

National Forest Programme Facility

Rome, 15 February 2010

2009 Progress Report

Final

2009 Progress Report

CONTENT

2009 – REFLECTIONS BY THE TEAM	1
KEY ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS IN 2009	3
Outcome and Impact Monitoring and Evaluation System (OIMES)	3
Forest Financing.....	5
Information and Capacity Building.....	5
Funding situation	5
FACILITY GOVERNANCE	6
Facility Steering Committee (SC).....	6
Facility Management.....	6
OIMES	7
COUNTRY SUPPORT	8
Ongoing Facility Partnerships.....	8
Country Coaching.....	10
“Nfp’s for All” Training	10
Facility support to the development of National Forest Financing Strategies	11
The Facility and the Growing Forest Partnership (GFP)	13
INFORMATION SERVICES.....	15
Facility Web Platform	15
Sourcebook on Funding for SFM.....	16
Promotion of the Facility	16
Nfp Update.....	17
Dissemination and Learning Processes.....	18
Enhancing Knowledge and Capacities	18
FINANCIAL ASPECTS.....	20
Overall situation at the end of 2009.....	20
2009 Budget Implementation	20
ANNEX I	25
Facility Steering Committee Members	25
ANNEX II.....	26
Facility Country Coaches for 2009	26
ANNEX III	29
Facility Partner Countries and their 2009 Human Development index ranking	29
ANNEX IV	30
Reporting against the Logical framework (2002-2009).....	30

2009 – REFLECTIONS BY THE TEAM

Overall, 2009 has been an intense and challenging year for the Facility with both ups and downs. The Facility has successfully implemented a tight work plan and participated actively in the international dialogue on forest. Positive feedback from those efforts has been received and has sustained the motivation and spirit of the Team. In September, the Team went through a very difficult time when one of its core members, Francesca Gentile, administrator in charge of Spanish speaking countries, lost her fight against cancer. She kept on working until her last weeks and her spirit, energy, efficiency, and open, transparent way will forever be missed by the rest of the Team.

Nineteen partnerships (12 new and 7 for a second agreement) were launched during the year. In addition, the Facility has actively participated in events like the FAO Committee on Forestry (COFO), UNFF, GFP, ETFAG, WFC and the CLI in China. The Facility experience, in general, and on more specific themes such as participation, financing, and payment for environmental services (PES) has, in most cases, been presented by partner country stakeholders and the feed back has generally been positive. However, many old challenges remain and new ones have emerged.

Nfp platform

A key remaining challenge is to maintain the nfp as a platform for forest related initiatives, such as REDD and FLEGT, and there remains an urgent need for the international dialogue on forests to take this issue seriously. The CLI in China discussed this issue and confirmed the important role of nfp's as the platform.

It is of great concern to the Facility that other initiatives, like FLEGT and the Congo Based Forest Partnership (CBFP), are still not building their support on the nfp process, but on calls for proposals, bypassing the nfp process and the country priorities. Projects are decided upon by expert committees established by the donors. Country ownership, a key nfp principle, is, as a result, not strengthened and those calls for proposal refer to projects of much bigger size (80 – 100 000 US\$ each) than the Facility grants. However, the selected organizations are often also recipient organisations of Facility support and given that those projects are 3 – 4 times bigger than Facility grants, it is obvious that the nfp process supported by the Facility will receive less attention. The methodology and principles of other initiatives thus come into conflict with those of the nfp process, highlighting the clear and urgent need for donors to harmonize and coordinate their support to different initiatives.

The forest related climate initiatives supported by donors (REDD, REDD +, REDD++, and others) are being handled, in most Facility partner countries, by the Ministry of Environment and their agencies. Awareness of this is growing and creating frustration in forest departments and among foresters in general, as they realize that, despite not being part of the development of the forest/climate schemes, they will be made responsible for achieving REDD and SFM.

In 2009, the Facility has continued to emphasize the linkages between the nfp process and other forest related initiatives and processes, like GEF/SGP, GFP, FLEGT and VPA, REDD, FCPF and UNFF/NLBI implementation. The Facility point of view is that it is important to build upon and strengthen existing structures and platforms (like the nfp or similar) rather than creating new parallel structures and project organisations. Experience has shown that it takes time and energy to establish a common ground for organisations with different mandates and experiences. Personal commitments by the responsible officers at country level also have a great impact on success.

Forest Financing

A new challenge is to determine how the Facility experience on National Forest Financing Strategies could be scaled up to support the implementation of the facilitative process on financing SFM agreed upon at UNFF in late 2009. It is hoped that a closer collaboration between the Facility, PROFOR and UNFF Secretariat will be developed during 2010 in order to make efforts more complementary.

The experience in 2009 has confirmed that, in spite of the importance of forests and trees in mitigating and adapting to climate change, Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is still viewed by other sectors as a technical issue linked to the measuring and harvesting of wood. The importance of forests and trees for local livelihoods and poor people is less well recognized. The value of forests and trees remains underestimated and data hardly exists about their contribution to poor households. Additionally, the value of informal trade and environmental services is scarcely available and not accessible to policy makers and nfp stakeholders.

There is also now a main focus on payment for the role of forests in mitigating and adapting to climate change. New, large donor financing is available for planning the implementation of REDD and the development and testing of systems and methods for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV). Work in this area is already absorbing a great part of the capacities available at forest agencies in many partner countries. However, there is a genuine frustration among foresters in those countries that payment for REDD alone will not be enough to achieve SFM. To be able to compete with other land uses, it is important to recognize the value of the other forest products (wood, energy, etc.) and services (water, biodiversity, soil conservation, etc.) that improve rural livelihoods. These have now almost been forgotten.

Communication and education

A clearly perceived contributing factor for foresters not becoming involved in other related policy areas (cross sector integration) is that foresters are generally poor communicators and often feel uncomfortable when confronted with actors beyond the forest sector itself. In addition, in quite a few countries there is a lack of trust in the forest department and in foresters in general. Lack of transparency and corruption in the past has created this situation; demonstration of good governance (and the production of results) is the only way to improve the reputation of the sector.

Another contributing factor is that forest education, at all levels, in Facility partner countries is still very traditional and has not responded to the new and emerging socio-economic and environmental challenges facing the sector today. To support the process of re-designing forest education to meet current and future needs, the Facility has entered (in 2009) into an agreement with the African Network for Agriculture, Agroforestry and Natural Resources Education (ANAFE) for a research and development project on needed educational reforms in Eastern Africa. The outcome is intended to provide a base for similar processes in other regions.

Monitoring results

A survey on the implementation of the nfp principles in the 70 Facility partner countries shows that 50% have established a truly national process, one third have established a small ad-hoc steering committee to govern the Facility support. and in 11 partner countries there is no active nfp process in place, despite Facility efforts. The Facility target is the establishment of some 60 sustainable nfp processes by 2012. The achievement of this target is still a possibility, but will require a focus during the coming years on the 24 countries managing the Facility as a project. Reaching this target will, in addition, depend heavily on the use of the nfp as a platform for forest related policy issues, as described above.

In 2009, 13 new countries signed partnership agreements with the Facility. Those new countries, approved by the Steering Committee in February 2009, have low capacity and their start up will take time. In contrast, the 7 countries having entered into a second agreement with the Facility in 2009 have shown high motivation and the new agreements have provided direct support to the continuation of their nfp processes. It is thus felt that the decision by the Steering Committee in 2009 not to invite more new countries to become partners was a wise one. The Facility Team is, however, proposing that second agreements with partner countries should be continued in 2010.

In conclusion, Facility experience in 2009 has demonstrated that the key issues for continued and strengthened support are Financing and Communication. Both will facilitate the much needed inter and intra sector linkages, and the latter should include facts on the multiple roles of forests and building a new image of foresters and forest institutions.

Facility Core Team, January 2010

KEY ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS IN 2009

The 8th meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) took place at the World Bank Headquarters in Washington DC on February 5 and 6, 2009. The Facility Donor Meeting took place at the EC, EuropeAid Headquarters in Brussels on 29 January. Some of the important strategic conclusions reached during those meetings are listed below:

- Agreed that, based on the satisfactory funding situation, the Facility should continue operation in 70 partner countries and with 4 regional partners, at full scale, through mid 2012.
- Proposed a "state of the art" paper on how to position the forest in the overall financing of services, based on the Facility experience in support to NFFS and the PROFOR thematic area on Innovative Financing.
- Welcomed the Facility involvement in the GFP initiative, emphasizing that it should add value by building upon what already exists in countries and focusing on strengthening local partnerships. GFP should be known as a concept rather than a new project in itself.
- Welcomed that the training modules on Financing, Participation and Conflict Management are now developed, tested and ready to be offered to partner countries. Emphasized the importance of finding suitable institutions willing to conduct the training at country or regional level, using the "south to south" knowledge and experience sharing as an important strategy.
- Emphasized the importance of linking the nfp, from the start (in new countries), with other ongoing initiatives, REDD, FCPF etc. and national climate strategies and to support cross-sector integration.
- Proposed that, in relation to cross-sector integration, a study be undertaken in all Facility countries on how representative the stakeholder committee members are.
- Noted the serious need for improving the communication skills of forest administrations and other direct stakeholders and identified the need for Facility and PROFOR to jointly develop communications manuals/guidelines specific to different country/regional conditions.
- Welcomed the continued support to the development of National Forest Financing Strategies and requested the Facility be prepared to substantially scale up this support, based on the outcome of the ongoing international dialogue on forest financing.
- Welcomed the planned Facility presence at COFO, UNFF, ETFAG and WFC and the Facility support to China in organizing a CLI on nfp's and in emphasizing the need for improved communication with SC members in order to better join forces at these events.
- Agreed to allow countries to apply for a second partnership agreement in 2009, to be implemented during the period 2010 – mid 2012.
- Agreed to an evaluation at the end of 2010, commissioned by the EC and, if possible, at the same time and by the same team on the Facility, FLEGT and PROFOR, in order to have a base for decisions about the future role and linkages of those and other emerging partnerships.
- Requested the Facility to do "horizon searching", in advance of the evaluation, on possible ways forward after mid 2012 and expressed keen interest in SC participation.

The above listed strategic decisions were reflected in the Facility development and operations in 2009.

Partnerships were signed in 2009 with another 13 countries adding up to a total of 70 countries and 4 regional organizations. During the year, small grants were provided to stakeholders in 41 countries and to 4 regional organisations. The process for requesting and entering into a second agreement has been ongoing throughout the year in 6 countries and in one regional organization (ACICAFOC) with support from the Facility. By December 2009, applications were in the process of being received from all 6 countries and from ACICAFOC.

Outcome and Impact Monitoring and Evaluation System (OIMES)

Result Based Management (RBM) and the OIMES have been introduced and put into practice in 51 partner countries. The system has been well received and it has brought further insight to the stakeholders of the nfp framework about the reality and status of the nfp in the country. In 2010, the remaining 19 countries will be included in the OIMES.

Stakeholder monitoring and evaluation of their nfp (based on OIMES in 51 countries) with respect to the 3 key principles (country ownership, inter & intra sector integration and participation) shows that in 30% of the countries, the process is progressing well; in 40% a process is established and operational but still a lot could be done to improve it; and in the remaining 30% of the countries the process is incipient with plenty of room to develop further.

A survey done by the Facility (perception by the Coaches) on the implementation of the nfp in all 70 Facility partner countries shows that 50% (or 35 partner countries) have established a truly national process, owned and directed by a well established multi stakeholder committee. One third (or 24 of the countries) has established a small ad-hoc steering committee to govern the Facility support. In those countries the Facility is regarded as yet another project and is not really regarded as support to a national process. In 11 partner countries there is no active nfp process in place, despite Facility efforts.

Comparing the results of the different regions, OIMES shows that the nfp processes, on average, are well established in Africa and Asia, needs a lot of improvements in Latin America and is at a very early stage of development in Central Asia. The Facility survey confirms the same regional differences considering that in 50% of the partner countries in Latin America, the nfp is perceived (by the coaches) as a project supported by the Facility and not as a truly national process. On the other hand 25% of the Asia and Pacific partner countries and 20% of the African partner countries (compared to only 5% in Latin America) do not have an nfp process in operation. Thus, in Latin America there are more functioning nfps than in Asia and Africa. But in Asia and Africa, where they work, they work better than in Latin America.

