD
- No 23 Biodiversity Global Youth Biodiversity Network UNCBD

MGS WITH INADEQUATE INFORMATION:

All other IAF-associated Major groups presumably have the equivalent information and the Children and Youth, but it could not be found. Women came close. Selected highlights for others:

LOCAL AUTHORITIES MAJOR GROUP

[<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=270&menu=3170>]

- For **Effective multilevel governance, follows the 4C Approach:**
 - COHERENCE of policies across national sectoral policies;
 - COHESION of national and subnational plans and strategies;
 - COORDINATION between national and subnational level to align strategies and ensure the necessary support to action at the subnational level;
 - COOPERATION among all levels of government and with all stakeholders. Establishing partnerships and involving civil-society, business, academia and local communities should be at the heart of the implementation efforts of LRGs.
- **Contributions to the Global Reviews:** the aim of the Local Authorities' Major Group, organized within the Global Taskforce, is to promote in-depth voluntary reviews at subnational level to contribute to the global reporting process, and thus enable the benchmarking of different strategies used by LRGs worldwide.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL COMMUNITY MAJOR GROUP

<https://council.science/science-technology-major-group/>

- The International Science Council (ISC), together with the World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO), is a co-organizing partner of the Scientific and Technological Community Major Group at the United Nations.
- Forests are NOT part of the group.

WOMEN'S MAJOR GROUP GOVERNANCE & STRUCTURE

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/17386WMG_Governance_29May2017_Final.pdf

- Women's Major Group works The Women's Major Group is facilitated by a set of up to 9 Organizing Partners (OPs). This includes two global OPs (ideally one North/one South) and up to 7 regional OPs to ensure geographical representation across all regions including the economic South and North: (1) Africa, (2) Asia, (3) the Middle East & North Africa, (4) Europe & Central Asia, (5) Latin America and the Caribbean, (6) North America (preferably NY based), and 7) Pacific Small Island States.
- The WMG aims to cooperate closely and build bridges with other Women's Major Groups and Women's constituencies linked to related UN policy processes, while respecting their mandates in those processes.
- It also includes constituencies in processes for Climate, Biodiversity, Disaster Risk Reduction, Cities, Financing for Development, Commission on Population and Development (CPD), Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and processes of the UN Regional Economic Commissions.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY MAJOR GROUP GOVERNANCE

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/6236businessgovernance.pdf>

The Business and Industry Major Group Organizing Partner role will include the following responsibilities:

- (a). Coordinate the business input to intergovernmental processes; (b). Continuous outreach to various networks to disseminate information to keep constituency informed of various developments and to help inform business positions to different themes and issues; (c). Organize side events, briefings and collaborate with other major groups and stakeholders to co-host activities; (d). Identify representatives to fill speaking and other roles.

Source: CHILDREN AND YOUTH - Mandate and Governance: <https://www.unmgcy.org/mandate-and-governance>

88. The examples in Box 10 confirm the elaborate focal point arrangements in major groups at all levels from global to grassroots. As implied earlier, the challenge is not possible weak focal point arrangements but that the system is so complete and complex that full compliance may lead to paralysis or slowing down. Indeed, in any activity with a short lead time (such as questionnaires giving a month or so deadline), the democratic and consultative traditions of major groups may make timely turnaround of responses impossible, something that can at times be interpreted as fatigue or disinterest.
89. MGs have a long-established scheme of focal points-often a lead and an alternate for each MG. These global focal points and their alternates work with a network of focal points in their country level membership. They appear to jealously guard the right of all members (down to the grassroots) to be consulted and to have their role voice heard. The extract on focal points from Box 10 is as follows: **“System of Focal Points: at full elaboration, it includes: (a) Global Focal Points (GFPs) (b) Regional Caucus Coordinators (RCCs) (c) National Platform/Caucus Coordinators (NPCs/NCCs) (d) Children’s Platform Focal Points (e) Science Policy Interface Platform Focal Points (SPI Platform-FP) (f) Regional Focal Point (RFPs) (g) Thematic Focal Points (TFPs) (h) Science Policy Interface Focal Points (SPI-FPs) (i) Board Members (BMs) (j) UN IANYD Youth Caucus Convenor(s) (xiv) Youth Entity (International, Regional, National, Grassroots, ECOSOC accredited, Youth Mechanisms of UNGA Observers) Platform Focal Points / Liaisons”.**
90. Contacts with some MG focal points suggest that the response delays to UNFF and consultant questionnaires on this MTR arose precisely because of the democratic consultative culture. The focal point and alternate are in place but both feel constrained to respond on behalf of their membership and so they invite grass-roots inputs before replying, by when deadlines have been missed. The work is carried by motivated people that volunteer much personal time and have limited (if any) secretariat. The focal points system would probably work much faster if each MG was large enough to have a standing secretariat to deal with daily routines and to follow-up on required actions, but this raises budget issues, including likely resistance from donors to such an expense. Some suggest that motivation and capacity building is key: an exchange of ideas among MGs could suggest options, most likely a diversity of approaches are needed to suit the many MG types.
91. Notwithstanding the desire for coordination, the MGs still allow room for initiative by any of their membership. For example, to organise the MGI on Cross-sectoral collaboration for inclusive forest landscapes” in Nairobi MGC&Y took a leadership role. MGC&Y also provided the already mentioned high-profile statement at the UNFF16 *High Level Round Table* and the *“Youth Call for Action: Work with Us”* delivered at the 2022 World Forest Congress in Seoul.
92. This sub-section also covers Assessment Issue J3: **“Assess the ability of major groups and other relevant stakeholders to deliver effective representation within their constituencies”**. On this dimension, the following may be noted:
- a. There is a strong interface between coordination⁴⁹ and effective representation: a governance arrangement that offers coordination structures and focal point arrangements can also support effective representation if not overdone.

⁴⁹ In commenting on a draft of this report, the point has been made (which perhaps deserves discussion by the MGs at the Bangkok EGM) that Governance structure and representation is not only about “coordination”. It also includes transparency and inclusiveness. One important aspect of representation is that how the internal mechanism of

- b. On the effective representation issue, information is not abundant. An observation made earlier on MG Children and Youth revealed the highly elaborate focal point hierarchy on which comments have already been made (Box 10)⁵⁰:
- c. In considering this review, the meeting which will consider the report may wish to secure feedback on whether as implied in this section J.3.3.2, that the challenge is not weak focal point arrangements but that the system is so complex that full compliance may lead to paralysis or slowing down of MGoS functioning.

III.3.3 The Agenda for cooperation with others

- 93. There is a foundation to build upon in the process of proposing further or more effective involvement of major groups and other stakeholders with other partners in the UNFF and its PoWs. That foundation is earlier consideration of their inputs, as was done at UNFF15 in 2020 [UNFF15, Doc E/CN.18/2020/6]:
- 94. But the picture that emerges tabulation of aspects of the GFG that are being visibly attended to reveals that coverage of the GFG sub-goals scope appears inadequate. Also, that there is poor matching between the requirements of the UNSPF 2017-2030 and the activities various parties have chosen to implement. Several lines of action could be considered in order to improve matters:
 - a. In its next iteration of the publication **The Global Forest Goals Report**, go deeper in identifying for greater attention the sub-goals of the GFG that are not being addressed adequately by any of the key players: Member State Governments, the CPF, Regional and sub-regional partners, and Major Groups;
 - b. Have thematic focus on a subregion or key forest system (e.g., Africa's populated savannas or the more usual tropical high forests etc) and do the GFG progress assessment at that level rather than the global one. At that scale, it will be easier to reveal the real contribution of MGs. A lot of MG work is at the local level,⁵¹ not necessarily visible to the global IAF/UNFF structures but nevertheless vital. At that level, indications are that MGs form partnerships with the private and philanthropic sectors and even with UN and international entities (e.g., WRI, WWF, CI etc) but they do not succeed so well at global level;
 - c. Promote self-introspection within the CPF (a lead partnership with considerable capacities and influence – with some members having deep pockets) about the apparently patchy coverage of its practical interventions. The real question is whether the scatter of interventions is adequate to give momentum to the overall uplifting of progress in achieving the GFGs;

communication among specific category of major groups is working, how much it is inclusive of all relevant major groups in different regions and countries, how transparent and inclusive is the process of selection of focal points for that specific MG, how they are selected... these are all points that have to be clarified/answered so to ensure that representation by a specific individual has been based on the principals of fairness, transparency, and inclusiveness.

⁵⁰ An observation has been made that linkages internal to each MG are only part of the story. Thus, for the MG C&Y, it is also present in the Dept of Global Communications NGO Committee, HLPF major groups, and in FAO and UNEP NGO entities

⁵¹ MGs reach indigenous and peasant communities that are often marginalised; they fit in because they adopt multisectoral and multi-resource approaches that blend in rather than being narrowly focused on just forest management.

- d. Push for more engagement of several potentially key parties that have so far not come to the fore in action: local governments, the commercial private sector, and philanthropies.⁵² There is a huge community of financial institutions operating at sub-global levels that, if motivated, could probably yield more finance than the global institutions so far targeted. In doing this, the Forum will need to think of special incentives to overcome potential reluctance to come on board under a UNFF umbrella:
- i. The *commercial private sector* already has its own frameworks for action and will probably insist on retaining those [also for philanthropists - See OECD⁵³] so the UNFF should seek partnership for common purpose (or even join them rather than the reverse);
 - ii. The *philanthropic sector* does not prioritise environment in general and forestry in particular so the UNFF will have to be particularly selective in promoting its engagement with IAF activities: they are unlikely to ever become a mainstream supporter.

III.3.4 Mobilising Finance

95. **Assessment Issue J4: Identify potential financial resources that could facilitate the development and implementation of quadrennial meetings of the Major Group-led Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests:**

- a. The question of finance also has to do with “plans, priorities and ambitions of other key players” as well as with the capacities of other parties. The inadequacy of funding facing MGoS institutions is a frequent refrain when they attend UNFF sessions as well as affiliated events, whether expert groups, externally sponsored initiatives etc. The short-lived MGPOF proposed in its paper to UNFF11 that as umbrella body for the MGs, it should “...on an annual basis and from a strategic trust fund, to guarantee core funding to the organization”. Also, that adequate funding be provided for the active participation of major groups in Forum sessions. That did not occur. One must note, though, that the UNFF Trust Fund is composed of donations and the respective donors decide how their funds should be used.
- b. During the previously mentioned December 2021 *Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening the Engagement of the United Nations Forum on Forests with Regional Partners, Major Groups, and other Stakeholders* **major groups requested** that the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network *guidelines be revised to include the possibility of enabling non-governmental actors to benefit from its assistance*. This message is not new, but this time emphasis also went to “...requests for support in project conceptualization and capacity building on accessing financing for implementation of activities/projects in the collective major group workplan”. Regarding GFFFN, the guidelines are decided upon by Member States and MGoS may consider reiterating their wish to be able to access the Facility directly or accepting that after so many attempts, the issue should be laid to rest.
- c. Thus, among *the MGs requests they did not get are that the:*
 - a. GFFFN Guidelines are revised to allow the MGs access support to implement projects and activities that would contribute to the implementation of UNSPF; and
 - b. UNFFS extend the capacity building in project conceptualization and development training programme to MGs.

