



Presentation on IAF MTR draft Assessment on Involvement of Major Groups and other Stakeholders

Mafa E. Chipeta

UNFF Expert Group meeting | January 2023 | Bangkok

1

PURPOSE AND CONTENTS

PURPOSE: This assessment is input into 2024 UNFF MTR of IAF effectiveness. It focuses on Major Groups and other Stakeholders (MGoS) engagement with IAF. Report highlights facts, analysis and views on engagement & its effectiveness.

- **Introduction and Methodology**
- **Analysis and Findings**
 - *UNFF commitment to MGs partnering*
 - *Main MGs IAF engagement developments since 2015*
 - *MGs attributes relevant to their UNFF engagement*
 - *Feedback through questionnaire responses*
- **Conclusions and Recommendations**



2

INTRO AND METHODOLOGY I

- MTR mandate in paras 28-31 of ECOSOC resolution 2022/17
- IAF desire to engage Major Groups & other stakeholders (MGoS) - strongly emphasised and repeatedly encouraged by ECOSOC and at UNFF sessions.
- Methodology involved access to & analysis of information from many sources (next slide).
- On this report, Bangkok January 2023 EGM to react clearly to:
 - the analysis;
 - its conclusions and recommendations;
 - Feedback on possible causes of low questionnaire response rate.



3

INTRO AND METHODOLOGY II

- **Analysis of information from diverse sources:**
 - UNFF and related websites;
 - The few responses to this MTR's questionnaires;
 - Comments exchanges with UNFFS on successive drafts.
- **Regrettably, responses to this assessments specific questionnaires totalled only 15:**
 - 10 Member States,
 - 5 Major Groups themselves



4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS I

UNFF post 2015 - MGs partnering

- The Forum and associated events have repeated ECOSOC resolution 2015/33's call for MGs / Forum collaboration in policy dialogue and action;
- About 30 of some 2000 forest-related entities with ECOSOC consultative status regularly attend UNFF sessions and related events;
- MGs have proposed better collaboration arrangements to UNFF—with focus on meetings & not the action that MGs now stress more.
- MGoS appeal at both Bangkok and Nairobi meetings: IAF to focus more on practical SFM action
- The *MG Statement of Commitment to Forests Action from Nairobi* also highlighted “enablers for action” for UNFF15 attention.



5

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS II

Main post 2015 engagement –Action orientation

- MGoS have high GFGs ambition, e.g.: propose conservation of 35 million ha Amazonian tropical forests; women MG in Africa plans planting 20 million trees;
- MGs own progress tracking: see undated “*Progress in the Implementation of UNSPF - Contribution of Major Groups to UNFF 16 & 17 Thematic Priorities*”; will hopefully continue regularly;
- In this first progress tracking report, only four MGs feature; the activities are somewhat dispersed and few actually involve establishment or management of forest resources



6

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS III

Post 2015 MGs - Funding

- Observed challenges in funding even for participation in UNFF meetings, let alone substantive SFM field action;
- No reports of substantial technical assistance or investment-scale funding;
- It appears that MGC&Y has successfully fundraised for projects and meetings participation (e.g. from FAO and IUFRO);
- Few reports of funding partnerships with regional/subregional development banks or philanthropies, despite these also being MGs;
- Repeated past MG requests for access to UNFF Trust Fund and UNFF's Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network (GFFFN) help in funding or fundraising support have failed except in *ad hoc* manner;
- Recommendations section draws attention to need for full-time fundraising and to possible funding sources.