With respect to how representative the nfp national multi stakeholder steering committees (NMSC) are, the Facility survey showed that other ministries (Environment, Rural Development, Energy, Finance etc.) are represented in 50%, NGO's/CBO's in 80% and the private sector, surprisingly, in almost 50% of the committees. The most striking regional difference (see Table 1 below) is that in Asia the international partners (donors) and research organisations are much more frequently represented (80%) in the NMSC than in other regions. In Latin America, the level of participation of decentralised forest offices is less and in Africa the indigenous peoples groups (IPs) participate in less than 10% of the steering committees, compared with 25% in Asia and Latin America. On average, IPs are represented in only 14% of the committees at the national level. A reason for their low participation is that they are, in most countries, not well organised for participation in national fora. With funding from the GFP, the Facility is supporting the establishment of platforms at the national level to ensure the participation of marginalized, forest dependent groups.

Table 1: Stakeholder representation in NMSC (70 countries surveyed)

Stakeholder Groups Represented in the National Multi-stakeholder Steering Committee	Africa %	Asia Pacific %	Latin America and Caribbean %	Western and Central Asia %
Forestry Department (at national or federal level)	100	100	100	100
Decentralised Forestry Department at provincial, district or state level	46	46	18	50
Other ministries (Ministry of Environment, Rural Development, Energy, Finance, Agriculture, etc.)	57	46	35	75
Forest Research institution or institution for forestry extension	57	85	41	100
Forest Education and Academia (university, forestry school, training institute, etc.)	71	69	59	75
Professional Associations	26	23	35	0
NGOs/ CBOs	83	77	76	75
Indigenous Peoples Groups	9	23	24	0
Private sector or private sector associations	51	38	53	25
International partners, donors (informed as observers)	43	77	29	25

The OIMES shows that at global level, the nfp principles of (i) country ownership and (ii) participation are more developed than (iii) inter and intra sector linkages. OIMES also shows that about 50% of Facility support goes towards participation, 30% to country leadership and only 20% to inter and intra sector linkages. The most problematic and difficult principle is thus also the one receiving the least priority in the nfp processes. One reason may be that the importance of this principle is not really understood by stakeholders. Another possible reason is a lack of ideas on how to implement or improve this principle.

The results of the above evaluations are similar and it could be concluded that some 75 to 85 % of the countries have established an nfp process, but still a lot of improvements are needed in most of them. For 25% of the partners, the process is incipient, rudimentary or not at all operational.

Forest Financing

In a number of partner countries, the Facility, together with FAO and other partners, has provided further support to the development of National Forest Financing Strategies (NFFS) and selected financing instruments. The purpose of this support is to encourage and guarantee active participation of forest and financial stakeholders in the process to discuss, elaborate and implement NFFS, as tools to strengthen the nfp.

A draft Concept Note on continued support to NFFS has been developed and discussed, together with FAO and other partners, outlining a framework for coordinated and collaborative work in Asia, Africa and Latin America, in response to the needs and interests expressed by countries and to the decision of the UNFF to establish a facilitative process.

The Facility experiences, so far, on NFFS highlight the importance of addressing a number of key institutional weaknesses that currently limit a more constructive communication between the forest and financing sectors: limited knowledge of financing language, instruments, and processes; isolation from other sectors and from other key stakeholders within the sector; a legacy of dependence on public resources, both domestic and international, with a focus on limited instruments; and inadequate attention to efforts improving the climate for investment and market development.

Information and Capacity Building

The Facility, in close collaboration with FAO, has in 2009 continued to strengthen capacities of forestry stakeholder representatives through the "Nfp's for All" modules: in Nigeria and Vietnam on "Enhancing participation in their nfp's"; in Lesotho and Cambodia on "collaborative conflict management". This support has taken the form of training, mentoring and provision of practical guidance through a newly published handbook entitled "Enhancing stakeholder participation in nfp's, tools for practitioners".

In order to create ownership and resident capacities in the African region, a training of trainers' session, involving 6 African countries (Uganda, Gambia, South Africa, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Malawi), was held in November 2009.

In 2009, considerable efforts were undertaken to improve the Facility web-based information platform. It has been completely renewed in order to facilitate updates, and dissemination of information about Facility achievements in partner countries. A visit to the improving Facility website is highly recommended (www.nfp-facility.org)!

Funding situation

The funding situation of the Facility has remained strong in 2009. The World Bank Development Grant Facility entered as a new funding partner for the implementation of the GFP in Facility partner countries. That was the only new donor to join the Facility in 2009. The long term agreements with the EC, Sweden and the UK are still running and annual contributions have been received from Finland, France, Germany, the USA, Austria, and Switzerland. The financial situation at the end of 2009 is encouraging, but in order to run the Facility operations as planned until mid 2012, commitments for another \$US 1,9 million are needed.

FACILITY GOVERNANCE

Facility Steering Committee (SC)

In accordance with the Facility Management Arrangements (as stated in the Programme Document), no SC member can serve for more than two consecutive periods of 3 years, unless agreed upon by the SC. As three of the members had served for 6 years, the SC in 2009 assigned a subgroup of its members to develop a proposal, including names, on the composition of a new SC. The subgroup made a proposal which included a new chair person and new members "representing" private sector, forest research, and NGO's. Their proposal was endorsed by all SC members (see Annex I for the composition of the renewed SC).

Facility Management

In September, the Facility lost a core Team member. Francesca Gentile, administrator in charge of Spanish speaking countries, lost her fight against cancer. Her spirit, energy, efficiency, and open, transparent way will forever be missed by the Team. In addition, her departure created a vacuum in the support to the Facility Spanish speaking partners. In December, a replacement was found and the Latin American operations came back to their normal speed again.

At the end of 2008, FAO staff coaches to Central Asian countries moved to new positions, creating a difficult capacity challenge for the Facility during the first half of 2009. However, the in-kind support from FAO has been considerably stronger than in previous years, both in HQ and in the field (see below).

In December 2009 the staffing situation of the Facility was as follows.

Facility Core Team

At HQ in Rome:

- Mr. Jerker Thunberg**, Manager
- Mr. Johan Lejeune**, Senior Operations Officer
- Mr. Jhony Zapata**, Coach for Latin America
- Ms. Marguerite France-Lanord**, Information & Communication Officer
- Ms. Sophie Grouwels**, GFP Coordinator and Coach for Gambia
- Mr. Luca Paolini**, Information Systems Officer (FORIS), Information Services Team
- Mr. Marco Perri**, Information Systems Officer (Website), Information Services Team
- Ms. Daniela Mercuri**, Budget Assistant
- Ms. Ulrika Häggmark**, Programme Assistant, English and French Speaking Countries
- Ms. Zoraya Gonzales**, Programme Assistant, Spanish Speaking Countries
- Ms. Laura Schweitzer**, Consultant, Information Services Team
- Ms. Elisabetta Casagrande**, Consultant, Sourcebook on Financing

In the field:

- Ms. Xiaojie Fan**, Coach for the Asia and Pacific Region, based in Bangkok
- Mr. Michael Chihambakwe**, Coach for Southern Africa, based in South Africa
- Mr. Atse Yapi**, Coach for West Africa
- Mr. Ignacio Bustos**, Coach (part-time) for Ecuador, Colombia and Peru
- Mr. Wulf Killman**, Coach (part-time) for Bolivia
- Mr. Manuel Paveri**, Coach (part-time) for Brazil
- Mr. Francois Wencelius**, Coach (part-time) for Tunisia, Morocco and Niger

FAO support:

As in the past, the Facility continued to enjoy excellent working relations with the FAO Forestry Department in Rome and, in particular, with the Forest Policy Service (FOEP) headed by **Ms. Eva Müller**.

Time was provided by the following professional staff during 2009 as in-kind support from FAO.

Mr. Fred Kafeero, Coach for Kenya, Zambia and Uganda

Mr. Arvydas Lebedys, Coach for Central Asia

Mr. Marco Boscolo, National Forest Financing Strategies

Ms. Rosalie McConnell, Focal Point for the CLI in China

Ms. Qiang Ma, Coach for Yemen

Mr. Ewald Rametsteiner, Nfp Senior Officer

In addition the Forest Officers at the FAO Regional and Sub-Regional Offices devoted a portion of their time to coaching Facility Partner Countries:

Mr. Fernando Salinas, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Mali, Sierra Leone

Mr. Michel Laverdière, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Burundi and Sudan

Mr. Jean-Claude Nguinguiri, DRC and Republic of Congo

Mr. Dominique Reeb, Mongolia

Mr. Patrick Durst, Philippines

Mr. Claus Eckelmann, Belize, Cuba, Jamaica, Dom. Republic, Surinam, Guyana and CANARI

Mr. Jorge Meza, Paraguay and Chile

Mr. Aru Mathias, Palau, Vanuatu and SPC

Mr. Simmathiri Appanah, Technical back-up in Asia

The full list of present Facility Country Coaches is provided in Annex II.

Facility Team Meetings

The "2009 nfp week", bringing all Facility staff together for briefing, consultation, training and teambuilding, was planned to take place in connection with the CLI in China. For various reasons, this was not possible to arrange and the meeting will instead take place at the beginning of 2010. The main topics covered will be training on the Forest - Poverty Tool Kit (by Profor), introduction to new modalities in FORIS (Forest Information System), strategies for improved cross-sector integration and experience sharing on OIMES and the support to National Forest Financing Strategies.

OIMES

The Facility OIMES was designed and tested in the beginning of 2008 with consultancy support from Germany. The Facility coaches were called to Rome for training and since then the system has been introduced in 51 countries.

In order to get all 70 partner countries to use the OIMES, it will be introduced to the remaining 19 countries in coordination with their next call for proposals. It should be noted that the remaining countries are all slow movers, but nevertheless, their participation is important in order to get a full picture of Facility impact by 2012.

The OIMES system has been well received in most countries and has also been appreciated as a tool for their own monitoring of the nfp process. It has brought insight to the stakeholders on the nfp framework and the reality and status of the nfp in the country. Monitoring results from the system are already available (see above), but reliable results on Facility impact demand more time. Only a few countries have, so far, done a full cycle and the data received at the end of 2009 is insufficient to be able to draw conclusions.

An updated report against the Facility Logical Framework is presented in Annex IV.

COUNTRY SUPPORT

As in the past, most of the attention, funds and energy during 2009 went to the Country Support “pillar”. Following the conclusion of the Steering Committee meeting in February 2009, 13 new country partnerships were signed over the course of the year (see Table 2). “Nfp’s for All” workshops including the introduction of OIMES, bringing Government and Non-Government stakeholders up to date on nfp’s and on the modus operandi of the Facility, were organised into 12 new partner countries. Due to the security situation in Guinea-Bissau, the launching there had to be postponed.

Similar workshops, focusing on achievements and OIMES, were organized in the 7 countries, China, Ecuador, Nigeria, Paraguay, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia, that entered into a second agreement in 2009. Another 6 countries, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal and Sudan, in 2009, went through the evaluation process and submitted applications for a second agreement (see separate document on the review and ranking of the applications).

In 2009, the Facility established 116 small grants with stakeholders (87% with non-state actors) in 41 countries and 4 regional organizations, totalling 2.6 million US\$.

Ongoing Facility Partnerships

With the 13 new partner countries brought on board in 2009, the total number of Facility Partners became 74 (70 Partner Countries and 4 Regional Entities), as shown in the table below.