⁵² Their engagement may be revealed better when looking at sub-national level, certainly not at global level.

⁵³OECD (2017): **Global Private Philanthropy for Development - Results of the OECD Data Survey as of 3 October 2017.** <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/beyond-oda-foundations.htm> and Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors (undated): **Philanthropy and The SDGs - Practical Tools for Alignment.** Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors Philanthropy Roadmap.

- d. This MTR may be the best opportunity to address the question of how to assure access to adequate funding for MGoS remains prominently on the table. And it is well to recognise that they do not want just money to attend meetings but to also invest in ground action, many in partnership with the rural communities they work so closely with.
- e. In this regard, the December 2021 meeting proposed that the midterm review consider including revising the [GFFFN] eligibility criterion to major group entities' requests for support in project conceptualization and capacity building on accessing financing for implementation of activities/projects in the collective major group workplan. *This proposal has been floated unsuccessfully very many times and deserves official closure: a yes or no by Member States that would make further repeats unnecessary. This is best done by the MGs themselves (at the meetings leading up to the 2024 MTR) rather than as a consultant suggestion.* But in addition to repeats of requests to UNFF for GFFN and UN Trust Fund support, perhaps MGGs should also focus more attention to external fundraising (including capacity for it) as explored in this report.
- f. The UNFFS already has ideas on the table for attracting more potential partners to achieve UNSPF ambitions, for example from the UNFF16 Note by the Secretariat on the "Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030: contributions of and enhanced cooperation with partners towards achieving the thematic priorities for the biennium 2021–2022⁵⁴. In the sub-section III.3.3 (The Agenda for cooperation with others), some financial success could come from further or more effective involvement of major groups and other stakeholders with other partners in the UNFF and its PoWs. Specifically, the MGoS could push for more engagement of several potentially key parties that have so far not come to the fore in action: local governments, the commercial private sector, and philanthropies.
- g. There is a huge community of financial institutions operating at sub-global levels that, if motivated, could probably yield more finance than the global institutions so far targeted. In doing this, the Forum will need to think of special incentives to overcome potential reluctance to come on board under a UNFF umbrella:
- i. If the private sector focal point service of ICFPA suffices to help the MGs tap into substantial and effective private sector engagement in UNSPF implementation, including possibly by leveraging its investment muscle, then no issue arises. If, however, there remains room for additional private sector partnerships, then ICFPA could add to its functions helping to facilitate contacts with such potential groups and not necessarily with intent to force them to fall under the UNFF umbrella, only to support SFM development. The UNFF (and its MGoS partners) would be seeking partnership for common purpose (i.e., join the private sector rather than the reverse) since the *commercial private sector* outside ICFPA already has its own frameworks for action and will probably insist on retaining those. In certain regions, neither ICFPA nor other large-scale commercial industry associations can suffice, given that enterprises are informal and small-scale;
 - ii. The *philanthropic sector* does not prioritise environment in general and forestry in particular⁵⁵ so the UNFF will have to be particularly selective in promoting its engagement with IAF activities: they are unlikely to ever become a mainstream

⁵⁴E/CN.18/2021/3

⁵⁵<http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/beyond-oda-foundations.htm>

supporter]. A recent significant exception is the **Bezos Earth Fund**⁵⁶ which currently has some \$440 million committed to forests-related projects, of which some \$123 million for a range of global pursuits; \$51 million for restoration (\$36 million for the US, \$15 million for Africa; \$106 million for the Congo Basin; \$152 million for the Tropical Andes; and \$31 million for “other Africa”. OECD data summarised in [Box 5](#) suggest that philanthropy is otherwise very unlikely to be a major saviour of the IAF agenda (especially at global level) but breakthroughs at local community level may come from “selling” compelling cases of need for development.

- h. An illustrative set of funding sources to approach is in [Box 4](#) but essentially what seems to be needed is MGoS capacity to dedicate a lot of time to fundraising. Also, collectively, if they were to activate participation by Business and Industry major group, by Philanthropies and by Local Authorities (government entities with public budgets) their collective financial profile could improve dramatically. This matter may deserve serious discussion in studying the MTR report on the MGoS community.

III.4 FEEDBACK THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

- 96. Under this heading, replies about MGs were received not just from the MGs themselves but also from Member States (see [Table 1](#)). The highlights from received responses are given in [Annex 3](#), alongside the full responses.

IV CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

IV.1 CONCLUSIONS

- 97. The MGoS community enjoy a multi-faceted engagement with the IAF. The commitment of the IAF to their engagement has a long history, set out in Section J.3.1 of the report. Most visible is their attendance at UNFF sessions and intersessional events such as Expert Group Meetings or initiatives sponsored by Member countries, CPF organisations or the CPF collectively, or even by the MGs themselves. Examples of such meeting contributions are given in Section J.3.2. But only meeting participation does not satisfy their collective ambition, which is to also engage in SFM activities on the ground.
- 98. Both for attendance at UNFF meetings and for field action, MGs face funding challenges which in the case of meetings are solved somewhat informally by sponsorship from the UNFFS or member states or CPF organisations. No doubt forestry projects in various countries may also sponsor some delegates. It is a rather precarious way to take up dialogue that MGs believe it to be important to influence and to benefit from.
- 99. The actions of MGs in field SFM activity have recently been reported upon through a first report by the MGs themselves. The report is incomplete but is significant in being the first under the unified workplan and in reaffirming commitment to action. Many interventions are of modest scale but there may be room for growth in future as experience is gained. But here too, as for meeting attendance, funding is a challenge.
- 100. Given the significance of funding for both main facets of IAF interface (meetings, field action), the report has devoted much space to finance issues, with suggestions for

⁵⁶BEZOS EARTH FUND - Nature Solutions. <https://www.bezosearthfund.org/our-programs>

accessing more and from a wider range of sources, including especially the private sector and philanthropies. In the first place, fundraising becomes an obvious need, perhaps requiring full-time attention collectively or by individual MGs. Second: not all potential sources of financing are associated with the IAF or would necessarily wish to be. The MGs will need to find ways to operate under frameworks other than the UNFF while retaining their link to it.

101. Similarly, it appears that financiers may not necessarily fund SFM equally easily for all labels. SFM sold under the climate or biodiversity labels may be more appealing: MGs may need to consider this in promoting their activities. In geographic terms, the few questionnaire responses received show relative ease of donor interest in funding MGs in the field when forests are sold as a benefit to a combination of conservation, livelihoods and indigenous peoples benefit. Thus, in their efforts, MGs will need to balance the amount of effort to fundraise for global as opposed to lower-level interventions.

102. The analysis has led to some recommendations that are presented in detail in the Section IV.2.

IV.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

103. The information from desk study, supplemented by the few questionnaire responses that came, has allowed some conclusions and perceptions to be made which are communicated in this report and are summarised just above. The attempt at recommendations leads to the elements below, which are linked directly to the conclusions.

104. **Recommendations - assessment Issue J1: Assess the level of engagement of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders with the work of the Forum, including their contributions to the achievement of the global forest goals and targets and their interactions with the Forum and the Collaborative Partnership on Forests:**

- a. Given MGoS constituencies, continue to arrange multi-stakeholder dialogue and place forest issues more frequently in multi-sectoral context.
- b. Many constituents value environment but also face pressing livelihood issues. MGoS and members of the IAF need to strike a proper balance between conservation and livelihood needs for SFM.
- c. The driving narratives that can encourage forests action are many, with the IAF as a unifying factor but not a unique one. Past and continuing discussion at UNFF sessions of forest roles under other conventions, frameworks and the SDGs are very important but MGoS entities may need ideas and best practice exchanges on how to better capture action opportunities from non-IAF forests frameworks. The tracking of non-IAF framework forests progress should be of critical importance for the IAF, possibly to be publicised in future issues of the GFG report first released in 2021.
- d. Policy and strategy dialogue is important to create enabling conditions for action on SFM. The MGoS community has, however, for long called for giving more prominence to action. The way forward will need agreement on how to strike the balance and (especially for MGoS) how to mobilise more financial resources than has proved possible so far to allow their engagement. The repeated requests for GFFFN mandate expansion to also include the

MGoS needs final clarification rather than vague outcomes during past tablings of the issue on agendas.

- e. Global leadership in both policy and action support to the IAF/UNFF process lies in the hands of the CPF organisations. Their interventions in implementing the UNSPF ambitions does not cover all key areas with appropriate energy (see Annex 5) thus in some cases complementary effort by the MGoS community could help deliver fuller results. So far, structured cooperation with the CPF needs more definition and application in practice: the UNFF can offer a forum for pursuing such partnerships.
- f. From experience, act to pursue SFM in a more multi-sectoral, livelihoods-linked manner and be open to use whatever framework (such as climate change, biodiversity etc - even if not under IAF) helps to sell the forests agenda and to mobilise resources for it, as explained in the conclusions section on this issue.

105. If UNFF protocols allow and MGs agree, a regular update on contribution of MGs to implementation could be useful, the MGs could agree on a format for presentation. *At the January 2023 open-ended intergovernmental ad hoc expert group meeting on the MTR, MGs and other stakeholders could be requested to agree on such a format weighted scores of their interest/engagement areas and even on their achievements.*

106. **Recommendations - assessment Issue J2: Assess the efforts made by the major groups to establish and maintain effective coordination mechanisms for interaction and participation in the Forum and other forest-related United Nations bodies.**

- a. After several years of having adopted a unified workplan (together with some complementary plans for some MGoS), implementation remains challenging partly for financial challenges but also lack of synergy with member entities not working in full synergy. Even the first report on progress revealed weaknesses on non-universal feedback by entities and incompleteness on magnitude of investment/efforts and cross reference to pillars of the workplan that interventions fell under. There is room for improvement.
- b. UN system affiliated MGoS join a highly structured coordination system, of which focal points are only a small part. Coordination opportunities beyond the membership of the forests entities associated with the IAF may also lose opportunities for cross-learning from MGoS in other sectors and frameworks. The challenge must be faced of how to make better use of the potential for excellent coordination.
- c. Given relatively loose association among MGoS forests entities under their workplan and yet strong traditions of consultation with all concerned, UNFF session opportunities could be useful to explore ways for retaining the practice of consultation but not in a manner that can excessively slow down processes or action.