7

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS IV

MGs attributes & UNFF engagement

- Report presents factors most affecting engagement with UNFF: **MGs Diversity; MGs governance for Coordination and Operational Performance; and Agenda for cooperation with others:**
 - Of [almost 2000 forest-related groups](#) in current consultative status with ECOSOC, only about 30 regularly at UNFF meetings: Local Authorities, Business and Industry and philanthropies are least often present;
 - For Business and Industry MG, current focal point ICFPA and other global private sector groups are predominantly from developed countries and all lack membership by small, informal and artisanal forest businesses prevalent in developing countries;
 - Intra-MG coordination with IAF was highest when the Major Group Partnership on Forests (MGPOF) operated briefly, starting in 2012; reasons for its disbanding unclear. Since then, highest coordination was 2019 adoption of umbrella workplan;
 - MGoS have focal points for coordination from global to grassroots levels. System appears complete but with heavy culture of consultation may be so heavy as to potentially slow down action.



8

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS V

Feedback through questionnaire responses

- The questionnaire responses being few may be unrepresentative but they yielded some key messages on practical action, including:
 - it is a shortcoming that UNFF has had limited success in promoting practical action and/or investment into SFM;
 - UNFF does not appear attractive to some important commercial and philanthropic entities - reasons need studying;
 - There may be useful lessons to learn from the apparent very high attraction to the UNFCCC - around which there is reportedly financing of different types;
 - The GFGs should be pursued broadly to also serve desire for global biodiversity, restoration and climate change agendas;
 - Consider building MG capacity for development of bankable proposals to attract funding.



9

CONCLUSIONS I

- Domination of UNFF meetings participation does not satisfy MGoS collective ambition, which is to also engage in practical SFM activities on the ground;
- MGoS entities may need ideas and best practice exchanges on how to better capture forest action opportunities from non-IAF forests frameworks;
- Following their recent first MG progress report after having a joint workplan, *a regular update would be useful and the MGs could agree on a format for it at the January 2023 ECG on the MTR;*
- The limited prominence of Local Authorities and Business & Industry MGs is unfortunate; for the latter neither ICFPA nor other large commercial industry associations can suffice, given that they exclude much of the developing world's informal and small-scale enterprises.



10

CONCLUSIONS II

- Finance issues are very important and report makes suggestions for greater fundraising efforts and attracting funds from a wider range of sources, especially the private sector and philanthropies;
- Not all potential sources of financing are associated with the IAF or would necessarily wish to be. The MGoS need to also operate under non-UNFF frameworks while retaining their link to it;
- Balance search for funding at local and global levels and secure support for a combination of conservation, livelihoods and indigenous peoples benefit, not just forests as such;
- The *philanthropic sector* does not prioritise environment in general and forestry in particular BUT a recent significant exception is the Bezos Earth Fund.



11

RECOMMENDATIONS I

General

- In the next The Global Forest Goals Report, deepen identification of the GFG sub-goals that need more adequate attention by key players including the MGoS;
- Sustain use of the unified MG workplan and continue publishing the MG implementation progress report to highlight necessary improvements;
- Respect the UN-linked coordination/ focal points/ democratic system but make it nimble;
- Take advantage of extra-sectoral links offered by the UN system MG governance framework to benefit forestry activities - use whatever combination of frameworks best "sells the forests agenda" (e.g. climate change, biodiversity etc) - even if not under IAF;
- Coordinate more with CPF for purposes of synergy, given relatively patchy CPF coverage of practical GFGs interventions;
- Energetically pursue greater participation of Local Authorities and Business and Industry in the areas of MGoS interest.



12

RECOMMENDATIONS II

Funding

- At this MTR, it may be best for the MGs to seek clear closure – “yes” or “no” by donors and Member States – on accessing UNFF Trust Fund and GFFFN funds so that repeat vague mentions of procedural bottlenecks do not keep unwarranted hope alive. [This proposal has been floated unsuccessfully very many times and deserves official closure];
- 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;
- Mobilise more MG financial resources than has proved possible so far including from non-IAF linked private sector and philanthropic sources, not all of which are or want to be affiliated with the UNFF;
- Collectively as MGs or separately, consider starting full-time grant fundraising at the field alongside global level and “sell” not just local community livelihoods, conservation, and indigenous and other marginalised groups needs;
- 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.



13



Thank You!

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

14