Table 2: Admission of Facility partners

Admission year	Country / Regional Organization
2002	8 partners: Chile, China, ACICAFOC, Malawi, Mongolia, Nigeria, Thailand, Tanzania
2003 (SC decision/December 2002)	7 partners: CCAD, Ghana, Indonesia, Mali, Namibia, Philippines, Senegal
2003 (SC decision/July 2003)	15 partners: Colombia, Cuba, DR Congo, Ecuador, Honduras, Kenya, Lesotho, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda
2004 (SC decision/December 2003)	8 partners: Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Georgia, Jamaica, Pakistan, Sudan, Vanuatu
2005 (SC decision/January 2005)	8 partners: Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Palau, Viet Nam, Zambia, SPC, CANARI
2007 (SC decision/January 2007)	9 partners: Sierra Leone, Angola, Uzbekistan, Dominican Rep., Guinea, El Salvador, Laos, Cambodia, Belize
2008 (SC decision/January 2007)	6 partners: Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Nepal, Yemen
2009 (SC decision/February 2009)	13 partners: Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Liberia, Peru, Surinam, Togo, Zimbabwe

Since the beginning of Facility operations, some 540 small grants have been delivered. In 2009, a total of 116 small grants were established with stakeholders in 41 Partner countries and 4 regional organizations, at a total cost of 2.6 million US\$ (Table 3). The table also shows that about half of the small grants were delivered in Africa, one third in Latin America & Caribbean (3 out of the 4 regional organizations are from that region), and 15% in Asia & Pacific. The amount per grant is considerably higher in Latin America than in other regions (US\$ 29.000 versus US\$ 19.000) as it includes the GFP support to Guatemala (totalling US\$ 400.000).

Since 2002, the direct support to countries in the form of small grants represents almost 50% of total programme costs (12.6 out of 26 million US\$) and about 80% of the total amount has been shared equally between Africa and Latin America.

Table 3: Facility small grants since 2002 and established in 2009

Region	2002 - 2009			2009		
	Number of grants	Total Amount (US\$)	Total amount (%)	Number of grants	Total Amount (US\$)	Total amount (%)
Africa	239	4,954,985	39	54	962,014	37
Asia & Pacific	77	1,985,435	16	17	393,760	15
Latin America & Caribbean	185	4,229,319	33	37	1,087,792	42 ¹
Near East and Central Asia	26	443,300	4	4	74,500	3
Regional Organisations	17	1,026,990	8	4	76,490	3
Grand Total	544	12,640,029	100	116	2,594,556	100

As can be seen in Table 4 below, since the start in 2002, about 70% of the grants have been established in support of non-governmental organizations and 30% were signed with Forestry Departments and other Government Agencies. In the initial years of the Facility, almost 90% of the grants were established with NGOs/CBOs, but experience showed that this had a negative impact on the principle of country ownership and coordination.

Table 4: Grant beneficiaries since 2002 (%)

Region	Forest Admin	Other Government	Education & Research	NGOs & CBOs	Private Sector
Africa	31	1	7	55	6
Asia Pacific	36	0	32	30	2
Latin America and Caribbean	20	1	6	60	13
Near East and Central Asia	38	0	2	60	0
Regional Organisations	0	30	0	70	0
Grand Total	26	3	10	54	7

A complete list of small grants since 2002 is available in a separate document.

Activities and Themes Supported by the Facility

In 2009, the Facility started to use a new set of keywords to briefly capture the areas of activity reflected in the Letters of Agreement (LoAs).

Results of an analysis of the "Main Activities" are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Activities financed by Facility grants since 2002

Activities	No of grants	%
Training	218	44
Information	103	21
Study	76	15
Sector Analysis	46	9
Coordination of the nfp process	27	6
Extension Activities	23	5

Since the inception of the Facility, about half of the grants have been used to support capacity building and awareness raising initiatives, and around 20% of the grants have gone to support specific studies and workshops.

During 2009, Facility grants mainly financed stakeholder capacity building, workshops, awareness raising campaigns, reviews and specific studies and study tours.

¹ Includes US\$ 400,000 GFP support to Guatemala

A short description of all partnerships, activities carried out in 2009 as well as the planned activities for 2010 are provided in the document "Facility Country Partnerships Activities 2009 and Work plans 2010".

Country Coaching

In 2009, the Facility engaged 24 different staff for to provide coaching services to the 70 Partner Countries and 4 Regional Partners (see Annex II). Out of a total of 74 Partners, 61 have been visited at least once in 2009. To reduce costs, some Focal Points and key stakeholders were invited to a neighbouring partner country or to a Regional meeting to meet with the coach, and to discuss the progress of the nfp in the country. This was the case for Kyrgyzstan (in Uzbekistan) and Jamaica (COFLAC meeting, and regional workshop in the Dominican Republic). Some countries could not be visited in 2009 due to security reasons (Pakistan, Guinea Bissau, and Guinea). Some non-responding countries were also not visited (Equatorial Guinea, Laos, Palau, Vanuatu, the Republic of Congo and the Democratic Republic of Congo).

Each coaching visit lasts approximately 5 working days and is often combined with an organised event, such as a launching workshop, a meeting with the NMSC, a training workshop, or a meeting to rank and select proposals from stakeholders.

In 2009, as in previous years, coaches spent between 50% and 75% of their time on policy backstopping. Overall, an estimated 55% of available coaching time was spent on policy backstopping and advisory services, which is charged to "Country Support".

"Nfp's for All" Training

The "Introductory Training Module" (ITM) under the "Nfp's for All" initiative is part of the Country Support provided to Partner Countries. In 2009, the ITM was used to launch the Facility partnership in 12 partner countries (Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guyana, Liberia, Peru, Surinam, Togo and Zimbabwe). The purpose of the 2 or 3 day workshop is to increase country ownership of the nfp, to enhance broad stakeholder participation and to build national capacity for nfp implementation at the country level, also including Result Based Management and OIMES.

In these workshops, all key forestry stakeholders are invited (government and non-government), and between 25 and 35 people usually participate. The workshop is generally chaired by the NFP Focal Point or the Director of the Forestry Department. During the workshop, the NMSC is set-up and its mandate clarified. The Concept Note that was submitted to the Facility is presented, discussed with the stakeholders and modified, if necessary. Based on the discussions, priority actions are identified, the first annual workplan drafted, and the Terms of Reference for the call for proposals established.

In 2008 the modules on "participation" and "conflict management" were tested and in 2009 those models have become available to countries (as country support). Based on requests from Nigeria and Vietnam, the module on enhancing stakeholder participation was implemented. In addition, based on demand from Lesotho and Cambodia, the module on collaborative conflict management has been implemented in 2009 (in close cooperation with FAO). This support has taken the form of training, mentoring and provision of practical guidance through a newly published handbook entitled "Enhancing stakeholder participation in nfp's, tools for practitioners".

In order to create ownership and resident capacities at the regional level, a training of trainers' module was developed and a first training involving 6 African countries (Uganda, Gambia, South Africa, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Malawi) was held in November 2009. The trainings were found to be relevant to the kind of problems encountered in the nfp context in all the countries and revealed the following insights:

- Problem with 'programme'. For a concept that tries to encourage reform in the forest sector, moving towards iterative multi-stakeholder processes and away from rigid, exclusive, and centralized planning, the word 'programme' in nfp's creates misunderstanding. Many participants confused it with the National Forest Plans and others view it as a stand-alone project. The use of the words "principles" and "process" in explaining the concept improved the understanding.
- Continued small & medium enterprise exclusion. Small to medium forest enterprises, particularly informal ones, were singled out in all countries as affected stakeholders where urgent effort is needed to facilitate their meaningful engagement in nfp's.
- Targeting the powerful with participation. There was a continued misconception that participatory approaches were only suitable for rural people. The training helped to raise awareness on the need to (in tandem) target the powerful to increase their willingness to engage and to highlight the importance of participatory approaches in senior level decision making processes.

Facility support to the development of National Forest Financing Strategies

In a number of partner countries, the Facility has provided further support to the development of National Forest Financing Strategies (NFFS) and selected financing instruments. The purpose of this support is to encourage and guarantee the active participation of forest and financial stakeholders in the process to discuss, elaborate and implement NFFS, as tools to strengthen the nfp.

The Facility, in close collaboration with FAO and other partners, has undertaken the following steps:

- Participatory elaboration of the analysis of the current forest financing situation in the Philippines and update of previous analyses in Paraguay and Ecuador;
- Organisation of national workshops to launch the process of development of NFFS in Paraguay (see Box 1), the Philippines and Ecuador, with the participation of key stakeholders of the forest and financial sector;
- Supported (as part of the GFP activities) the establishment of a Forest Finance Intelligence Unit in Guatemala, together with an in-depth assessment of the feasibility of alternative financing instruments and the piloting of factoring and micro-financing for forest enterprises (see Box 2);
- A "state of the art" paper on Forest Financing was produced together with PROFOR. The paper and country experiences enriched the dialogue on forest finance at UNFF8.
- Organized a side event at the World Forestry Congress which provided the opportunity for countries that are undergoing the development of a NFFS to share experiences amongst themselves and with other countries;
- Supported the finalization of a NFFS in El Salvador and followed up on the establishment of a forest incentives program (PINFES);
- A draft Concept Note on continued support to NFFS has been developed and discussed outlining a framework for coordinated and collaborative work in Asia, Africa and Latin America, in response to the needs and interests expressed by countries and to the decision of the UNFF to establish a facilitative process.

National Forest Financing Strategies (NFFS): The case of Paraguay

A national workshop on forest financing was held in Paraguay in February 2009. Co-organized by 11 different organizations, the workshop was attended by over 100 representatives of the public and private sector, both of the forest industry and of the financial sector. The capacity building process was initiated against a backdrop of challenging issues (Paraguay has one of highest deforestation rates in South America) but also promising opportunities including a new leadership with INFONA (the National Forest Institute), a supportive private sector group, and the fact of having been selected as a pilot country by both the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and REDD. Paraguay has also received valuable support from various donors to improve its investment climate, most recently by the IADB and the Spanish Government.

The workshop received attention from national level representatives from both the public and private sectors (two ministers attended the first and last day, along with key decision makers and private sector CEOs), received good media coverage, and offered various presentations on innovative instruments, drawing on both domestic and international experiences.

From the workshop emerged three voluntary working groups, focusing on the design of instruments, review of legal and technical forest information, and cultivation of cross-sector communication.

Some initial achievements have included:

- Two financing instruments were identified for development
- A trust fund (Fideicomiso) that is attractive for private and institutional investors (e.g., pension funds)
- An appropriate credit line through the Agencia Financiera de Desarrollo (AFD)
- Initial elements of a financing strategy were identified and an initial draft of a national Forest Financing Strategy developed
- A declaration was signed by ministers and key private sector representatives in support of forest sector development
- Both the head of the Environment Ministry (SEAM) and the President of the National Forest Institute (INFONA) were nominated as national focal points for REDD activities. Negotiations are underway to have both institutions become focal points on climate change issues related to forests.
- Communication between the two sectors has been strengthened with the help of: (a) a targeted meeting with representatives of financing institutions (such as AFD, pension funds, etc.); (b) the development of an excel spreadsheet for "communication" purposes; (c) a field visit for financing representatives in October 2009;
- Changes in Central Bank regulations that would make it easier to establish trusts (fideicomisos);
- Trust (fideicomiso) structured and established with confirmed investors (pension funds) for a value of \$2 million.

In addition, various ideas are being developed, such the contracting of an economist for INFONA, and linking small to large producers through out-grower schemes.

Representatives from Paraguay shared their experiences at the financing workshop in Ecuador in September 2009 and at the side event on financing organized at the World Forestry Congress in October 2009.

National Forest Financing Strategies (NFFS): The case of Guatemala

In Guatemala, during a national workshop on forest financing held in November 2007, participants identified three possible financing instruments with potential for development: (1) Securitization of forest based cash flows; (2) "Factoring", and (3) Repurchase agreements. In 2009, an initial assessment with financial institutions regarding the feasibility and attractiveness of the above instruments pointed to Factoring as an instrument with potential for piloting. CABI, a local business intelligence organization agreed to explore the implementation of factoring and of the expansion of micro-financing as a pilot case. Interestingly, CABI agreed to be compensated only if implementation leads to actual investment.