107. **Recommendations - assessment Issue J3: Assess the ability of major groups and other relevant stakeholders to deliver effective representation within their constituencies.**

- a. Internal representation within the MGoS community is linked with governance arrangements – coordination arrangements and functioning of focal points appear structurally more than adequate. The MGoS community, with inputs from partners in IAF/UNFF, could usefully consider how to make the heavy structure for representation able to be agile in seizing opportunities, responding to requests for MGoS inputs, and securing resources for dialogue or action, including finances.

108. Recommendations - assessment Issue J4: Identify potential financial resources that could facilitate the development and implementation of quadrennial meetings of the Major Group-led Initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests.

- a. Seek closure (positive or negative) on whether Member States are willing to change GFFFN guidelines to (a) assist MGoS entities to use some of its funds to attend meetings; (b) assist them to mobilise external funds; or (c) provide training on grant and investment-fund proposal preparation and “selling” to potential donors. Regarding access to UNFF Trust Fund resources, MGoS may decide to leave the insurmountable *status quo* that each donor decides how their funds are used, including as far as sponsoring MGoS representatives’ participation in UNFF sessions and related events.
- b. Energetically pursue participation of Local Authorities and Business and Industry in the areas of MGoS interest: the first group is public sector and has more assured budgets; business and industry have interest areas that other MGoS entities should sympathise with (and not insist that business and industry should adjust to fit the other MGs’ ways of working).
- c. The large-scale forest industry groups have invested billions in forestry – one example is those under the WBCSD which operate under the SDG umbrella and make no reference to the IAF. The MGoS associated with the IAF should study closely what in their approach allows possible partnership building: partnership for SFM under their SDG umbrella rather than under IAF may be an option.
- d. Collectively as MGs associated with the IAF/UNFF process, consider creating full-time pursuit of grant funding at the field rather than global level (including from philanthropies - despite their limited appetite for environmental projects). Indications are that local community livelihoods, conservation priorities, and support to indigenous and other marginalised groups needs can attract funding at that level but not so much at global level.
- e. As the health sector capitalises on high-profile diseases to also fund health systems for less “attractive” diseases, study possibility of attracting SFM funding from exciting agendas: the current darlings of donors are climate change and biodiversity. The challenge is to hitch livelihood and other dimensions of SFM to funding secured for the “attractive” concerns.

Annex 1: MAJOR GROUP CONTACTS FOR THE SECTION J QUESTIONS***Annex 1 (a) : MAJOR GROUPS QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION***

Regional/Sub-regional partners	Major Groups & other stakeholders	
<p>African Development Bank A.DAHERADEN@AFDB.ORG; g.phillips@afdb.org; j.cunha@afdb.org; m.croizat-viallet@afdb.org; Asian Development Bank Tnakao@adb.org; njahmad@adb.org;</p> <p>Interamerican Development Bank elima@iadb.org; gloriav@iadb.org; johanl@IADB.ORG;</p> <p>African Forest Forum g.kowero@cgiar.org; chileshe_masinja@yahoo.com; exec.sec@afforum.org;</p> <p>Commission des Forêts d’Afrique Centrale – COMIFAC comifac@comifac.org;</p> <p>Réseau des Parlementaires pour la Gestion Durable des Écosystèmes Forestiers d’Afrique Centrale (REPAR) janjakzam@yahoo.fr;</p> <p>Asian Forest Cooperation Organization - AFoCO ricardo.calderon@afocosec.org; mariemily@afocosec.org; jmkim@afocosec.org;</p> <p>International Model Forest Network imfn@imfn.net;</p> <p>International Network for Bamboo and Rattan – INBAR bescardo@inbar.int; jdurai@inbar.int; wmlu@inbar.int</p>	<p>CHILDREN AND YOUTH: International Forestry Students’ Association * Joshua Amaitum Email: joshua.amaitum@ifsa.net , unff.ip@ifsa.net</p> <p>Alternate Focal Point Erica Di Girolami Independent Consultant in International Forest Policy and Economic Sustainability Email: digirolami.e@gmail.com</p> <p>BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY: International Council of Forest and Paper Associations – ICPPA Derek Nighbor President and CEO of the Forest Products Association of Canada Email: dnighbor@fpac.ca</p> <p>FOREST WORKERS AND TRADE UNIONS: Building and Wood Workers’ International (BWI) * Alternate Focal Point Mr. Coen van der Veer Global Wood and Forestry Director, BWI Email: coen.vanderveer@bwint.org</p> <p>INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests Mr. Hubertus Samangun Regional coordinator (Bahasa region) Jalan Setia Kawan Raya No. 39 – 41 Jakarta Pusat 10140, Indonesia Tel: +62 21 632 7559 Fax: + 62 21 632 6425 E-mail: hsamangun@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Alternate Focal Point Ms. Lucy Mullenkei Executive Director, Indigenous Information Network (IIN) Kenya Email: mullenkei@gmail.com</p> <p>LOCAL AUTHORITIES: Networks are in discussion regarding their focal point – message not sent.</p> <p>NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS: Friends of Siberian Forests Dr Andrei Laletin PO Box 26779 Krasnoyarsk-36, 660036 Russia Tel: +7 3912 498404 Fax: +7 3912 498404 Email: laletin3@yahoo.com</p> <p>Coordinadora Ecuatoriana de Organizaciones Para la Defensa de la Naturaleza y el Medio Ambiente Ms. Martha Cecilia Nunez Canizares Av. Universitaria s/n y Juan Larrea. Tola Chica, Tumbaco-Ecuador Email: marnuz4@yahoo.com</p>

Regional/Sub-regional partners	Major Groups & other stakeholders	
<p>FARMERS AND SMALL FOREST LANDOWNERS:</p> <p>Global Alliance of Community Forestry (GACF) Mr. GhanShyam Pandey Chairperson, Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN) GPO Box No. 8219, PuranoBaneshwor, Kathmandu, Nepal Tel: +977 1 4485263 Fax: +977 1 4485262 Email: pandeygs2002@yahoo.com</p> <p>FARMERS AND SMALL FOREST LANDOWNERS (cont'd):</p> <p>IFFA – International Family Forestry Alliance Ms. Satu-MarjaTenhiälä The Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners (MTK) Simonkatu 6, P.O. Box 510, 00101 Helsinki, Finland Email: satu-marja.tenhiala@mtk.fi</p>	<p>SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL COMMUNITY:</p> <p>Asia Pacific Association of Forestry Research Institutions Mr. Gan Kee Seng c/o Forest Research Institute Malaysia, Kepong, 52109 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia Tel: +60 3 6279 7007 Fax: +60 3 6277 3249 Email: latif@frim.gov.my</p> <p>Forestry Network of Sub-Saharan Africa Mr. Joseph Cobbinah University Box 63, Kumasi, Tel: +233-24440560; +233-5160646; +233-5161378 Fax: +233-5160121 Email: jrcobbinah@yahoo.co.uk</p>	<p>WOMEN:</p> <p>African Women’s Network for Community Management of Forests (REFACOF) Ms. Cecile Ndjebet Director Email: cndjebet@yahoo.com</p> <p>Alternate Focal Point Forest Women Network Ms. Fernanda Rodrigues President Email:redemulherflorestal@gmail.com</p>

Annex 1 (b): COVER NOTE FOR THE CONSULTANT COMPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE

[03 October 2022]

MESSAGE: For practical reasons, I send this message to you as a group rather than individually; my apologies.

Greetings from Malawi; my name is Mafa Chipeta, contacting you as a consultant for the UNFF Secretariat-managed independent **Assessment of the International Arrangement on Forests in Preparation for the Midterm Review of its Effectiveness by the UN Forum on Forests**. I have been retained by the UNFF Secretariat to contribute material under **topic I** (Involvement of regional and subregional partners) and **topic J** (Involvement of major groups and other relevant stakeholders). My draft report should be practically in final by mid-November 2022.

Under cover of a 9 August 2022 letter, **UNFF18 Chair ZephyrinManiratanga** (copy attached separately) already sent you a consolidated questionnaire that covers all aspects of the ongoing assessment. I assume you have already received that consolidated questionnaire so my contacting you is to build on it (so far only government replies have started to come in).

I now appeal to you to give any IAF assessment-relevant supplementary material for the period since UNFF12. ***I believe that your replies will simply sharpen what you may already have included in responding to the UNFF18 Chair’s questionnaire.***

Am available for further interaction by email, WhatsApp, Phone (**contact details on attached WORD note**).

Sincerely, Mafa E. Chipeta

***Annex 1(c): FOLLOW-UP ON QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
FROM A SAMPLING OF REGIONAL/SUBREGIONAL PARTNERS***

First follow-up was forwarding of consultant questionnaire by UNFFS, having learned that MGs had apparently not received it. First reaction to consultant was by focal point for MG NGOs (at Friends of the Siberian Forests) – indicating the original UNFFS questionnaire had not been seen. Later the NGO focal point sent NGO input; his alternate also forwarded inputs from two NGO members: Forest Stewardship Council, and Fundación Pachamama.

The Women MG focal point later made contact but as of 15 November has not followed up with substantive input/questionnaire response.

Annex 2: POST 2015 EVENTS CO-ORGANISED BY MAJOR GROUPS AND UNFF

There are currently **1395 forest-related groups** in active consultative status with ECOSOC.
[<https://www.un.org/esa/forests/major-groups/participation/index.html>]

A. PAST MEETINGS

Only one found (beyond MG-led Initiative Nepal meeting):

(i) Expert meeting on Strengthening Major Groups and Other Stakeholders' Engagement in the work of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF) beyond 2015. 5-6 October 2016, Ottawa, Canada

Note: The United Nations Forum on Forests Secretariat (UNFFS) and the Canadian Forest Service will jointly convene a two-day expert meeting titled "expert meeting on strengthening major groups and other stakeholders' engagement in the work of the international arrangement on forests (IAF) beyond 2015".

No report found.

Documents for meeting:

- Mahendra Joshi, PhD (2016): **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.; 5 September 2016
- Jan Church McAlpine (2015): **Review of The Provisions and Arrangements Of 10 Intergovernmental Organizations for Involving Major Groups and Other Stakeholders.** August 2015

Other Major Groups related meetings:

(ii) **Expert Meeting to review progress in implementation of the major groups workplans and input to the fourteenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF14)**, 9-11 January 2019, Bangkok, Thailand

(iii) **Expert Meeting on Major Groups and other Relevant Stakeholders' Contribution to the Implementation of UNSPF and 4POW**, 20-21 November 2017, Nairobi, Kenya

B. AVAILABILITY OF MAJOR GROUPS REPORTS

[<https://www.un.org/esa/forests/major-groups/documents/index.html>]

The most recent session at which MGs submitted a paper was UNFF11 in May 2015.

Economic and Social Council (2015): **Future of the international arrangement on forests Discussion paper submitted by the major groups.** United Nations Forum on Forests Eleventh session New York, 4-15 May 2015 Item 7 of the provisional agenda. Document E/CN.18/2015/6/Add.1.

Contributing Major Groups: Children and youth, indigenous peoples, the scientific and technological community, farmers and small forest landowners, women, and workers and trade unions.

C. MAJOR GROUP LED INITIATIVES

“Cross-sectoral collaboration for inclusive forest landscapes”. Major groups-led initiative in support of the fifteenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests for UNFF15, June 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/8

“Sustainable Forest Management: Designing the Vehicles for Securing the Means of Implementation” Major Group-led Initiative in support of the 11th session of the United Nations Forum on Forests.

From before the MTR assessment period:

‘Crafting the Path for Forests to Contribute to Sustainable Development’, a Major Group Initiative in support of UNFF10 [2013 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil] [“https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/MGI-Rio-Final-Workshop-Report.pdf”](https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/MGI-Rio-Final-Workshop-Report.pdf)

Applying Sustainable Forest Management to Poverty Reduction: Strengthening the Multi-Stakeholder Approach within the UNFF, a Major Group Initiative in support of UNFF9 [2010 in Accra, Ghana]

Annex 3: QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES RECEIVED ABOUT MAJOR GROUPS

Question J-1: In your view, what are the top three areas in which major groups and other relevant stakeholders have made the most important contributions to SFM policy development and dialogue since the 15th session of the UNFF? /1. What do you consider to be the top 3 key (a) achievements and (b) ambitions of the Major Group (MG) for which you are the Focal Point in promoting policy and strategy change beneficial to the IAF?

Highlights from key messages in response to Question J-1

Question J-1: In your view, what are the top three areas in which major groups and other relevant stakeholders have made the most important contributions to SFM policy development and dialogue since the 15th session of the UNFF? /1. What do you consider to be the top 3 key (a) achievements and (b) ambitions of the Major Group (MG) for which you are the Focal Point in promoting policy and strategy change beneficial to the IAF?

- *A rallying point to promote the importance of forests is climate change: use it to IAF advantage.*
- *Promote the development of policies and actions in an intersectoral manner, including comprehensive regional territorial planning [not narrow focus on forests in isolation].*
- *During UNFF meetings, include civil society in the policy development process. Hence seek successful multi stakeholder dialogue at each UNFF meeting and have the chance to raise the concerns from civil society, forest owners, business and other interest groups [especially the marginalised] on the topics being addressed during UNFF sessions.*
- *Support the actions carried out by Indigenous Peoples and nationalities in aspects such as respect for their rights over the land and forests in their territories; include in interventions the eradication of extreme poverty.*
- *Help create formal space for dialogue, involvement, participation, deliberation, consultation and monitoring by key stakeholders the processes carried out by government authorities.*

MG Children & Youth:

- *Delivered interventions at UNFF sessions together with other intersessional events seeking to integrate their actions in various forestry initiatives following effective consultation processes within their memberships.*
- *Major Groups developed a joint work plan aimed at building consensus and identifying priority actions for major groups implementation of the UNSPF.*
- *Contributed to the development of scientific assessments which inform policy development.*

MG NGOs (Focal point):

- *The Major Groups, and especially the NGOs, have clearly raised the need to maintain a holistic and comprehensive approach, to promote the development of policies and actions in an intersectoral manner, to promote comprehensive regional territorial planning. To a large extent, this position was projected on the theme of the meeting of the Major Groups-led initiative (MGI) in support of the Fifteenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF15) held in Nairobi, Kenya (3-5 March 2020), and was: "Cross-sectoral collaboration for inclusive forest landscapes"⁵⁷. We consider this to have been one of the most significant achievements, since the reflections, analysis and proposals derived around this theme, were very important. Main*

⁵⁷ The meeting was led by the Major Group for Children and Youth (MGCY), with financial support from the German government. The concrete proposals of the MGs can be found in the report of the meeting. In addition, it includes the "Statement of Commitment to Forests Action"

outcomes of the meeting in Nairobi were published on the UNFF webpage and can be searched by anybody who is interested in the MGs input to the IAF.

- NGOs have continued to promote the importance of forests on climate change and to influence governments so that actions related to combating climate change are closely related and coordinated with forest management, halting deforestation and forest degradation. The Glasgow Leaders' Declaration on Forests and Land Use was a fundamental demonstration of the efforts made in this regard.
- The joint work and the support provided by NGOs to the actions carried out by the Indigenous Peoples, in aspects such as respect for their rights over the land and forests where they live, the development of initiatives in various areas, must be highlighted as another achievement. Several regional projects in different latitudes suggest it. The worldwide recognition of the importance of the Amazon also demonstrates this, and especially the struggle of the Indigenous Peoples for the survival of forests and their way of life.

Fundación Pachamama (Ecuadorian NGO, member of CEDENMA):

- One area where civil society, academia and indigenous peoples and nationalities have had space for direct dialogue with environmental authorities is the REDD+ Working Table, which now in its third period 2020-2022. CEDENMA and Fundación Pachamama have been active members of civil society during all the periods carried out by the Working Table and prior to its formation during the design of Ecuador's REDD+ strategy. The REDD+ Working Table is a formal space for dialogue, involvement, participation, deliberation, consultation and monitoring of key stakeholders in the processes carried out by the Ministry of Environment and Water-MAE, within the framework of the national preparation and implementation phase of REDD+, with the technical and financial support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- In this new period (2020-2022), with the participation of different actors, the following Working Groups have been created: WG REDD+ Coast, WG REDD+ Amazon Indigenous REDD+, WG REDD+ Sustainable Forest Management, and WG REDD+ Academia. During the period, the Third Summary of Information on Social and Environmental Safeguards (RIS) was also publicly consulted with the member organizations of the Roundtable.
- In this space, some norms and public policies related to Forests and Climate Change have also been reviewed, such as the Organizational Technical Norm of the Ecuador Zero Carbon Programme (PECC), the Deforestation Free Distinctive, the Amazon Integral Plan and Mechanisms related to Carbon.
- The Cuencas Sagradas⁵⁸ (Sacred Watershed), an initiative of which Fundación Pachamama is a founding member and holds the General Secretariat, has worked intensively on this last aspect to generate discussions on the different climate finance mechanisms, especially to ensure the participation of indigenous peoples and nationalities. Currently, there are no regulations governing the implementation of financing mechanisms. However, the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition-MATTE is working towards the approval of the so-called compensation regulations in the short term.
- The Sacred Watershed Initiative also launched the Bioregional Plan in 2021, which is an innovative planning instrument that sets out the roadmap for a transition in the Amazonian territorial model, from a perspective that includes contributions from indigenous nationalities, academia and civil society. This proposal has been socialized with the national authorities, including the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition, the Planning Secretariat and the National Assembly, so that they can promote new public policies that prioritize the conservation and sustainable management of Amazonian forests and indigenous territories.

⁵⁸<https://cuencasagradas.org/>

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

- *Role of women and girls in sustainable forest management.*
- *Indigenous peoples, farmers, and community forest management and value-added forest production and processing.*
- *Contribution of forests to poverty eradication and livelihoods and environmentally sound and improving efficiency with innovative forest-based technology.*

These three contributions are part of the seven identified priority areas that are linked directly to the Global Forest Goals or indirectly through the indicative thematic areas and aimed at contributing to the eradication of extreme poverty among forest-dependent people and the achievement of the SDGs.

FARMERS + IFFA:

The top 3 achievements are:

- *successful multi stakeholder dialogue at each UNFF meeting,*
- *coordination and collaboration between the Major groups and other stakeholders and other UNFF delegates*
- *Multi stakeholder visibility at UNFF sessions, including side events.*

Details:

- ***Multi-stakeholder dialogue:*** *The UNFF multi-stakeholder dialogue has been a great platform for Major Groups and other stakeholders (MG&OS) to raise the concerns from civil society, forest owners, business and other interest groups on the topics being addressed during UNFF sessions. It is important that this multi-stakeholder dialogue will be kept as part of the formal structure and program of UNFF Sessions. Moreover, MG&OS should be able to speak and present their views on all other agenda items of UNFF in a similar way that MG&OS are actively part of all agenda items during the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF). Since not all MG&OS are currently represented at UNFF meetings the UNFF Secretariat should actively reach out to ensure the representative representation of all MG&OS. As a starting point could be to reach out to focal points for MG&OS in HLPF.*
- ***Multi-stakeholder visibility:*** *MG&OS have been visible during the UNFF meetings not only during the multi-stakeholder dialogue and other official sessions during the Forum, most notably during side-events. IFFA has been actively participating during various different side events both as speakers and in the in-depth discussions providing the views and concerns of forest owners.*
- *The ambitions are to ensure a just and fair participatory process. The ambition is to include civil society in the policy development process during the UNFF meetings. Moreover, the ambition is to be agents of change. To enable civil society to be active partner in the implementation of global forest policies and strategies. As farmers and forest owners we can bring to the table the perspectives of the end user. We can contribute with the reality on the ground in the daily management of forests owned by smallholders and family forestry.*

FORESTS EUROPE (FE):

- *Situation of the young generation in the forest sector*
- *Situation of women in the forest sector*
- *Voice of vulnerable groups into the policy debate which would not be included in Members statements otherwise*

KENYA:

- *Development of the National Forest Policy 2021 (Draft) to be presented to the cabinet and parliament for promulgation*

MALAWI:

- *Advocacy*
- *Research*
- *Formal and informal capacity building*

MEXICO:

- Su capacidad de representar sus miembros a través de puntos focales apropiados;
- sus observaciones y propuestas a los documentos y evaluaciones del FNUB, para que sus intereses también se vean reflejados;
- la elaboración de planes de trabajo concretos para contribuir al logro de los objetivos y metas forestales mundiales.