Participants also identified critical bottlenecks in the development of financing instruments in Guatemala. One such constraint is the availability of economic-financial information needed to properly estimate the value of forest assets and of future forest earnings. Another constraint is the lack of known methodologies in Guatemala for rigorously assessing forest investment risks. In 2009, a Forest Finance Intelligence Unit (*Unidad de Inteligencia Financiera Forestal*) was created and staffed to address these limitations. The unit is developing its strategy and work plan and will provide forest finance information, capacity building opportunities for foresters and finance professionals and facilitate the development of pre-investment initiatives (business cases).

These activities are deeply integrated within an initiative known as the Growing Forest Partnerships (GFP). Recently launched in Guatemala, it is creating and expanding opportunities for key forest-dependent stakeholders to influence important decisions that relate to sector financing (e.g., international financing mechanisms like the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, national government programs like PINFOR, PINPEP and PPAFD that are in the process of being discussed and reformulated, and private instruments).

These experiences highlight the importance of addressing a number of key institutional weakness that currently limit constructive communication between the forest and financing sectors: limited knowledge of financing language, instruments, and processes; isolation from other sectors and from other key stakeholders within the sector; a legacy of dependence on public resources, both domestic and international with a focus on limited instruments; and inadequate attention to efforts to improve the climate for investment and market development.

The Facility and the Growing Forest Partnership (GFP)

The GFP aims to facilitate bottom-up, multi-stakeholder partnership processes in developing countries that will improve the identification of national priorities, stakeholder access to the increasing forest financing being made available through a wide variety of international means and mechanisms (e.g. carbon finance, private sector investments, and ODA), and stakeholder access to other resources, notably knowledge. The GFP also aims to provide a platform at national and international levels to ensure that marginalized, forest-dependent groups can participate in the formulation of national priorities and be included in the international dialogue on forests. The GFP will work largely through locally-based institutions in a wide range of countries and will build on existing partnership structures.

Since 2009, the GFP initiative has begun to:

- Identify effective partnerships-preferably building on existing ones, otherwise establishing new ones
- Engage with stakeholders through "people's diagnostics" or focus groups
- Improve in-country access to finance, in collaboration with donors
- Research innovative and practical mechanisms at the local level
- Continue to consult widely through the Canopy of Friends
- Share learning at the national and international levels

The four GFP facilitating partners, FAO/Facility, WB, IUCN and IIED, make up the Catalytic Group. FAO facilitates in-country processes building on the efforts of the nfp Facility process. IUCN also facilitates in-country processes and builds upon its in-country work. The WB is the funding body. The Catalytic Group reports to and is overseen by a Reference Group. The IIED supports the Catalytic and Reference Groups.

The Facility aims to establish sustainable stakeholder processes in 70 countries by 2012. This objective necessitates a collaborative effort by donors and national ministries in support of nationally owned, coordinated, and driven processes. For this reason, during the second half of 2008, the Facility became active in the preparation of the GFP initiative, together with FAO, WB, IUCN and IIED. The GFP creates an opportunity to form better partnerships and coordination, based on existing nfp processes and Facility mechanisms, and to more efficiently use existing and new resources at the national level in Facility partner countries.

Since 2009, the Facility has initiated GFP activities in Guatemala, Liberia and Bolivia.

In **Guatemala**, the nfp stakeholders identified four pillars of work to be addressed by the GFP, to add value to the support of the Facility.

- Governance and participation;
- Financing instruments;
- Information and communication; and
- Strengthening capacity for forest management with communities.

In order to achieve the fourth identified pillar, 'Strengthening capacity for forest management with communities,' indigenous and community forest organisations from across Guatemala convened a first national meeting to explore the idea of setting up a national alliance that can ensure that the voices of marginalised groups are heard more clearly at the national and international levels. From this event came the most important achievement to date: the formation of the 'alianza nacional de organizaciones forestales comunitarias de Guatemala', or the National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations of Guatemala.

In 2009, the National Forest Financing Strategy was formulated and approved by the Board of Directors of INAB (the Guatemalan forestry authority) and a small Forest Finance Intelligence Unit (UIFF) was established with GFP support to start working on ideas for finance instruments that can benefit smallholders and forest communities.

In **Liberia** GFP was launched at a workshop of the Facility Partnership Agreement. Shortly thereafter the Community Forest Development Committees (CFDC) presented a project proposal for a national meeting, which was held and attended by over forty participants from various CFDC areas in Liberia as well as FDA representative observers and media institutions. The meeting achieved the following objectives:

- CFDC NUnion Leadership unanimously confirmed by the delegates;
- Experience gained through negotiating Social Agreement was shared;
- CFDC representative appointed to the NMSC and the National Forest Forum (NFF); and
- Capacity needs for CFDC members identified and catalogued.

In **Bolivia** the Facility has introduced GFP as an opportunity to the stakeholders, complementary to the support provided through the nfp process by the Facility. A publication on the lessons learned and experience gained on forest certification and the cooperation between small forest owners and private forest concession companies have been supported. Due to the recent elections in Bolivia, no other activities have been supported, so far, by either the Facility or by the GFP.

INFORMATION SERVICES

The 2009 Information Services activities have focused on the following:

- Renewing and improving the Facility database and website;
- Developing and disseminating new Facility promotional material;
- Strengthening knowledge and capacities of nfp practitioners worldwide.

Facility Web Platform

The Facility web-based information platform has been completely overhauled in order to make updates and improvements to the database structure easier and more manageable. This improvement now allows coaches to more easily input information, which has led to having a better ability to manage and disseminate information about Facility achievements in partner countries. In particular, the following changes have been made:

Facility Database

A complete revamp of the FORIS Country Support Database has been done through (i) a new and user friendly interface (for navigation, printing, downloading, book marking, editing and clickable functions), (ii) a new structure of the partnership information related to LoAs linked to the Facility WebPages; and (iii) an interactive map to find the partnerships.

The key results section of each LoA has been restructured and is in the process of being updated for all closed LoAs - that information is now linked to the Facility website.

The list of keywords of all the LoAs has been revised, simplified and made available for selection in FORIS. These new keywords are divided into 3 levels, as follows:

- the recipient organisation (Central Government, Decentralised Forestry Departments, Other Government, NGOs, CBOs & Indigenous people, Education & Research, Private sector Associations);
- the main activities (training, information gathering and dissemination, study in support of the nfp, sector analysis, coordination of the nfp process, extension services); and
- the thematic Areas (20 themes covering a range of topics such as agroforestry, wildlife, and wood energy, amongst others).

A revision of the selection of keywords for each LoA is currently ongoing. As soon as this revision is completed, the search tool by activity and thematic area on the Facility website will be reactivated and will be much more efficient than before.

The section related to the sector of the recipient organisation has been improved and updated and recipient organisation on-line information is now linked to the Facility website.

The OIMES system has been implemented in the FORIS database: for 51 countries the nfp-matrix has been inserted with the indicators selected by the stakeholders. The possibility to mark the indicators supported by the Facility has been implemented and applied for countries signing LoAs in 2009 according to the OIMES methodology.

Contact points (Facility coaches and nfp focal points) have been revised and updated.

The administrative documents related to Facility operations and the training material packages are made available for the Facility staff in all languages on the FORIS database.

Facility Website

The Facility Website has been entirely redesigned. In addition, the information made available has been completed by the coaches and the Facility HQ team so as to display the most up-to-date information online. In particular, summary reports have been produced for each LoA and put online.

The news page illustrated with pictures is regularly updated with the Facility workshops in partner countries, the main activities in the field and the participation of the Facility at international meetings.

Some new pages have been created: the Nfp's for All training material; the publication related to nfp's; the contact of the Facility with a picture of the HQ team.

All the links available on the website have been improved and updated.

Web Information and Statistics

In 2009, the total number of visits was 6,000. This is less than in 2008 as visits were concentrated on the procedures for the new call for proposals to countries. In 2009, 72% of the visitors of the Facility website were new. This number is 13% higher than in 2008, indicating an increased interest about the Facility.

Table 6: Web-visits by geographic area in 2009 (%)

Europe	28
Africa	26
South & Central America	23
Asia	13
North America	8
Oceania	1

CPF Sourcebook on Funding for SFM

The CPF Sourcebook compiles information on funding sources for forestry, policies and delivery mechanisms, with particular focus on projects in developing countries. Its contents come from various sources: donor agencies and countries, CPF members, international forest-related organizations and instruments, developments banks, private sources, regional processes, foundations and international non-governmental organizations.

In 2009, most of the funding sources have been updated (especially links and contacts through improvements of the FORIS database to update the organizations, in particular bilateral and multilateral donors) according to user's needs identified through a survey. The online survey on the sourcebook and the newsletter for feedback and improvement was sent out to the funding mailing list and to FAO regional/sub-regional offices, and was posted on the CPF Sourcebook and Facility website.

A new layout has been developed for the Funding Newsletter and six editions in 2009 have been circulated. In addition, online registration for the Newsletter was developed.

Promotion of the Facility

The Facility has been actively promoting itself throughout the hectic 2009 agenda of international and regional meetings, however the philosophy of the Facility remains to the same: "letting the results and our partners speak for us". In 2009, partners of the Facility were invited to international and regional meetings to present their results and their experiences from the nfp implementation in their countries.

The Facility Team organised the representation of the Facility partners at the following meetings:

COFO and World Forest Week, Rome, March 2009: Facility side event on nfp experiences, and Facility stand.

UNFF8, New York, April 2009: Facility and PROFOR side event on Forest Financing Strategies.

WFC, Buenos Aires, October 2009: participation of focal points and one organisation per country representing its civil society (Sudan, Uganda, Uzbekistan, El Salvador, Paraguay, the Philippines and Cambodia); Facility side event on "Participation" and on "National Forest Financing Strategies"; coordination of a session on "Instruments for Forest planning and Development". See Box next page.

CLI, Guilin, November 2009, on Forests for People, November 2009. See Box next page.

Facility Team members also participated in several regional meetings like ETFAG in Helsinki and the Forest Dialogue (GFP) in Brussels. The Facility has also been active, together with FAO, WB, IUCN and IIED, in the Catalytic Group preparing the Growing Forest Partnership (GFP) initiative

The XIII World Forestry Congress

The NFP Facility sent staff to the XIII World Forestry Congress in Buenos Aires in October 2009 and held a side event "Participation: Political Rhetoric or Real Necessity?" on stakeholders involvement in the nfp process. Country cases from Sudan, Uganda, Uzbekistan, El Salvador, Paraguay, the Philippines and Cambodia were presented.

The objective of the side event was to share good cases of participatory processes and to explore how stakeholders (such as civil society organisations, ngo's, cbo's and national institutions and associations) have contributed to the success (or failure) of nfp processes.

Some lessons learned on concrete actions and reflections to enhance stakeholder participation in nfp processes were identified from the outcome of the presentations and discussion.

The key principles of an nfp are country leadership, participation and cross sector integration. Successful participation is part of the nfp process. It requires time and patience and integration of participatory principles in all phases of an nfp including analysis, formulation, implementation, and monitoring.

Elements such as identification of stakeholders, adaptation of institutional arrangements to face conflicts, mobilization of resources, and building trust and real commitment from the government were highlighted to ensure a true participatory process.

CLI in Guilin, China

From 17 to 20 November 2009, China hosted an international workshop, in support of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), on "forests for people – the role of national forest programmes and the non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests" (Forest Instrument). The meeting was designed to share experiences and lessons learned in the use of national forest programmes to achieve sustainable forest management and as a means to implement the Forest Instrument.

The NFP Facility provided administrative, technical and substantive support during the preparatory phase of the meeting as well as during the event itself.

Participants from 41 countries shared experiences and lessons in the use of national forest programmes to achieve sustainable forest management and agreed they could be used to a greater extent to enhance the contributions of forests to livelihoods and poverty reduction. A number of presentations were made in plenary to highlight issues and set the stage for discussions which followed in working groups.

The visibility of FAO and the Facility was prominent throughout the meeting, starting with a statement which was made during the opening ceremony and two presentations in plenary. On several occasions, countries expressed appreciation for the assistance they were receiving to develop and implement national forest programmes. In this regard, the final report reflects the general view that these processes are an efficient means to implement the Forest Instrument and to adopt "a people centred approach" to forest management. Countries also called for continued support to the Facility to nurture NFP processes.