- *The designation of focal points to represent members;*
- *The ability to communicate own interests by being able to make comments and suggestions on UNFF documents;*
- *The preparation of concrete work plans for contribution to global forest goals and objectives.*

PANAMA:

Las contribuciones más importantes que han realizados los diversos grupos y actores principales en Panamá para el dialogo y desarrollo de las OFS han sido:

El incentivo a la reforestación.

El marco legal y jurídico solido para las inversiones forestales en Panamá (por ejemplo, la tenencia de la tierra).

El empoderamiento de nuestros pueblos originarios en el manejo de los bosques, cumpliendo con todos los procesos dispuestos en las leyes.

The most important contributions that Major groups and actors in Panama for development and sustainable forest management have been:

- *Incentives for reforestation.*
- *Solid legal framework for forest investment in Panama (e.g., durable land tenure).*
- *Empowerment of our indigenous people in management of forests, backed by legal provisions*

SADC:

- *The major contribution to sustainable forest management policy development and dialogue since the UNFF15, is the involvements to the revision of SADC forestry strategy, and on development of SADC Forestry Guidelines*

USA:

- *Major Groups input and contributions into UNFF sessions and implementation of the UNSPF are important.*
- *We appreciate the focus on women, youth, and indigenous programs, as these groups are vital to long-term SFM.*

Question J-2: What are prime examples of major groups and other relevant stakeholders successfully contributing to the practical achievement of GFGs under the UNSPF 2017-2030? [alone or in partnership with governments or business community]

Highlights from key messages in response to Question J-2

Question J-2: What are prime examples of major groups and other relevant stakeholders successfully contributing to the practical achievement of GFGs under the UNSPF 2017-2030? [alone or in partnership with governments or business community]/ What are your Major Group's most useful experiences in partnering with selected key IAF players, including especially (a) the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), and (b) Regional and Subregional Partners in all or selected regions of the world, with top 3 suggestions each for improving them further?

- *UNFF has had limited success in promoting practical action and/or investment into SFM. This is indeed a shortcoming of UNFF.*
- *MG&OS should be given more opportunities to engage with CPF and GFFN in particular the implementation at the national and local level on hand on implementation of SFM measures.*
- *Not to look at the GFGs narrowly but to attend to global biodiversity, restoration and climate change agendas are key enablers that work hand in hand with the achievement of the Global Forest Goals.*
- *Have high GFG ambition for major groups, including civil society and indigenous peoples: an example is the proposed conservation of 35 million hectares of Amazonian tropical forests in an area combining the entire Amazonian region of Ecuador with northern Amazon of Peru.*
- *Have faith in local institutions: associations, local governments and private enterprises.*
- *Seek out national-based donors such as FINIDA, SIDA, NORAD, GTZ who recognize the importance of making farmers to establish and manage more trees and forests; FAO and its Forest and Farm Facility is another good potential partner.*
- *Reforestation of driven by fiscal incentives that exonerate actors from taxes: not easy to sustain government commitment due to long forest rotations.*
- *Engage broadly with businesses and philanthropic communities to drive sustainable forest management [including with international businesses platforms such as the UN Global Compact and the World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD)].*

Children & Youth MG:

- *MGCY developed a Youth Call for Action which outlined mechanisms through which stakeholders could create enabling conditions that enhance youth contribution to the forestry sector.*
- *Held a major group initiative meeting under the theme "Cross-Sectoral Collaboration for Inclusive Forest Landscapes" in which recommendations on the Quadrennial Programme of Work were developed.*

Forest Stewardship council (FSC):

- *Looking at prime examples related to effective collaboration regarding global agendas, both the global biodiversity and restoration agendas are key enablers that work hand in hand with the achievement of the Global Forest Goals.*
- *Looking at FSC as an organization and a system to deliver solutions that result into SFM, FSC per se contributes towards the 6 Global Forest Goals. FSC is governed by a global network of over 1,000 individuals and member organizations representing environmental, social, and economic perspectives. FSC's democratic and participative system brings these diverse perspectives together to find solutions that safeguard healthy, resilient forests worldwide by demonstrating the value and benefits of forest stewardship.*

- *FSC standards translate into tangible actions that make a positive impact on the world's forests. To achieve this, FSC has a certification system in place that verifies sustainable sourcing of forest products and ecosystem services at every step of the value chain, from forest to consumer.*

Fundación Pachamama:

- *The Sacred Watershed Initiative is a clear example of a contribution of major groups, including civil society and indigenous peoples, to achieving the Global Forest Goals, as it proposes the conservation of 35 million hectares of Amazonian tropical forests in an area that encompasses the entire Amazon region of Ecuador and the northern Amazon of Peru. The initiative bases its proposal on the recognition of the territorial rights of indigenous peoples and nationalities, who occupy approximately half of the entire bioregion, and on the joint work of civil society, academia, and local and national governments to build a new vision of an Amazon that overcomes the extractive model that continues to destroy the Amazon forests.*
- *Fundación Pachamama also works together with indigenous and peasant communities in the Amazon to develop local strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of forests. Through our Forest Economies programme, we promote the development of bio-enterprises that make sustainable use of forest resources, providing economic opportunities for families and generating alternatives to activities that destroy forests and biodiversity. We are developing management plans for some non-timber forest species together with the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition, and at the same time we will seek recognition of deforestation-free products to validate the production model.*
- *Fundación Pachamama works in several productive value chains of non-timber forest products, through coordinated work with families and local communities, as well as productive associations, local governments and private enterprise.*
- *As part of the implementation of the Bioregional Plan, Fundación Pachamama is working on a reforestation and restoration process in the Amazonian provinces of Pastaza and Morona Santiago Ecuador), to plant at least 300,000 native trees and plants, recovering nearly 500 hectares of forest.*

KENYA:

- *Tree planting campaigns*
- *Pilot Forest certification*
- *IDF commemoration*

FOREST EUROPE:

- *We have no experience here*

MALAWI:

- *Providing financial resources (grants, loans, aid) to member states for implementation of SFM*
- *Assisting member states in project proposal development*

NIGERIA:

- *Alternative livelihood support*
- *Land use planning and management*
- *Forest financing and sustainable trade.*

SADC -

- *The involvement on the development SADC strategy for the implementation of the Great Green wall initiatives*

MEXICO:

Su participación sistemática en las reuniones y labores de UNFF, logrando un incremento de la participación del sector privado en las discusiones.

- *On systematic participation in meetings and work of the UNFF, we are achieving some increase in participation of the private sector.*

PANAMA:

En el marco de los GFG, se ha trabajado de diferentes formas, a nivel de iniciativa del gobierno con proyectos que buscan el aumento de la cobertura boscosa de Panamá descrito durante todo el cuestionario, a su vez, en asociación del gobierno con la empresa privada como la Asociación Nacional de Reforestadores y Afines de Panamá por sus siglas ANARAP, en temas puntales como fiscalización forestal y la exoneración de impuesto (mediante la Ley No. 69 de incentivo forestal).

En temas de conservación de bosques, como las alianzas que tiene el Ministerio de Ambiente con Organizaciones sin Fines de Lucro, del cual puedo mencionar la Asociación Nacional para la Conservación de la Naturaleza por sus siglas ANCON, en temas de conservación de los bosques en la provincia de Darién, acciones de reciclaje en la esfera de ciudad de Panamá junto a la Alcaldía y Empresa Privada.

- *With regard to the GFGs, there are different approaches some being government projects aimed at raising the country's forest cover or, at times, joint government/private sector like with the National Association of Reforestation of Panama (ANARAP) driven by fiscal incentives that exonerate them from taxes (Law 69 on forest incentives).*
- *On the matter of forest conservation there are alliances between the Ministry of the Environment with non-profit such as the National Association for Nature Conservation (ANCON) to conserve forests in Darien province, some recycling in the neighbourhood of Panama City together with the Mayor's office.*

SWITZERLAND:

- *The private sector-trade*
- *The agriculture sector*

USA:

- *We are encouraged by the use of practical technology to foster more youth and gender-inclusive communication that improves general knowledge of SFM.*
- *Major Groups, especially youth, played a large role at the 2022 World Forestry Congress in Seoul, Republic of Korea through the "Youth Call for Action," as well as during the lead up to the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille, Republic of France through the virtual Global Youth Summit on Nature in 2021.*

What do you consider to be the top 3 key (a) achievements and (b) ambitions of your Major Group in promoting practical action and/or investment into SFM in line with the ambitions of the IAF (e.g., under its Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-2030)?

FARMERS + IFFA -

- *UNFF has had limited success in promoting practical action and/or investment into SFM. This is indeed a shortcoming of UNFF. The meetings focus predominantly on policy development and dialogue on different forest related topics.*
- *UNFF lacks the ability to connect policy to hands on practical action and investment. UNFF tend to have difficulties to get out of the diplomatic policy bubble.*

- However, IFFA as focal point for MG farmers and forest owners always focuses on sharing lessons learned on promoting practical implementation or practical action.

Also:

- The ambition from IFFA as focal point for MG&OS has always been to bring forward in the discussions at UNFF meetings the perspectives of practical action from family forestry, small holders and community forestry.
- The practical action and /or investment into SFM are predominantly left to Member States and the national level, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) and its members, and to certain extent the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network (GFFFN).
- IFFA as focal point for MG Farmers and Forest Owners has had very limited involvement with CPF and/or GFFFN. Perhaps MG&OS should be given more opportunities to engage with CPF and GFFFN in particular the implementation at the national and local level on hand on implementation of SFM measures.

What are your Major Group's most useful experiences in partnering with selected key IAF players, including especially (a) the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), and (b) Regional and Subregional Partners in all or selected regions of the world, with top 3 suggestions each for improving them further?

FAO:

- As it has been noted in relation to Question A, strengthening the involvement of various stakeholders would allow for increasing effectiveness in multiple areas, due to stronger ownership and commitment.
- Several good examples of the power of stakeholders' involvement could be taken from FAO's ongoing practices, which may include the activities of the Forest and Farm Facility, or the result of the collaboration with Youth in the context of the XV World Forestry Congress.
- Deepening and expanding partnerships with stakeholders is one of the pillars of FAO's reinigorated business model, and based on the achievements so far, pursuing a similar approach by UNFF may be highly beneficial.