Many participants stated they were pleased with the calibre of discussions and the quality of outcomes. They felt China did an excellent job in organizing and hosting the event and were optimistic that the report, as intended, would inform deliberations at UNFF9.

Nfp Update

Collaboration between FAO and the Facility has, over the course of 2009, continued to maintain the nfp Update. Information related to nfp background, nfp evaluation matrix and country forest policy and institutions are currently provided online from a link on the Facility website for 43 countries. Some countries have already done two matrices on different dates (e.g. 2007 and 2009), allowing comparison of their evaluation scores and, in this way, drawing conclusions about progress, stagnation or decrease of certain indicators.

Dissemination and Learning Processes

At Country Level

Although dissemination of information at the country level is a topic which is often supported through Facility grants, efforts were made to spread information obtained through regional initiatives at the country level. This was the case for topics such as "Forest and water" as described in the Box below.

Development of compensatory mechanisms linking forest and water in Central America and the Caribbean

This initiative was initiated in 2008 and was concluded in 2009 with a presentation and discussion at the WFC and the production of a final report.

This report summarizes a qualitative analysis of 27 experiences of compensatory mechanisms for the hydrological services provided by forests throughout Central America and the Caribbean. Most of the compensatory mechanisms studied are taking place at a local scale in response to problematic situations with water supply. NGOs and government agencies have played an important role as facilitators of these processes. In general, the cases analyzed reflect social and political negotiation processes that need to be strengthened; the need to find suitable permanent financial schemes seems to be the critical issue for the long-term sustainability of the initiatives. Although national governments do not participate directly in many of the initiatives, they are playing an important role for the advancement of the issue since they carry out public policies that both regulate and provide incentives for natural resources use. Finally, conclusions are drawn from the global analysis of the cases and some areas for action are suggested in order to strengthen the issue in the region. In 2010, the experience and learning gathered from the regional initiative will be followed up at national levels and form part of the Facility support to interested countries. In Nicaragua, the Facility will support implementation of compensatory mechanisms in five municipalities and the establishment of a community of practice national network on forest and water.

At the Regional Level

A Sub-Regional workshop, in which the Facility participated, was held in May 2009 in Uzbekistan to enhance collaboration in Central Asia on the development of forest policy and the legal and institutional framework for sustainable forest management, with specific focus on nfp's.

An Eastern and Southern Africa sub-regional knowledge sharing workshop on Community participation in REDD programmes involving representatives from Government, civil society, research, academia, community from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe was held in Mombasa. The workshop shared concrete examples on challenges and opportunities to community participation in REDD programmes and laid strategies to be undertaken at country and sub-regional levels.

A pre-event to the World Forestry Congress in Argentina offered the opportunity to gather the nfp focal points from South America to facilitate exchange of experiences of their respective nfps. The meeting was attended by Directors of Forestry Department, operational nfp focal point as well as a selected number of nfp partner institutions (NGOs).

At the Global Level

The Facility has produced a new manual describing the nfp principles and the procedures of the Facility (in English). The French and Spanish translation is ongoing and will be published in 2010. A new 2010 Facility desk calendar was printed and disseminated all over the world. Two Facility posters were published and disseminated: one with the map of Facility partners and one with the message "*stimulating stakeholders' participation*".

Enhancing Knowledge and Capacities

The implementation of this component has been developed mainly through the "Nfp's for All" training workshop and its thematic modules.

The "Nfp's for All" training module on National Financing Strategies and Mechanisms for sustainable use and conservation of forests was implemented in Paraguay and Ecuador.

The module on Participation developed and tested in 2008, was published in 2009. Training workshops were held in Nigeria and Viet Nam. In South Africa, an African training of trainers was organised in November 2009. A summary of the lessons learned on this initiative on enhancing stakeholder participation in nfp's was presented in the section "Country Support".

Training workshops on Conflict Management and Resolution were held in Lesotho and Cambodia. The digest on Conflict Management was published and disseminated in 2009.

A new initiative, in collaboration with FAO, on the linkages between climate change and nfp's has been developed in Cambodia and Paraguay. A desk study and interviews have been conducted in these countries followed by a national workshop identifying the potential for better synergies between forest policy processes and climate change developments. This initiative will be further implemented in 2010 in Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of Congo and South Africa. Some guidelines to integrate climate issues into nfp's will be produced at the end of the process.

The Introductory Training Module (ITM), including OIMES/RBM, was implemented in all the new partner countries (Gambia, Peru, Suriname, Bolivia, Bhutan, Zimbabwe, Togo, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, Burundi, and Cape Verde) and adapted to partner countries starting a second agreement (workshops held in Tanzania, Uganda, Ecuador, China, Nigeria, Paraguay and Zambia).

Another initiative on enhancing knowledge and capacities is the one with ANAFE (ICRAF) on "Revitalising Forest Education in Eastern African Countries", as described in the Box below.

Revitalizing Forestry Education in Eastern African Countries

As agreed in the 2009 Steering Committee, the Facility supported the African Network for Agriculture, Agroforestry and Natural Resources Education (ANAFE) to revitalize forestry education in four Eastern African countries (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Ethiopia). The objective of the programme is to discuss and reach consensus with key institutions and stakeholders on (i) how trees outside forests can be incorporated in forest management; (ii) how multi-sector needs can be met (especially water, energy, agricultural sustainability, wildlife, environment, and climate change); (iii) what new institutional arrangements are needed for efficient forestry; and (iv) what new innovations are needed in tree and forest resources assessments.

In 2009, ANAFE selected (competitively) 4 consultants for the first task of developing survey instruments in an effort to harmonize the data collection in the different countries.

- Overview of forestry sector in East Africa (Current trends; World trends; Emerging issues);
- Forestry Institutions questionnaire (forestry-related degrees/diplomas offered; main courses taught; curriculum review aspects; recommendations on forestry education reforms).
- Forest sector training needs assessment: Forestry sector employees by qualification (certificate; diploma; BSc; MSc; PhD) and by main activities; identifying gaps in graduating students and recommendations to remedy the situation; identification of professional and technical capabilities needed now and into the future.
- Checklist of key informants: Perception with respect to competence of new forest graduates; Key competencies needed by the current forest graduates; Reforms envisaged in forestry training.

The outcome of this initiative, in 2010, is intended to act as a base for similar processes in other regions.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS

Overall situation at the end of 2009

The funding of the Facility was good in 2009. The World Bank Development Grant Facility entered in 2009 as a new donor for the implementation of the GFP. The long term agreements with the EC, the UK and Sweden are still running and annual contributions have been received from Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Switzerland and the USA.

The funding situation of the Facility for the coming 2.5 years (2010 to mid 2012) is encouraging, with the commitments of EC, Sweden and UK as a base and, hopefully, continued annual contributions from Austria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Switzerland, the USA and the World Bank.

In addition it is expected that the Facility will be indirectly supported through the FAO partnerships with Norway and the Netherlands, particularly on the "Nfp's for All" implementation and the development of financing strategies.

FAO is committed to continued in-kind support and it is expected that it will continue in the years to come at an equally high level as in 2009. Germany has also committed consultancy support in 2010 for a new publication, "Implementing nfp's", which is a follow-up to "Understanding nfp's".

2009 Budget Implementation

Table 7 indicates the Facility expenditures, actual (paid directly from HQ) and committed (transferred to FAO Representations in the countries for payment of the Letters of Agreement in different instalments) for the period of January to November 2009 and forecasted for December against the budget approved by the SC in February 2009.

Table 7: Facility expenditures in 2009 (US\$)

NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMME FACILITY 2009		
EXPENDITURES	Planned	Actual/Committed
Country Support		
Facility Grants		
-Africa	700,000	962,000
-Asia & Pacific	400,000	426,000
-Central Asia & Near East	200,000	75,000
-Latin America & Caribbean	1,100,000	1,132,000 ²
Nfp's for All (awareness/capacity)	500,000	219,000
Policy Backstopping	900,000	656,000
Total	3,800,000	3,470,000
Information Services		
Facility Web Platform	35,000	6,000
Dissemination & Learning	220,000	141,000
Knowledge & Capacity Building	150,000	43,000
Promotion of the Facility (UNFF, WFC, CLI)	175,000	196,000
Total	580,000	386,000
Programme Delivery		
Personnel	1,320,000	1,118,000
Travel, GOE & Equipment	270,000	174,000
OIMES	10,000	0
Total	1,600,000	1,292,000
TOTAL DIRECT COST	5,980,000	5,148,000
Indirect Support Cost	350,000	270,000
GRAND TOTAL	6,330,000	5,418,000

² Includes US\$ 400,000 for GFP activities in Guatemala

As presented in Table 7, the overall expenditures in 2009 represent 86% of the amount planned and approved and about 1 million more than in 2008. The financial outcome for 2009 is commented upon in the following.

Country Support

Support to countries represents 64% of total expenditures (60% in 2008). Of this, 2.6 Million US\$ or 48% of the total expenditures (1.6 Million US\$ and 37% in 2008) was provided as direct support, in the form of small grants to stakeholders in partner countries (Table 8). Since 2002, the direct support to countries, in the form of small grants, represents 53% of total programme costs (24 million US\$).

The support to all regions, with the exception of Central Asia, is in line with or exceeding what was planned (as is the case in Africa). The total expended amount in small grants is still highest in Latin America, but the number of grants is higher in Africa. The average grant in Latin America is almost double the amount in Africa (29,000 compared to 17,000). This is an effect of the GFP support to Guatemala having received more than one third of the total to Latin America.

The low outturn in Central Asia is an effect of slow country processes, in particular regarding the involvement of civil society actors in the process, combined with low Facility coaching capacity during the first half of 2009. The outturn in Africa for 2009 is back to "normal" again (doubled compared to 2008) since the most efficient partner countries have entered into a second agreement in 2009.

As for Asia, Cambodia and Vietnam could be added to the list currently including China and Pakistan in terms of having good nfp processes in 2009. Bhutan, a new country in 2009, is expected to add to that group in the coming years. The turnout in 2009 is thus more than double in comparison with the previous years. Mongolia and Philippines have slow and good processes in place whereas Thailand, Nepal and Laos are still not moving their nfp process in spite of considerable Facility efforts. The South Pacific Islands, Palau, Vanuatu and the regional SPC are not moving at all due to lack of political will and almost non-existent coaching (relying on FAO sub regional staff). Indonesia has been very busy with due to the high level of support they have received for climate related programs and projects, leaving little no room for real interest in a Nfp process at the national level.

In total, 41 partner countries (Table 8), out of 70, received direct country support in 2009 (36 in 2008). As in previous years, very few countries are spending the indicative target of 100,000 US\$ per year (in 2009 only 10% of all partner countries did so). Average annual country support amounts to less than 50,000 US\$.

Less than half of the budget for the "Nfp's for All" initiative was spent. Initial awareness raising and capacity building workshops took place in 12 countries (Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guyana, Liberia, Peru, Surinam, Togo, and Zimbabwe). The start-up workshop has thus been implemented in 12 of the 13 countries that have come on board in 2009. The "Nfp's for All" modules on "Conflict Management" and on "Participation" have been implemented in Lesotho, Cambodia, Nigeria and Vietnam, in close cooperation with the FAO Forest Department. In addition, a training of trainers' module involving 6 African countries was held in 2009.

The cost for Policy Backstopping in 2009 is considerably lower than in previous years. It has decreased to 12% as compared with 20% in 2008 and 16% in 2007. The main reason is that the total country support volume has increased by 40% (from 2.6 to 3.5 million \$US). Another reason is that the in-kind support from FAO, in terms of regional and sub regional staff time dedicated to policy backstopping, has increased considerably in 2009.

Table 8: Facility's Direct Country Support in 2009

Grants Awarded to Partners by the NFP Facility in 2009				
Region	Country	Number of grants	Total amount (US\$)	% of Total
Africa	Angola	1	46,600	
	Benin	5	78,450	
	Burkina Faso	9	77,000	
	Burundi	2	22,000	
	Cape Verde	1	7,500	
	Côte d'Ivoire	1	12,000	
	Gambia	2	25,620	
	Kenya	2	103,000	
	Lesotho	2	43,000	
	Liberia	3	44,503	
	Malawi	2	47,500	
	Mali	1	12,000	
	Nigeria	2	43,330	
	Rwanda	1	4,000	
	Senegal	7	99,400	
	South Africa	3	92,211	
	Tanzania	5	68,300	
	Togo	1	7,000	
	Tunisia	1	8,000	
	Uganda	2	114,800	
Zimbabwe	1	5,800		
	Subtotal	54	962,014	37
Asia Pacific	Bhutan	1	13,300	
	Cambodia	6	136,200	
	China	1	18,900	
	Nepal	1	10,320	
	Pakistan	4	141,640	
	Thailand	1	7,000	
	Viet Nam	3	66,400	
		Subtotal	17	393,760
Latin America & Caribbean	Belize	3	64,000	
	Bolivia	4	72,374	
	Brazil	1	53,435	
	Chile	1	5,600	
	Colombia	3	35,000	
	Ecuador	1	6,700	
	Guatemala	13	601,575 ³	
	Nicaragua	2	52,790	
	Paraguay	7	163,950	
	Peru	1	7,368	
	Suriname	1	25,000	
	Subtotal	37	1,087,792	42
Western & Central Asia	Georgia	1	9,500	
	Uzbekistan	3	65,000	
		Subtotal	4	74,500
Regional Organisations		4	76,490	
		Subtotal	4	76,490
Grand Total		116	2,594,556	100

Information Services

Information services correspond to 7% of the total expenditures in 2009 (6% in 2007) and only about 70% of the planned expenditures were actually spent. 2009 has been characterized by a move towards stronger focus on experience sharing and learning within and between countries. The Forest and Water Initiative, focusing on concrete and sustainable examples of payment for water in Central America and the Caribbean has been concluded in 2009 with a regional workshop and a final report. A new initiative on the need for reform of Forest Education in East Africa

³ Includes US\$ 400,000 for GFP supported activities

has been initiated. In addition, the Facility has, in 2009, organized side-events at COFO, UNFF8 and WFC, and actively participated in all aspects of the Chinese CLI on nfp's and NLBI implementation.

The more technical aspects of upgrading the Facility Web Platform have been undertaken by Facility and FAO staff and the costs involved have been less than planned.

Programme Delivery

The programme delivery accounts to 23% of the total expenditures in 2009 (30% in 2007). The cost for programme delivery is back to a more normal level and in line with the target of 20%. The main reason is that the in-kind support from FAO in 2009 has also drastically increased programme delivery. In total the Facility payroll has decreased, compared to 2008, by almost two full staff members.

The travel costs are slightly lower than in 2008 (202,000 US\$). The main reason being that many of the staff missions, in 2009, have been undertaken in connection with participation in international events and thus accounted for under Information Services (Promotion of the Facility).

Funding available for 2010 – mid 2012

Actual committed funding of the Facility for the January 2010 – June 2012 period amounts to 11 million US\$ as shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Facility funding situation at the end of 2009 (000 US\$)

Sources of Funding	2002 - 2009		2010	2011	Through Mid 2012
	Cash	In Kind			
Austria	300		100	100	
Czech republic	243				
European Commission	5,690		4,900		
FAO		3,900			
Finland	2,897		400	400	
France	1,151	330	100	100	
Germany	523	450	130	130	
Ireland	310				
Japan		220			
Netherlands	801				
Norway	1,157				
Sweden	6,277		750	750	375
Switzerland	412		130	130	
United Kingdom	4,304		820		
USA	1,086		150	150	
World Bank, DGF (GFP)	860		1,185	1,200	
Total Contributions	26,011		9,685	4,735	110
Total Expenditures	23,981		5,700	5,000	2,000
Remaining Funds	2,030		3,985	(265)	(1,890)

Note: Figures in **bold** are actual/committed figures. All other figures are indications and estimates.

The total donor contributions from the start in 2002 through the end of 2009 are 26 million US\$ (See Table 9). In addition, in-kind support has been provided during the same period by FAO (Professional Staff time), France (one APO), Japan (one APO) and Germany (consultancies). FAO has clearly demonstrated its commitment to continued in-kind support to the Facility. During 2009, the contribution from the FAO Forest Department has been estimated at 0,7 million US\$ which is considerably higher than in previous years. It is expected that the FAO in-kind support will continue in the years to come at the same level.

The total spending for the same period is almost 24 million US\$ and thus 2 million US\$ remain for the period 2010 till mid 2012. Formal commitments from the EC, Sweden, the UK and the WB add another 8.8 million US\$ to the available financing for the period through mid 2012. In the table, funding from last years contributors (Finland, France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and the USA) has been indicated.

In addition, it is considered that new agreements with the EC and the UK, supporting implementation for the period 2011 – 2012, may be a possibility. It is also expected that the Facility will receive some contribution from the support to forestry in the Norway and the Netherlands partnerships with FAO.

The estimated expenditures for the coming 2.5 years are 12,7 million US\$ (see Table 9). The estimate is based on experience gained on the implementation capacity in the countries. The expenditures will remain at the 2009 level during 2010, and then gradually phase out to enable a close down of the Facility operations by mid 2012 (as planned in the revised Programme Document 2007-2012).

Given the actual funding and estimated expenditures, it is concluded that new formal commitments, totalling 1,9 million US\$, are needed to run the Facility as planned until mid 2012.

ANNEX I

Facility Steering Committee Members

As of February 2010

ORIGIN	NAME	POSITION	CONTACT
Africa	Godwin Kowero	Executive Secretary African Forest Forum c/o World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) - Kenya	g.kowero@cgiar.org tel. +254 20 722 4203
Asia	Hooi Chiew Thang (Chairperson)	International Forestry Consultant - Malaysia	hcthang@streamyx.com tel. +60 3 77822115
Latin America	Ronnie de Camino Velozo	Sub-Director General CATIE, Turrialba Costa Rica	rcamino@catie.ac.cr tel. +506 25582318 fax +506 25582057
European Commission	Frank Jacobs	European Commission EuropeAid Co-operation Office Belgium	frank.jacobs@ec.europa.eu tel. + 32 2 296.50.50 Fax. +32 2 296.14.30
United Kingdom	John Hudson	Senior Forestry Advisor Dept. for International Development (DFID) - UK	j-hudson@dfid.gov.uk Tel. +44 20 7023 0683 Fax +44 20 7023 0679
International Forest Research	Doris Capistrano	Visiting Professor Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Wageningen University Netherlands and Senior Fellow SEARCA Philippines	doriscapistrano@yahoo.com Tel. +632 643 3103
Foundations	Jeffrey Campbell	Director of Grant making Christensen Fund USA	jeff@christensenfund.org tel. +1 650 323 8704 cell, +1 650 213 6889
Private Sector	Michael Peter	Executive Director, Forestry South Africa Johannesburg South Africa	mike@forestrysouthafrica.co.za tel. +27 11 8033403 fax. + 27 11 8036708 cell. +27 828080425
Non Governmental Organization	Emelia Arthur	Forest Watch Ghana Accra Ghana	earthur@ucomgh.com emeart2003@yahoo.com
World Bank	Peter Dewees	PROFOR Manager Agriculture & Rural Development The World Bank	pdeweese@worldbank.org tel. +1 202 4584021 fax. +1 202-614-1402
FAO	Michael Martin	Director Forest Economics & Policy Division FAO – Italy	michael.martin@fao.org tel. +39 06 57053302 fax. +39 06 57055137

ANNEX II

Facility Country Coaches for 2009

Africa

Countries	Coach
1. Angola	Michael Chihambakwe
2. Benin	Atse Yapi
3. Burkina Faso	Marguerite France-Lanord
4. Burundi	Michel Laverdière
5. Cape Verde	Fernando Salinas
6. Congo, Democratic Republic of	Jean Claude Nguinguiri
7. Congo, Republic of	Jean Claude Nguinguiri
8. Côte d'Ivoire	Atse Yapi
9. Equatorial Guinea	-
10. Ethiopia	Michel Laverdière
11. Gambia	Sophie Grouwels
12. Ghana	Atse Yapi
13. Guinea	Atse Yapi
14. Guinea-Bissau	Fernando Salinas
15. Kenya	Fred Kafeero
16. Lesotho	Michael Chihambakwe
17. Liberia	Jhony Zapata
18. Malawi	Michael Chihambakwe
19. Mali	Fernando Salinas
20. Morocco	François Wencélius
21. Mozambique	Michael Chihambakwe
22. Namibia	Michael Chihambakwe
23. Niger	Atse Yapi
24. Nigeria	Atse Yapi
25. Rwanda	Michel Laverdière
26. Senegal	Atse Yapi
27. Sierra Leone	Fernando Salinas
28. South Africa	Michael Chihambakwe
29. Sudan	Michel Laverdière
30. Tanzania	Michael Chihambakwe
31. Togo	Fernando Salinas
32. Tunisia	François Wencélius
33. Uganda	Fred Kafeero
34. Zambia	Fred Kafeero
35. Zimbabwe	René Czudek

Europe and Central Asia

Countries	Coach
36. Armenia	Arvydas Lebedys
37. Georgia	Arvydas Lebedys
38. Kyrgyzstan	Arvydas Lebedys
39. Uzbekistan	Arvydas Lebedys

Near East

Countries	Coach
40. Yemen	Qiang Ma

Asia and the Pacific

Countries	Coach
41. Bhutan	Fan Xiaojie
42. Cambodia	Xiaojie Fan
43. China	Fan Xiaojie
44. Indonesia	Marguerite France-Lanord
45. Laos	Marguerite France-Lanord
46. Mongolia	Dominique Reeb
47. Nepal	Xiaojie Fan
48. Pakistan	Fan Xiaojie
49. Palau	Fan Xiaojie
50. Philippines	Patrick Durst
51. Thailand	Fan Xiaojie
52. Vanuatu	Aru Mathias
53. Vietnam	Fan Xiaojie

Latin America

Countries	Coach
54. Belize	Claus Eckelmann
55. Bolivia	Wulf Killmann
56. Brazil	Manuel Paveri
57. Chile	Jorge Meza
58. Colombia	Ignacio Bustos
59. Cuba	Claus Eckelmann
60. Dominican Republic	Claus Eckelmann
61. Ecuador	Ignacio Bustos
62. El Salvador	Jhony Zapata
63. Guatemala	Jhony Zapata
64. Guyana	Claus Eckelmann
65. Honduras	Jhony Zapata
66. Jamaica	Claus Eckelmann
67. Nicaragua	Jhony Zapata
68. Paraguay	Jorge Meza
69. Peru	Ignacio Bustos
70. Suriname	Claus Eckelmann

Regional Partnerships

Regional Partners	Coach
71. ACICAFOC Asociación Coordinadora Indígena Campesina de Agroforestería Comunitaria Centroamericana	Jhony Zapata
72. CANARI Caribbean Natural Resources Institute	Claus Eckelmann
73. CCAD Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo	Jhony Zapata
74. SPC Secretariat of the Pacific Community	Aru Mathias

ANNEX III

Facility Partner Countries and their 2009 Human Development index ranking

Very high Human Development

Norway
Australia
Iceland
Canada
Ireland
Netherlands
Sweden
France
Switzerland
Japan
Luxembourg
Finland
United States
Austria
Spain
Denmark
Belgium
Italy
Liechtenstein
New Zealand
United Kingdom
Germany
Singapore
Hong Kong, China (SAR)
Greece
Korea (Republic of)
Israel
Andorra
Slovenia
Brunei Darussalam
Kuwait
Cyprus
Qatar
Portugal
United Arab Emirates
Czech Republic
Barbados
Malta