FSC:

- FSC as a multistakeholder organization engages broadly with businesses and philanthropic communities to drive sustainable forest management. These actors can actively participate in FSC's processes and adopt FSC as solution to deliver on their commitments towards SFM through certification across the forest value chain.
- FSC as an organization actively engages with international businesses platforms such as a member of the UN Global Compact and collaborates with the World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD).
- More recently, through FSC Investments and Partnerships (FSC I&P), FSC has expanded its engagement with philanthropic communities, looking for the most significant opportunities and projects supporting on FSC's mission.

FSC actively engages with the majority of the CPF members, being official member of IUCN, IUFRO, Global Landscapes Forum (Led by CIFOR), accredited with observer status to the ECOSOC, UN CBD and UNFCCC. FSC is also key player and member of the One Planet Network, led by UNEP. FSC has engaged and collaborates with members such as FAO, GEF, ITTO and the World Bank:

Collaborative interventions:

- FSC and IUCN are developing a collaborative approach for the certification of Nature-based Solutions <https://www.iucn.org/news/species/202109/iucn-develop-collaborative-certification-scheme-nature-based-solutions>
- FSC collaborated with ITTO and the World Bank in a book that identifies fiscal reforms that can positively influence forest conservation and management https://www.cif.org/sites/cif_enc/files/knowledge-documents/designing_fiscal_instruments.pdf
- FSC has also collaborated with UNEP on a biodiversity communication toolkit featuring FSC <https://www.oneplanetnetwork.org/programmes/consumer-information-scp/biodiversity>.

Suggestions:

- Accelerate the awareness and understanding on the role of forests as a key solution to address global challenges.
- Focus on concrete implementation measures, including relevant indicators to monitor SFM – encouraging reporting on granular data.
- Collaborate further with organizations with multistakeholder governance that implement Sustainable Forest Management on the ground such as FSC.

Fundación Pachamama:

- *In recent years we have implemented three projects managed by UNDP; two of them were local projects for the development of value chains free of non-timber forest products, whose financing was given by the ProAmazonía Program; and an award called The Lion's Share to work with communities of the Achuar Nationality in the lower basin of the Pastaza River, to promote productive activities that promote the conservation of biodiversity. All three were very good experiences that have strengthened our intervention in indigenous territories and have allowed us to develop innovative proposals for sustainable resource management.*

FARMERS+IFFA:

- *For IFFA the FAO and its Forest and Farm Facility is one of rare organization besides national donors such as FINIDA, SIDA, NORAD, GTZ to recognize the importance of making farmers to establish and manage more trees and forests.*
- *The combined livelihood benefit for the managing family as well for combat climate change, land erosion, water management etc.*

MEXICO:

La representación del sector privado en los grupos principales y otras partes interesadas es clave y se puede aprovechar para lograr mayor participación de las comunidades empresariales y filantrópicas incidiendo para reducir los riesgos reales y percibidos a fin de atraer mayor financiamiento al sector forestal, buscando fomentar e impulsar bases productivas que en el corto o mediano plazos logren una consolidación de empresa o cadena productiva y un potencial de rentabilidad.

- *The presence of the private sector in the Major Groups and other stakeholders' community is key and can boost participation of the business community and philanthropies by reducing real and perceived risks so as to attract major financing for forestry that will boost the productive base in the short and medium term by achieving consolidation of enterprises and productive value chains with potential for profits.*

Question J-3: Given the power for good of the business and philanthropic communities, what are the key efforts of major groups and other relevant stakeholders to partner with them [both *within and outside the Business Council for Sustainable Development (UN-BCSD)*]?

Highlights from key messages in response to Question J-3

Question J-3: **Given the power for good of the business and philanthropic communities, what are the key efforts of major groups and other relevant stakeholders to partner with them [both *within and outside the Business Council for Sustainable Development (UN-BCSD)*]? / What top 3 successes has your Major Group achieved in more fully **engaging the private sector and philanthropic entities** in your work and (especially) supporting implementation of the IAF ambitions by civil society and member states?**

- *UNFF is not attractive [to these parties] at present: we [UNFF] need to talk to them to see why and see how we can attract them.*
- *It would be good if UNFF could establish closer link between Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network with the Global Investors for Sustainable Development (GISD) to engage investors to promote in SFM.*
- *Engage philanthropies (as other donors) on important indigenous and other marginalised community challenges: this may interest them.*
- *explore the barriers to obtaining support from philanthropic organizations for Major Groups programs.*

FARMERS + IFFA (FA-IFFA):

Coordination and collaboration between MG&OS and other UNFF delegates

- *UNFF meetings provides opportunity for MG&OS to engage in bilateral discussions with representatives from different Member States, CPF as well as other MG&OS on the resolutions negotiated during UNFF sessions (policy sessions). Views and suggestions from Farmers and Forest Owners have quite often been incorporated in the positions of Member States and the coordination with other MG&OS have sparked additional collaboration with other MG&OS, in particular between MG Farmers and Forest Owners and MG Women.*

SADC:

- *The key effort of major group and other stakeholders is important to the sustainable management of forest in the region. Therefore, an effort for collaboration and information sharing in this regard is crucial*

FOREST EUROPE:

We have no experience here

EL SALVADOR: En proceso de retomar la conformación de la Comisión Forestal de El Salvador

- *In the process of resuming the reshaping the Forestry Commission of El Salvador.*

KENYA:

- *Adopt a forest initiative for rehabilitation of degraded natural forest areas*
- *Fencing and protection of key forest ecosystems (Mt Kenya, Aberdares, Eburu, Kakamega, Maasai Mau)*
- *Aerial seeding for restoration of key forest ecosystems (Maasai Mau)*
- *Participatory forest management jointly with 156 community forest associations*
- *Voluntary relocation by forest adjacent communities in Leroghi forest Samburu, who previously irregularly occupied the state forests*

SWITZERLAND:

- *UNFF is not attractive at present. We need to talk to them to see why and see how we can attract them.*

USA:

- *We encourage strategic thinking for continued private sector engagement and **would like to explore the barriers to obtaining support from philanthropic organizations for Major Groups programs.***

PANAMA:

- El sector empresarial, cada día mas consciente de hacer contribuciones al medio ambiente con sus prácticas de desarrollo sostenible y creando procesos amigables con el ambiente, ha establecido ese puente de enlace con la comunidad ambiental y grupos organizados a fin de apoyar proyectos de conservación y protección de nuestros bosques.
- A modo de comentario, el enlace que sostuvo el grupo AAMVECONA en la provincia de Bocas del Toro (comunidad civil residente en el humedal San SanPondSank), con la empresa productora bananera local, la cual apoyo financieramente los programas de iniciativa de esta asociación, que hoy en día cuenta con el respaldo del GEF, PNUD y el SGP.
- Adopta Bosque Panamá, otra ONG, que ha establecido enlaces con a la empresa privada, apoyando áreas protegidas privadas, temas de educación ambiental e investigación, restauración de bosques con rango de acción a nivel nacional, también ANCON, con enlaces y financiamiento privado para la conservación de las áreas protegidas metropolitanas y en los bosques del Darién.
- Este tipo de asociación son cruciales he importantes para la conservación y manejo de nuestros bosques, aun cuando son tomados por iniciativa de la comunidad civil organizada.

- *The private business sector each day aware of having contributed to the environment through its sustainable development practices and created nature-friendly processes, has established links with the environmental communities and organised groups with a view to support forest conservation and protection projects.*
- *By way of comment, the link between AAMVECONA group in Boca de Toro province (a civil community in the San Pond Sank wetland) with a local banana producer which financially supports programmes of this association with some additional inputs from the GEF, UND and SGP.*
- *Adopta Bosque Panama, an NGO, has established links with a private company to jointly support private protected areas, environmental education and research, restoration of forests/vegetation at national level while also ANCON with private funding for conservation of peri-urban protected areas and forests in Darien.*
- *These types of associations are crucially important for conservation and management of our forests even when taken up as initiatives of the organised civil society.*

What top 3 successes has your Major Group achieved in more fully engaging the private sector and philanthropic entities in your work and (especially) supporting implementation of the IAF ambitions by civil society and member states?

FSC:

- *FSC as a multistakeholder organization engages broadly with businesses and philanthropic communities to drive sustainable forest management. These actors can actively participate in FSC's processes and adopt FSC as solution to deliver on their commitments towards SFM through certification across the forest value chain.*
- *FSC as an organization actively engages with international businesses platforms such as a member of the UN Global Compact and also collaborates with the World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD).*
- *More recently, through FSC Investments and Partnerships (FSC I&P), FSC has expanded its engagement with philanthropic communities, looking for the most significant opportunities and projects supporting on FSC's mission.*

Fundación Pachamama (Ecuador):

- *Fundación Pachamama bases its work on alliances and inter-institutional cooperation, in the first place with the organizations of indigenous peoples and nationalities, with whom agreements for organizational strengthening are maintained. In **Ecuador**, twelve agreements have been signed with indigenous organizations, and in **Peru**, at least eight other organizations are working. In addition, we implement several projects and initiatives with other civil society actors such as local and international NGOs, productive and community associations. In addition, we work in alliances with some local governments with whom we have signed cooperation agreements such as with the Decentralized Autonomous Government of the Province of Pastaza, Canton Arajuno and Macuma Parish in the Province of Morona Santiago. During the same week a specific agreement will be signed with the Pastaza Prefecture to plant 100,000 trees and plants and strengthen a local nursery of these local species. Within the framework of the Forest Economies program, we also work with private actors such as the AJE Group, with whom we promote value chains of Amazonian superfruits, and also with associations such as Kallari and Wiñak, with extensive experience in the Ecuadorian Amazon, working in chains such as guayusa, cocoa, and vanilla, within the ancestral productive system, called chakra.*
- *In **Peru**, we have agreements with regional indigenous organizations such as AIDSESP, ORPIO, ORPIAN, and also with organizations of the Achuar, Wampis, Awajun, Kandozi, Chapra nationalities, among others. We work on legal cases for the protection of indigenous territories from the oil industry, especially, and also on communication and advocacy campaigns such as the Law for the Protection of Indigenous or Native Peoples in Situations of Isolation and in Situations of Initial Contact or the PIACI Law; as well, in favor of the Napo-Tigre Reserve, in Loreto, Peruvian Amazon (reserve to be created to protect these peoples in voluntary isolation).*
- *We also seek to generate alliances to address key issues such as climate financing mechanisms. In the last year we have worked on various dialogues with environmental authorities and with indigenous organizations in coordination with the People's Forest Partnership, which is an alliance between forest communities and organizations from all sectors of the economy, civil society and government. whose role is to direct climate finance towards indigenous and local forest communities, indigenous peoples, traditional owners and local communities. The facilitating members of this alliance are Ever Land, RECOFTC, Greencollar, Forest Trends and Wildlife Works and work in Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America. The goals of the alliance are to rapidly increase the scale and impact of forest livelihoods and conservation projects, as*

well as create innovative climate finance streams that recognize and invest in communities protecting their lands.