High Human Development

Bahrain
Estonia
Poland
Slovakia
Hungary
Chile
Croatia
Lithuania
Antigua and Barbuda
Latvia
Argentina
Uruguay
Cuba
Bahamas
Mexico
Costa Rica
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
Oman
Seychelles
Venezuela
Saudi Arabia
Panama
Bulgaria
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Romania
Trinidad and Tobago
Montenegro
Malaysia
Serbia

Belarus
Saint Lucia
Albania
Russian Federation
Macedonia
Dominica
Grenada
Brazil
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Colombia
Peru
Turkey
Ecuador
Mauritius
Kazakhstan
Lebanon

Medium Human Development

Armenia
Ukraine
Azerbaijan
Thailand
Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Georgia
Dominican Republic
Saint Vincent & Grenadines
China
Belize
Samoa
Maldives
Jordan
Suriname
Tunisia
Tonga
Jamaica
Paraguay

Sri Lanka
Gabon
Algeria
Philippines
El Salvador
Syrian Arab Republic

Fiji
Turkmenistan
Occupied Palestinian Territories

Indonesia
Honduras
Bolivia
Guyana
Mongolia
Viet Nam
Moldova
Equatorial Guinea
Uzbekistan
Kyrgyzstan
Cape Verde
Guatemala

Egypt
Nicaragua
Botswana
Vanuatu

Tajikistan
Namibia
South Africa
Morocco

São Tomé and Príncipe

Bhutan
Laos, People's Dem. Rep.
India

Solomon Islands

Congo
Cambodia
Myanmar
Comoros

Yemen
Pakistan

Swaziland

Angola
Nepal

Madagascar
Bangladesh

Kenya

Papua New Guinea

Haiti
Sudan
Tanzania
Ghana

Cameroon
Mauritania
Djibouti

Lesotho
Uganda
Nigeria

Low Human Development

Togo
Malawi
Benin

Timor-Leste

Côte d'Ivoire
Zambia

Eritrea

Senegal
Rwanda
Gambia
Liberia
Guinea
Ethiopia
Mozambique
Guinea-Bissau
Burundi

Chad

Congo (Democratic Republic of the)
Burkina Faso
Mali

Central African Republic

Sierra Leone

Afghanistan

Niger

Palau HDI not quoted
Zimbabwe HDI not quoted

 Facility Partner Countries (70)

Bold are the countries covered through sub-regional Partnerships

ANNEX IV

Reporting against the Logical framework (2002-2009)

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Overall objectives	<p>Supporting forest policy planning and implementation processes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectively address local needs and national priorities - Reflect internationally agreed principles for national forest programmes (nfp's) - Involve all stakeholders in sustainable forest management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest sector issues in general and nfp's in particular are integrated into broader national policies (e.g., PRSPs) - International agreements (e.g., CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD) are reflected in national forest policies and planning - Mechanisms for stakeholder participation in nfp's are operational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partner countries have made an effort to integrate nfp's into broader national strategies (poverty reduction, combating desertification, land use planning), and inter-sector coordination in nfp implementation. There are also some examples of integrating international commitments and Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) / Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) proposals for action in national policy development - International agreed principles (country ownership, participation and integration into other sectors) for nfp and international agreements were explained in the national forest policy context during training and information sessions (under "Nfp's for all") - In all the partner countries, National Multi-stakeholder Steering Committees (NMSC) were set-up or strengthened to guide the nfp process. Activities are implemented by a wide range of stakeholders - in 2009, a survey revealed that the composition in the NMSC in the Facility Partner countries is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forestry Department (at national or federal level): 100% o Decentralised Forestry Department at provincial, district or state level: 40% o Other ministries (Ministry of Environment, Rural Development, Energy, Finance, Agriculture, etc.): 51% o Forest Research institution or institution for forest extension: 61% o Forest Education and Academia (university, forestry school, training institute, etc.): 67% o Professional Associations: 26% o Non-governmental Organisations / Community based Organisations: 81% o Indigenous Peoples Groups: 14% o Private sector or private sector associations: 47% o International partners, donors (informed observers): 43% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nfp documents - National policy and strategy documents - National action plans (e.g., CBD and UNFCCC) - National budgets - Minutes of meetings of the NMSC

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Programme Purpose	Strengthening the nfp process in up to 60 developing countries (DC) in conformity with local needs, stakeholders' interests, national priorities, internationally defined criteria, and best possible information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of improved nfp processes - Nature of the improvements initiated by Facility activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70 Facility partner countries and 4 Partner Organisations (including the 13 new partner countries who applied for partnerships in 2008, and came on board in 2009) - 11 (out of 13) new partner countries have had a so-called launching workshop, giving a boost to the nfp process in the country; In some of these new countries, a participatory process had already taken place in order to draft the Concept Note - Nfp processes strengthened in all the Partner Countries; in some of these countries the nfp process has been initiated almost from scratch; the Facility has supported the 3 main nfp-principles, spread over the 4 different phases - Development of an open and competitive process, guided by the NMSC, responsive to local needs and reflecting national priorities - Development of a monitoring system of the nfp process ("nfp-matrix" followed by the creation of the Appendix, which is part of the Facility Country Agreement); the system can also be used as a base for Facility impact monitoring and evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National reports to UNFF - FAO periodic reports and assessments - Facility OIMES (RBM) system - Appendixes of the Facility Country Agreements
Results	1. National capacity to implement effective nfp's is improved, through active civil society participation in up to 60 DC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of DCs where the Facility was active - Number of civil society organizations supported with Facility grants - Average volume of grants - Types and quality of Facility funded activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70 Partner Countries, and 4 Partner Organisations; 13 new countries came on board in 2009; 7 partner countries entered into a 2nd Agreement - Approximately 450 non-state stakeholders (NGOs, CBOs, National Institutions, Associations and decentralized forestry departments) were recipients of small grants - Grants range from 5,000 US\$ to (rather exceptional) 98,000 US\$ (average is 25,000 US\$) - Capacity building, information gathering and sharing, special studies to support forest policies (for example, the impact of forestry on rural livelihoods and GDP), development and adoption of new forest legislation and dissemination of forest related laws and regulations, development of new fiscal policies, new concession systems, new mechanisms to fund forestry (payment for environmental services; paying for water), and enabling private investment in the forestry sector; decentralization in the forest sector, empowering local governments in forest management and institutional reorganization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facility OIMES Monitoring system - Proceedings and reports from Facility funded activities (final reports freely available on the web) - Facility website - Facility database

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
	2. The availability, access to and use of information, and knowledge towards effective implementation of nfp processes are improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number, types and quality of Facility information services - Number of hits on Facility Websites - Number and type of regional lessons learned events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facility website; Facility publications (Digest, Understanding nfp's); Facility brochures; launching workshop ("Nfp's for All"); support to the establishment of databases on the different forestry stakeholders in the country by the Forestry Departments; making available to a wide public the key forest policy documents; the simplification of forest laws and regulations; the translation (and simplification) of forest laws into local languages, and the dissemination of them through the web site, through mailings, and most effectively, through national and local workshops and gatherings - In 2009, about 6 000 "visits" to the Facility website - Regional lessons learned workshops were annually organised and opportunities to meet have been take advantage of (such as the World Forestry Congress in Argentina, the County Lead Initiative in China and the FAO Regional Forestry Commissions) (Africa, Near East, Asia and Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, and Europe); in all these international and regional meetings, a side event on nfp's and the Facility were organised to exchange information and learn from country experience in the implementation of nfp's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facility Progress Reports, web pages and reports - Reports from Facility funded communities of practice - Reports and minutes from side events organised at International or regional conferences
	3. Country lead forest policy formulation and implementation are integrated in broader national policies and reflect international agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number and importance of forestry related policies and investment decisions included in national policies and strategies for sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 8 African countries (Sudan, Nigeria, Zambia, Malawi, Namibia, Kenya, Niger, and Morocco), a study was carried out in 2007 to look into the integration of Poverty Reduction Strategies in nfp's; the final concluding workshop took place in Kenya in November 2007 - Policy & strategy formulation support at different levels and on a wide range of topics (regional or sub-regional forest strategies; national forest statements; assistance to Forest Sector Reviews; sub-sector strategies (e.g., CBFM, afforestation/reforestation, agroforestry, protected areas, NWFP, forest utilization, forestry education and research, demonstration of the contribution of forestry to rural livelihoods) - Support on nfp implementation and monitoring through new legal, fiscal and institutional instruments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nfp documents - National policy and strategy documents - National action plans (e.g., CBD and UNFCCC) - National budgets - Minutes of meetings of the NMSC

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Direct Country Support			
1. Developing partnerships between the Facility and eligible countries	1.1 Inviting countries to apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of countries invited - Nature and number of initiatives/events used to publicize Facility support to countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official letters of invitation were sent (through the FAO or UNDP Country Offices) to all 108 eligible countries (Medium and Low Human Development Index); 95% of these countries have replied by sending a proposal (Concept Note); 70 are now partners, 13 have applied in 2008, and all were accepted as partner. Out of 49 Least Developed Countries (LDC), 34 are Facility partner (or 69% of all LDCs). - The Facility website and Flyer, international events such as the World Forestry Congress, CLI, COFO, FAO's Regional Commissions, UNFF, UNCCC-Bali, etc. - In 2009, the Facility coaches have visited almost all Facility Partner Countries at least once (except some countries for security reasons, and some non-responding countries). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facility Progress Reports - Facility Country Support Database - Reports from the NMSCs - Reports from Recipient Organizations (receiving Facility grants) - Back to Office Reports from Facility "coaches" - Concept Notes received
	1.2 Evaluating applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of applications received; quality and relevance of Concept Notes and corresponding applications - Number of respective decisions of the Steering Committee and Facility management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 95 countries and 7 sub-regional organizations have applied for Facility Partnerships by submitting a Concept Note - 70 partner countries and 4 partner Regional organizations were selected after a ranking and selection process in different prioritization sessions spread over 8 years. In detail: <u>2002</u>: 8 partners admitted: Chile, China, ACICAFOC, Malawi, Mongolia, Nigeria, Thailand, Tanzania <u>2003</u> (June): 7 partners admitted: CCAD, Ghana, Indonesia, Mali, Namibia, Philippines, Senegal <u>2003</u> (December): 15 partners admitted: Colombia, Cuba, DR Congo, Ecuador, Honduras, Kenya, Lesotho, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda <u>2004</u>: 8 partners admitted: Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Georgia, Jamaica, Pakistan, Sudan, Vanuatu <u>2005</u>: 8 partners admitted: Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Palau, Viet Nam, Zambia, SPC, CANARI <u>2007</u>: 11 countries admitted: Sierra Leone, Angola, Ethiopia, Uzbekistan, Dominican Rep., Nepal, Guinea, El Salvador, Laos, Cambodia, Belize <u>2008</u>: 4 countries were admitted: Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Yemen - <u>2009</u>: 13 new countries have been accepted as partner, based on the Concept Note (Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Peru, Suriname, Togo, and Zimbabwe) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 95 countries and 7 sub-regional organizations have applied for Facility Partnerships by submitting a Concept Note - 70 partner countries and 4 partner Regional organizations were selected after a ranking and selection process in different prioritization sessions spread over 8 years. In detail: <u>2002</u>: 8 partners admitted: Chile, China, ACICAFOC, Malawi, Mongolia, Nigeria, Thailand, Tanzania <u>2003</u> (June): 7 partners admitted: CCAD, Ghana, Indonesia, Mali, Namibia, Philippines, Senegal <u>2003</u> (December): 15 partners admitted: Colombia, Cuba, DR Congo, Ecuador, Honduras, Kenya, Lesotho, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda <u>2004</u>: 8 partners admitted: Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Georgia, Jamaica, Pakistan, Sudan, Vanuatu <u>2005</u>: 8 partners admitted: Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Palau, Viet Nam, Zambia, SPC, CANARI <u>2007</u>: 11 countries admitted: Sierra Leone, Angola, Ethiopia, Uzbekistan, Dominican Rep., Nepal, Guinea, El Salvador, Laos, Cambodia, Belize <u>2008</u>: 4 countries were admitted: Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Yemen - <u>2009</u>: 13 new countries have been accepted as partner, based on the Concept Note (Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Peru, Suriname, Togo, and Zimbabwe)