FARMERS+IFFA:

- *Our International Family Forest Alliance IFFA, as part of the Major Group Farmers and Small forests owner, have been able to arrange continental conferences in Asia, Africa and Latin America to stress the importance of producer organizations to strengthen the benefit and the enthusiasm at the small forest family forestry and hereby promote and interpret the UNFF policy language to reality at the local forest management.*
- *So far, we have not engaged with large private sector and philanthropic entities. It would be good if UNFF could establish closer link between Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network with the Global Investors for Sustainable Development (GISD)⁵⁹ to engage investors to promote in SFM.*

Question J-4: What degree of funding independence have you achieved for participation in (a) policy development and dialogue or (b) practical SFM contribution? What improvements would you prioritise?

Highlights from key messages in response to Question J-4

Question J-4: What degree of funding independence have you achieved for participation in (a) policy development and dialogue or (b) practical SFM contribution? What improvements would you prioritise?

- *Most NGOs are not prioritizing their involvement in UNFF-related activities. Their attention is focused mainly on the UNFCCC, around which there is financing of different types, and this is demonstrated in the participation of NGOs and other stakeholders and actors in the COPs.*
- *It is difficult to obtain specific financing to participate in UNFF actions. It is always difficult to obtain funds to participate in IAF dialogues and in MGs activities towards implementation of the GFGs.*
- *It would be important to provide direct support to Major Groups for their participation in UNFF activities and for joint implementation of the GFG - requests could be directed to the CPF and the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network.*
- *For the MG Farmers, the norm is sourcing reliable funds by collecting annual membership fee from its members. This pays costs of participating in UNFF and other global forest-related meetings.*
- *A specific trust fund could be established under UNFF trust fund that could cover for focal points to participate during UNFF meetings and Ad Hoc Expert Groups.*
- *Have capacity development for development of bankable proposals to attract funding.*

SADC:

- *Some of the achievements is the funding assistance by FAO on the revision of the SADC Forestry Strategy 2020-2030 and its standardised reporting template on the state of forests. Other achievement on funding is the development of SADC Forestry Guidelines developed by JICA. Furthermore, raise awareness, build capacity, and conduct training on sustainable land management initiatives and programmes in the region is needed.*

FSC:

- *FSC has established a certification system that requires the support of several third-party actors to operate it on the ground, making it market linked. The degree of funding independence is medium FSC works as an international non-for-profit organization, utilizing its revenue to cover its main operations.*

⁵⁹<https://gisdalliance.org/>

Question J-4: What degree of funding independence have you achieved for participation in (a) policy development and dialogue or (b) practical SFM contribution? What improvements would you prioritise?

EL SALVADOR:

No participamos, limitaciones de financiamiento

- *We do not participate due to funding limitations.*

FARMERS+IFFA:

- *IFFA largely depend on the sourcing of reliable funds by collecting annual membership fee from its members. This allows for IFFA members (predominately members of the board of IFFA) to participate in UNFF and other global forest-related meetings.*
- *We would welcome that a specific trust fund could be established under UNFF trust fund that could cover for focal points to participate during UNFF meetings and Ad Hoc Expert Groups. In an ideal solution, regional meetings should be held for collecting the views and opinions by MG&OS at the regional level.*

FOREST EUROPE:

- *FOREST EUROPE is an informal Ministerial process. The secretariat is funded by the four members of the General Coordinating Committee and thus the secretariat LUBo has a full degree of funding independence.*

FSC:

- *FSC has established a certification system that requires the support of several third-party actors to operate it on the ground, making it market linked. The degree of funding independence is medium FSC works as an international non-for-profit organization, utilizing its revenue to cover its main operations.*

Fundación Pachamama:

- *It is difficult to obtain specific financing to participate in UNFF actions. From Cuencas Sagradas, participation in the conferences of the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has been prioritized; this participation has been achieved through the sum of several funds that support the impact of the Cuencas Sagradas proposal for its importance for the conservation of Amazonian forests in Ecuador and Peru. This financing allows representatives of the indigenous organizations that are members of the Alliance for the Cuencas Sagradas to participate.*
- *The future strategy of Cuencas Sagradas seeks to consolidate financing mechanisms for indigenous peoples and nationalities so that they have their own management unit to channel national and international resources in favor of the communities that inhabit the Amazonian forests.*

KENYA:

- Degree of funding independence achieved for participation in:
 - Policy development and dialogue – 50%
 - Practical SFM contribution? – 20 %
- What improvements would you prioritise?
 - *Lobbying for funding from the exchequer and development partners*

- *Capacity development for development of bankable proposals to attract funding*
- *Enhancement of partnerships with communities and private sector*

MALAWI:

- *No independence yet*

MEXICO:

¿No se percibe un grado de independencia de financiación adecuado para participar en el desarrollo de políticas o en la contribución práctica del manejo forestal sostenible.

- *We do not feel adequately financially independent both for meetings participation or for practical SFM interventions.*

NGO UMBRELLA:

- *Financing is the most complicated and delicate issue. Obtaining financing by NGOs focuses on procurement the necessary resources to carry out actions on the ground. Of course, these actions are related to SFM, and in this sense the Forest Goals. It is always difficult to obtain funds to participate in IAF dialogues and in MGs activities towards implementation of the GFGs.*
- *Talking about financial independence is almost impossible in the case of NGOs.*
- *It should also be considered that, in the participation of NGOs in IAF, a fundamental factor intervenes; this refers to the fact that most NGOs are not prioritizing their involvement in UNFF-related activities. Its attention is focused mainly on the UNFCCC, around which there is financing of different types, and this is demonstrated in the participation of NGOs and other stakeholders and actors in the COPs, as was the case of COP 26 in Glasgow and COP27 in Sharm-el-Sheikh.*
- *The Mayor Groups have received financial support from the UNFF Secretariat to participate in several of the meetings: EGMs, UNFF Sessions (but not during last 2 years). The main donor for the MGs in IAF was the German government.*
- *Suggestions: Given that the contribution of the Major Groups has been repeatedly recognized and was ratified in the UNFF17 "Omnibus Resolution" (points 10 and 11), as well as the importance of collaboration, cooperation and coordination between the different actors, it would be important to provide direct support to Major Groups for their participation in UNFF activities and for joint implementation of the GFGs. The aforementioned resolution includes requests related to the CPF, in relation to the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network, which should be put into practice. Also, it would be useful to resume organizing of the Major Groups Initiative sessions before every annual meeting of the UNFF to involve more NGOs and other MGs into UNFF activities.*

2020-2022 years were very hard for forests and people because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Most countries closed their borders and many people suffered. It was useful that UNFF organized special sessions devoted to the influence of pandemic into forests and people. NGO MG actively participated in such discussions in the regional and global levels. Unfortunately, MGs representatives and many other actors could not participate in the UNFF sessions during last 2 years. Fortunately, pandemic is over, and we hope that it would be possible to participate in the UNFF sessions in 2023 and beyond face to face. EGM in Bangkok in January 2023 will be a good step in this direction that will give a chance for MGs to contribute.

PANAMA:

- Durante muchos años, entidades no gubernamentales y de cooperación internacional son las que han aportado el financiamiento para el desarrollo de políticas y diálogos internos para la contribución de las OFS. A modo de ejemplo, los pueblos originarios del Darién han recibido el apoyo de la WWF y USAID para los planes de manejos y planes operativos para el aprovechamiento de los bosques comunitarios.
 - Para el año 1995, el Banco Nacional de Panamá (BNP), inició aprobando prestamos para el establecimiento de plantaciones forestales, a nivel nacional, sin embargo, este programa de la banca estatal duro cinco años. Hoy en día, no contamos con políticas contundentes de financiamiento forestal, (salvo la Ley No. 69 de Incentivo Forestal), dado a que se les consideran inversiones de alto riesgo y de muy largo tiempo para recuperar el financiamiento.
 - Panamá, ha creado varias mesas de dialogo sobre medio ambiente y bosques, tanto con el sector público y organizaciones civiles, trabaja de la mano con la Asociación Nacional de Reforestadores y Afines de Panamá (ANARAP) en temas de política y acuerdos forestales.
 - La participación de Panamá en diferentes foros y cumbres le ha permitido a ese recurso humano, tomar el ejemplo de esas buenas iniciativas forestales y establecer esos lazos de comunicación con diferentes sectores a fin de ir encaminados a *esa sostenibilidad forestal*.
- *For many years non-governmental organisations and international cooperation have mobilised funding for internal policy dialogue for OFS. As an example, the original people of Darien have received funding from WWF and USAID for forest management plans and operations to provide community forests.*
 - *For 1995, the National Bank of Panama started approving loans for forest plantation establishment (a programme for 5 years). Since then, there is no policy to finance forestry (except for Law 69 on forest incentives) because this is considered a high-risk venture and requires too long before recovering expenses.*
 - *Panama has established various fora for dialogue on forests and the environment both with the public sector and civil society, working in close cooperation with the National Association of Reforesters and Related of Panama (ANARAP) on themes of policy and agreements on forests.*
 - *Panama's participation in various fora and conferences has allowed it to learn from good examples of forestry initiatives and to establish lines of communication with various sectors with a view to pursue SFM.*

SADC:

- *Some of the achievements is the funding assistance by FAO on the revision of the SADC Forestry Strategy 2020-2030 and its standardised reporting template on the state of forests. Other achievement on funding is the development of SADC Forestry Guidelines developed by JICA. Furthermore, raise awareness, build capacity, and conduct training on sustainable land management initiatives and programmes in the region is needed.*

REFERENCES

AFRICA CLIMATE CHANGE FUND (OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK)

<https://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/initiatives-partnerships/africa-climate-change-fund>

Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organisation (ACTO) (2020): **ACTO'S Contributions to Achieving the Biennium 2021-2022 Thematic Priorities Related to Global Forest Goals (GFGS) 1, 2, 4, 5 & 6 And Their Associated Targets.**

BEZOS EARTH FUND - Nature Solutions. <https://www.bezosearthfund.org/our-programs>

Brazilian Tree Industry (BTI) (2020?): **The planted tree industry is essential for the fight of COVID-19.**

Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) (2021): **Work Plan 2021-2024**

Working together to reach the Global Forest Goals. April 2021.

Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) (2020): **CPF Strategic Vision Towards 2030.** FAO Headquarters, 27 January 2020

ECOSOC (2015): **Resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 22 July 2015 [on the recommendation of the United Nations Forum on Forests (E/2015/42 and Corr.1)] 2015/33. International arrangement on forests beyond 2015.** ECOSOC 2015 Session Doc 15-14033 (E)

ECOSOC (2015): **Multi-stakeholder dialogue - Note by the Secretariat.**

UNFF15, New York, 4-15 May 2015. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2015/6

ECOSOC (2015): **Future of the international arrangement on forests - Discussion paper submitted by the major groups.** UNFF11, New York, 4-15 May 2015. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2015/6/Add.1

ECOSOC (2017): **Report of the United Nations Forum on Forests on its 2017 special session New York, 20 January 2017 I. The United Nations Forum on Forests recommends to the Economic and Social Council the adoption of the following draft resolution: United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017-2030 and quadrennial programme of work of the United Nations Forum on Forests for the period 2017-2020.** Document E/2017/10–E/CN.18/SS/2017/2

ECOSOC (2020): **Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, including the contributions of the Forum's regional and subregional partners and major groups, as well as involvement of its secretariat in major meetings. Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF15, 4-8 May 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/6

ECOSOC (2020): **Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030 - Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF15, 4-8 May 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/2

ECOSOC (2020): **Implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030: activities of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests- Information note.** UNFF15, 4-8 May 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/3

ECOSOC (2020): **Trust fund for the United Nations Forum on Forests - Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF15, 4-8 May 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/7

ECOSOC (2020): **Note verbale dated 20 May 2020 from the Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General [+Annex to the note verbale dated 20 May 2020 from the Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General: Report of the major groups-led initiative in support of the fifteenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests on the theme “Cross-sectoral collaboration for inclusive forest landscapes”]** UNFF15, June 2020. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2020/8

ECOSOC (2021): **Adoption of the Forum’s programme of work for the period 2022–2024. Technical discussions on the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030.** UNFF16, 26-30 April 2021. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2021/2

ECOSOC (2021): **Monitoring, assessment and reporting: progress on the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, including the United Nations Forest Instrument, and voluntary national contributions. Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF Sixteenth session 26–30 April 2021 ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2021/5

ECOSOC (2021): **Technical discussions on the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017-2030.** UNFF Sixteenth session 26–30 April 2021 ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2021/2

ECOSOC (2021): **Draft Resolution -Programme of work of the United Nations Forum on Forests for the period 2022-2024.** UNFF Sixteenth session 26–30 April 2021 ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2021/L.3

ECOSOC (2021): **Trust fund for the United Nations Forum on Forests - Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF Sixteenth session 26–30 April 2021 ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2021/6

ECOSOC (2022): **Monitoring, assessment and reporting: progress on the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, including the United Nations Forest Instrument, and voluntary national contributions. Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF17 9–13 May 2022. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2022/4

ECOSOC (2022): **Preparations for the midterm review in 2024 of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests in achieving its objectives - Note by the Secretariat.** United Nations Forum on Forests Seventeenth session New York, 9–13 May 2022. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2022/5

ECOSOC (2022): **Policy discussions on the implementation of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030: activities in support of the thematic priorities for the biennium 2021–2022. Note by the Secretariat.** United Nations Forum on Forests. Seventeenth session, New York, 9–13 May 2022. ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2022/2

ECOSOC (2022): **Draft resolution submitted by the Chair of the Commission “Outcome of the seventeenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests”.** United Nations Forum on Forests. Seventeenth session. 9–13 May 2022 ECOSOC Doc E/CN.18/2022/L.4

ECOSOC (2022): **Trust fund for the United Nations Forum on Forests. Note by the Secretariat.** UNFF17 New York, 9–13 May 2022, Economic and Social Council Doc E/CN.18/2022/6

EU FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

<https://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/seis/funding.htm>

GENERAL ASSEMBLY (2013): **Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 9 July 2013 [without reference to a Main Committee (A/67/L.72)] 67/290. Format and organizational aspects of the high-level political forum on sustainable development.** Sixty-seventh session, July 2013. Doc A/RES/67/290.

GLOBAL CONSERVATION FUND (GCF)

<https://www.conservation.org/about/global-conservation-fund>

IKI CLIMATE INITIATIVE - <https://iki-small-grants.de/>

IISD (2022): **Summary of the Seventeenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests: 9-13 May 2022.** Earth Negotiations Bulletin Vol. 13 No. 222 Monday, 16 May 2022. Online at: enb.iisd.org/un-forum-forests-unff-17

IISD (2022): **Summary of the Twenty-Sixth Session of the FAO Committee on Forestry: 3-7 October 2022.** *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* Vol. 13 No. 223 Online at: enb.iisd.org/fao-committee-forestry-cofo-26. Monday, 10 October 2022

JAPAN FUND FOR GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FOR NGOS/NPOS ENGAGED IN ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES

<https://concoursn.com/japan-fund-for-global-environment-for-ngos-npos-engaged-in-environmental-activities/>

Local Authorities Major Group (2022): **Position paper on the High-level Political Forum** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=270&menu=3170>

Major Group Children and Youth (of the UNFF) (2022): **Work with Us – Youth Call for Action.** Statement at the XV World Forestry Congress, Seoul, Republic of Korea. 2-6 May 2022

Major Group on Children and Youth (under UNFF) (2021): **Statement delivered by the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Major Group for Children and Youth - High Level Round Table Sixteenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests.** 26 April 2021, New York City

Major Groups on Forests (under UNFF) (2021?): **Progress in The Implementation of UNSPF - Contribution of Major Groups to UNFF 16 &17 Thematic Priorities.**

[Major Group] Workers and Trade Unions (2022): **Governance** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/majorgroups/workersandtradeunions>

Major Group Workers and Trade Unions (of the UNFF) (2022): **Statement on behalf of the Major Group Workers and Trade Unions Speaking to the High-Level Political Forum.** 9 May 2022

Major Group for Workers and Trade Unions: The 2030 Agenda: How Social Dialogue combats inequality and ensures social cohesion. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=3170&nr=285&page=view&type=30022>

Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) (2018): **Working with ECOSOC- an NGOs Guide to Consultative Status [2018].** http://csonet.org/content/documents/ECOSOC%20Brochure_2018_Web.pdf

NONPROFITS THAT SUPPORT DEFORESTATION

<https://projectworldimpact.com/cause/Deforestation#org-profile-nav-cause-country-section>

OECD (2017): **Global Private Philanthropy for Development - Results of the OECD Data Survey as of 3 October 2017**. [oe.cd/philanthropysurvey](http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/beyond-oda-foundations.htm) or <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/beyond-oda-foundations.htm>

Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors (undated): **Philanthropy and The SDGs - Practical Tools for Alignment**. Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors Philanthropy Roadmap.

Scientific and Technological Community Major Group
<https://council.science/science-technology-major-group/>

THE TERRA VIVA GRANTS DIRECTORY

https://terravivagrants.org/funding-news/?gclid=CjwKCAiAmuKbBhA2EiwAxQt71II1jc4fvj1-xy4YyW1OIMYaM1pII5J6VibgxQgNJH24ev2ZNw6ARoCeX4QAvD_BwE

UNDP (2022): THE GEF SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

<https://sgp.undp.org/>

UNEP ENVIRONMENT FUND

<https://www.unep.org/about-un-environment-programme/funding-and-partnerships>

United Nations General Assembly (2017): **Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 27 April 2017** [without reference to a Main Committee (A/71/L.63)] 71/285. **United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030**. Seventy-first session. Document A/RES/71/285

United Nations, (2020): **United Nations Forum on Forests - Report on the fifteenth session**. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 2020 Supplement No. 22 E/2020/42-E/CN.18/2020/9

United Nations, (2021): **United Nations Forum on Forests - Report on the sixteenth session**. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 2021 Supplement No. 22 Doc E/2021/42-E/CN.18/2021/8

United Nations (2022): **United Nations Forum on Forests - Report on the seventeenth session, (9–13 May 2022)**. ECOSOC Official Records, 2022 Supplement No. 22. E/2022/42-E/CN.18/2022/8.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Forum on Forests Secretariat (2021). **The Global Forest Goals Report 2021**. ISBN: 9789211304282 / eISBN: 9789214030515

UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs (UNDESA) (2022): **UNFF response to, role in, and expectations from forest-related multilateral developments- Concept Note**. UNFF17 High Level Round Table, UNFF17, 9 May 2022.

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2022): **Major Groups**. <https://www.un.org/esa/forests/major-groups/index.html>

United Nations Forum on Forests (2018): **WORK PLAN MAJOR GROUPS SUPPORT FOR THE UNSPF 2017-2030 UNDER THE FIRST QUADRENNIAL PLAN OF WORK 2017-2020 (4POW) OF THE UNFF**

Prepared collectively by the Major Groups on Forests [with support from the Secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests] Nairobi/New York 2017- 2018. 10 May 2018.

https://www.un.org/esa/forests/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/MG_workplan_May2018.pdf

United Nations Forum on Forests (2019): **Report - Expert Meeting to Review Progress in Implementation of the Major Groups Work plans and Input to the Fourteenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF14)**. Organised by the Secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) at the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), Bangkok.

United Nations Forum on Forests (2020): **Thematic priorities for UNFF16 & UNFF17**. 5 August 2020.

United Nations Forum on Forests (2021): **Concept Note - Strengthening the engagement of the United Nations Forum on Forests with Regional Partners and Major Groups and other stakeholders**. New York, 16-17 December 2021 (virtual)

United Nations Forum on Forests (2021): **Concept Note: High Level Round Table-Sixteenth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests**. 26 April 2021

United Nations Forum on Forests (2021): **Communication by the Bureau of the 16th Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests Input to the 2021 meeting of the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development**. 26 February 2021

United Nations Forum on Forests (2021): **Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening the Engagement of the United Nations Forum on Forests with Regional Partners, Major Groups, and other Stakeholders**. New York, 16-17 December 2021 (virtual)

United Nations Forum on Forests (2022): **Assessment of the Impacts of COVID-19 on Forests and Forest Sector- Summary by the Co-Chairs**. UNFF Expert Group Meeting (Virtual), 2-4 February 2022

WBCSD (undated): **World Business Council on Sustainable Development**.

<https://www.wbcsd.org/Overview/About-us>

Women's Major Group Governance & Structure

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/17386WMG_Governance_29May2017_Final.pdf