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Direct Country Support			
	1.3 Establishing and supporting partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of partnership agreements concluded with countries - Number of partnership agreements extended - Number of "Nfp's for All" Initial Training workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70 countries have signed a partnership agreement (one country – Guinea Bissau – did not get its launching workshop due to security reasons); 4 Regional Entities are also Facility Partners; - 2008: 2 partnerships (Honduras and Guatemala) were extended for a second agreement; - 2009: another 7 partner countries extended for a second partnership (China, Ecuador, Nigeria, Paraguay, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia); - "Nfp's for All" was organized up till now in 40 countries (Kenya, Thailand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Mauritius, Namibia, Indonesia, Sudan, Serbia, Zambia, Chile, Guatemala, Sierra Leone, Angola, Uzbekistan, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Laos, Cambodia, Belize; Malawi, Nepal, Benin, Burkina Faso, Yemen, Brazil, Ethiopia; and the 12 (out of 13) newly admitted partners (Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Peru, Suriname, Togo, and Zimbabwe) 	
	1.4 Monitoring and evaluating implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative and qualitative assessments of the achievements of the partnerships against their stated objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The concept of Outcome and Impact Monitoring and Evaluation System (OIMES) which is closely related to Result based Management (RBM) was developed in 2007, but the modus operandi and the first field tests were established in 2008 in 2 test countries (Guatemala and Honduras). - In 2009, OIMES/RBM was applied in most countries and will be compulsory for all new LoAs in 2010. Key elements in OIMES/RBM are the "in-country self-evaluation" of the past Facility support, the lessons learned workshop to discuss the new direction of the nfp process in the country, and the nfp-update which has the nfp-matrix as an important element. The latter shows in a quantitative way how vibrant the nfp process is. The matrix is in fact a gap analysis and shows the areas where Facility support is needed (now and in the future) to improve the nfp process. The criteria of the matrix on which action will be undertaken (through a Letter of Agreement) will be clearly shown as an annex to the contract. When the work of the stakeholder is over, the NMSC will judge if the scores on these particular indicators have been changed. 	
2. Supporting stakeholders in partner countries	2.1 Publishing calls for Facility stakeholder grant proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number, nature and outreach of actual calls for proposals made in partner countries; - Stakeholder awareness of grant availability in target country (e.g. questionnaire). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each partner country opens approx. annually a call of proposals (including the terms of reference, eligibility criteria, and ranking and selection criteria) which is made public through newspapers, websites, radio, posters. - When the outreach was good, many proposals are received, of which approx 75% are in principle eligible for funding (approx 25% are from private sector, individuals, or the proposal did not reply to the ToR). - In the old partner countries more applications are received because stakeholders are better informed, have easier access to information and have more trust in the modus operandi. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advertisements and press releases announcing the call for proposals - WebPages of Government - Draft project proposals (stored with the national focal point at the Forestry Department)

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Direct Country Support			
	2.2 Evaluating applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number, quality, and relevance of applications received; - Transparency and fairness of the evaluation of applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each call for proposals in a country has attracted 4 to 30 proposals. - Proposals are selected through an open vetting process carried out by the NMSC, chaired by the Director of Forestry. Members of the NMSC who have an own proposal submitted have to declare a conflict of interest and leave the meeting room when their proposal is evaluated and ranked. - In 43% of the countries, FAO or other donors are present as observer during the vetting process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports of the selection and ranking meeting (stored electronically at the Facility) - Annually, the Facility is producing a report showing all LoAs established since 2002
	2.3 Concluding stakeholder grant contracts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion of contracts involving different types of stakeholders (NGOs, CBOs, representatives of forest industry and trade, forest related Academia, and stakeholders from outside the forestry sector). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approximately 26% of the stakeholders contracts (Letters of Agreement) are given to Forestry Departments for guiding the process and monitoring of activities carried out by the non-state stakeholders. - Approx 74% of the grants support non governmental organizations such as NGOs, CBOs, National Institutions (including research and academic), Associations, and decentralized Governmental agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Facility website has a section providing the names of all recipient organizations with a short description of their normative mandate, their contact details and their website (if the have). - The Facility database (FORIS) keeps track of all contracts.
	2.4 Monitoring and evaluating grant implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of contracts satisfactorily implemented and completed; - Number of contracts assessed under the foreseen system to monitor the impact of Facility support to countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By December 2009, there were 544 small grants established (90% through Letters of Agreement; 10% by direct fund transfer through the FAO Representative), with a total amount of 12.6 Million US\$ - While most of the contracts are completed in a satisfactory way (technically spoken), many have suffered a delay in the execution of the work. - Only in a few occasions the LoA had to be cancelled because of the incapacity to carry out the activities as stated in the LoA. - The OIMES/RBM, established in 2008, was tested in 2009 in 19 countries. The system will be fully applied in 2010 in all the individual contracts (LoAs). As a result, all LoAs will be assessed and evaluated against the stated general objectives of the Country Partnership Agreement, as expressed in the concept note and as made visible in the (scored) NFP matrix. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OIMES training is documented in the minutes of the Workshop - the evaluation of the LoA will also be done through FORIS by the facility Coach and the NFP Focal Point of the country concerned.

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Direct Country Support			
	2.5 Providing policy backstopping and advisory services to stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number and duration of Facility "coaching" activities at the country level (missions) and from Headquarters; - Nature and importance of stakeholders' adherence to recommendations and advice from Facility "coaches". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 85% of the countries were visited at least once in 2009 (the missing ones were due to security reason, or non-responding). On average 4,5 working days are spent in a country while on mission. Coaches spent 55 % of their time on policy backstopping (from office and in the field). - The Mid-Term Review in 2005 and the EC external evaluation in 2007 confirm that the national stakeholders and beneficiaries of the Facility support greatly appreciate and value the advice and the stimulation received from the country coaches. This was confirmed by statements made by participants at the World Forestry Congress and the CLI. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Travel reports of the coaches. - Minutes of side-events
3. Web based information services	3.1 Establishing a Web based nfp information platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number and extent of nfp related Web sites and pages, and linkages with sites of other nfp related information providers; - Number and efficiency of search tools and information cataloguing procedures; - Number, nature, and quality of Web tools made available for nfp communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific Web-pages have been developed and constantly improved in order to present and inform about the Facility and its activities. Special sub-sections are dedicated to (i) Country support and (ii) Information services. - Links with FAO NFP site and 28 other relevant NFP and forestry policy related websites (such as: EFI, ETRN, PROFOR) and to stakeholders in partner countries. - Under the FAO FORIS System, a Country Support Database has been developed and implemented to archive and sort out information and results about partner countries and partner institutions. This Country Support Database is accessible worldwide through Internet to all Facility staff. - Two database systems are available in the Facility website: (i) One allows keeping track of on-going and achieved activities in the partner countries and (ii) the other (Sourcebook on funding sources for SFM, a joint effort between the Facility and the CPF) aiming to share existing information on available funding for SFM. http://www.fao.org/forestry/cpf/sourcebook/en/ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Facility website (www.nfp-facility.org) - Facility Progress Reports; - Database statistics, and web server statistics; - Users' lists (country administrators).
	3.2 Establishing the "nfp Update" database	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure, content, size and status of the database, availability of maintenance and updating procedures, accessibility and user-friendliness; - Use made of the database by nfp stakeholders in DCs and elsewhere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During 2003, the nfp-update initiative was launched; by 2005, the profiles of 104 countries were on-line. In order to improve the quality of the existing information, new and detailed guidelines were defined in 2006. - About 40 new nfp-updates have been completed in 2007, and further updated in 2008 and 2009. - Nfp matrix is used as part of the OIMES/RBM and according the information and feedback received appreciated by countries for assessment and monitoring of the nfp process and for other purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the nfp update is on-line, accessible though the FAO Forestry and facility websites - also the NFP matrix is on-line showing the status of the nfp in a particular country.

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Direct Country Support			
	3.3 Sharing knowledge resulting from other activities of the Facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Published outputs from communities of practice and Facility support to countries: on the Web and disseminated electronically (e-mail distribution lists), and use made of these outputs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – More than 50 “country stories” which summarize the main outputs/outcomes from the Facility support to national stakeholders are available on the Facility web pages. – A new feature, Facility Multimedia (implemented in 2007), offers the possibility to view on-line forestry related videos, produced with the support of the Facility. – In 2009, a new feature has been introduced to search information by topic (the key-words linked to these topics were revised in 2009), making it easier for the web viewer to search and retrieve information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Material can be viewed and/or downloaded from the Facility website
Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Information Services			
4. Dynamic methods of information and knowledge sharing	4.1 Developing communities of practice (CoP) (= may emerge from the regional lessons learnt seminars)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of CoP around specific nfp related themes and issues; number of members in these and geographic coverage; – Number of CoP related workshops supported by the Facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – “Enhancing stakeholder participation in nfp” was the first CoP launched and supported by the Facility. Later, a similar package was developed for “Conflict Resolution in nfps”. Since 2002, many workshops were organized on these issues of participation; in 2009: Lesotho; Cambodia, Nigeria, Vietnam). In order to create ownership and resident capacities in the Africa region, a training of trainers’ course was organised in November 2009, involving 6 African countries (Uganda, Gambia, South Africa, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Malawi). – Guidelines on “How to make an nfp process work through participation” and “Conflict Resolution in nfps” were drafted. – Considering the importance of cross-sectoral issues, the Facility provided financial assistance to two regional workshops on “Cross-sectoral policy planning in forestry” (one in Africa and the other in Central America). – Since 2005, CoP was implemented with the understanding of knowledge sharing and capacity building. – To disseminate the nfp principles, “Introductory Training Module” (ITM) was developed under the framework of “Nfps for All” (a joint initiative of FAO, the Facility and partners from the Netherlands, Germany and Finland). Two testing workshops took place in 2005. The ITM was regularly used during the launching workshops of the new partnerships (40 times, including 19 times in 2009). – To share experience and develop compensatory mechanisms linking forest and water an initiative was started 2008 in Central America and The Caribbean. 20 concrete cases in 9 countries have been identified and studied. The results were discussed and conclusions drawn for continued implementation at a regional workshop. A presentation of the findings was made at the WFC in October 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Facility Progress Reports; – Membership lists, activity reports of CoP; – Workshop proceedings; – Publication and distribution lists; – Feed-back from readers; – Reports and publications from Facility partner agencies. – All modules are available, though the website, or are request

Facility	Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Reporting against Logical Framework	Sources of Verification
Activities	Information Services			
	4.2 National and regional lessons learnt/exchange of experiences seminars/workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number, themes, location, participation and targeted public of the workshops supported by Facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With the "nfps for All", initiatives have been taken to develop training modules for the following themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Stakeholder participation; o Financing Mechanisms, o Conflict Management and o Forests and Climate. - These themes are of high interest and demanded by foresters and the forestry sector, worldwide. - This training material was available for use during workshops in order to build capacities, share knowledge as well as promote and establish new networks. - National workshops were held on Financing Mechanisms for SFM: in 2008 in Namibia and Guatemala, and in 2009 in Philippines, Paraguay and Ecuador. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All material is available at request (hard copies), or can be downloaded from the web - Workshop reports
	4.3 Disseminating information beyond the reach of electronic media.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Published outputs from CoP and Facility support to countries disseminated under hard copy documents and CD-ROMs (number, size, languages, and frequency). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In support of the "Nfps for All", the Facility published and disseminated the Facility/FAO document "Understanding nfps" (available in English, French and Spanish). - Special edition on nfps was published (in collaboration of PROFOR) in the ETFRN Newsletter (2004). - Nfp Digest on "Forests and poverty" was produced (at beginning to 2007) in paper version with a CD-Rom containing further background papers. - Promotional material, several CDs and (in 2009) a new Facility leaflet were produced in the six languages (English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese and Russian); annually a Facility Calendar is printed and widely distributed by mail and FAO Pouch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hard copies are available of all material