



**IIED – Growing Forest Partnership (GFP)  
Summary of lessons learned 2009-10**

**CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>2. ACHIEVEMENTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 Participation of all relevant stakeholders and integration of existing activities in-country.....	3
2.2 Building new partnerships.....	3
2.3 Forging communication pathways.....	4
2.4 Getting a “Theory of Change” (M&E) across.....	5
<b>3. LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1 Starting up GFP process in pilot countries: participation of all relevant stakeholders and integration of existing activities.....	7
3.2 Building new partnerships.....	8
3.2.1 Internal/operational processes.....	8
3.2.2 National.....	8
3.2.3 International.....	9
3.3. Getting a “Theory of Change” (M&E) across.....	9
3.4 Forging communication pathways.....	10
3.4.1 Internal/operational processes.....	10
3.4.2 National communication.....	10
3.4.3 International level.....	10
<b>4. CHALLENGES</b> .....	<b>11</b>
a. Operational aspects of the partnership.....	11
b. Timing.....	11
d. Funding.....	11
e. Forging communication pathways.....	11
f. Getting the Theory of Change (M&E) across.....	12
<b>5. OPPORTUNITIES</b> .....	<b>13</b>
a. Engagement in “Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry” and in-country processes.....	13
b. REDD.....	13
c. Catalysing other funds.....	13
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENATIONS</b> .....	<b>14</b>

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

**CIFOR** - The Center for International Forestry Research  
**FAO** - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations  
**FCPF** - The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility  
**FIP** - Forest Investment Program  
**GACF** - Global Alliance on Community Forestry  
**GEF** - *Global Environment Facility*  
**GFP** - Growing Forest Partnership  
**IAITPTF** - International Alliance for Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests  
**IFFA** - International Family Forest Alliance  
**IFC** - International Finance Corporation  
**ILCF** - Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry  
**IUCN** - International Union for Conservation of Nature  
**REDD** - Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation  
**WWF** - World wildlife fund

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document compiles and summarises the main lessons learned during GFP's inception phase and first year and a half of implementation (mid 2009 – September 2010). The information comes from GFP Catalytic Group internal briefings and exchanges and various reports submitted to the World Bank<sup>1</sup> between March 2009 and August 2010.

This is a ever evolving working document; it has been drafted with inputs from the Catalytic Group members and in the future it will include those of GFP country partners.

The document examines the processes involved in making GFP operational at international, national and local levels and in particular the lessons learned about forming, supporting and managing partnerships. It is as yet too early to assess the in-country impacts and draw lessons learned from in-country processes, as these are some cases such as **Liberia** – where activities have just started and **Nepal** –where the GFP is still in its inception phase.

The next phase of GFP will be devoted to the consolidation of these partnerships at international and national levels and to an analysis and reflection on how these partnerships are operating and what kind of changes and impacts are they having towards the sustainable management of forestry resources for the benefit of forest dependent people.

GFP 2011 programme will be devoted to: i) the implementation of the various in-country action plans; ii) further supporting the role of “rights holders”; iii) further mainstreaming and gathering evidence of the relevance of Investing in Locally Controlled Forests (ILCF) and creating ; and iv) capturing and disseminating lessons learned and distilling the added value of GFP partnerships at country and international levels.

This document does not aim to be exhaustive and a more in depth analysis will be provided in the GFP Mid Term Review, due to be carried out between June and November 2010.

---

<sup>1</sup> Six Monthly Report Jan-June 2009; Six Monthly Report July - Dec 2009; Interim report July 09; Quarterly Report Jan-Mar 2009; Quarterly Report Jul-Sept 2009; 2009 Activities Report; Interim report August 2010.

## 2. ACHIEVEMENTS

After one and a half years, GFP has proven to be faithful and coherent to its original aim to “*Facilitate local and international partnerships and investment that support forest rights holders and stakeholders in their efforts to secure livelihoods and maintain ecosystem services*” and there has been some progress in developing functioning partnerships (see 3.2.1 – 3.2.3).

“From global to local” and from “local to global” has been the core of GFP’s partnership approach. The initiative has worked to bridge gaps by strengthening existing alliances, creating new partnerships and empowering stakeholders, in order to create a shared vision and a better way of working together for the benefit of forests and the people that depend on them.

We have identified five main areas where GFP represents an added value at the international, national and local levels:

### 2.1 Participation of all relevant stakeholders and integration of existing activities in-country

Prior to and during the inception phase, GFP partnership process has encouraged the involvement of main forest actors in each GFP country with the aim of creating solid multi-stakeholders platforms, equally involving communities’ members, governments, civil society, and the private sector<sup>2</sup>.

These multi-stakeholders and cross-sectoral groups - guided by GFP national focal points - have identified their own priorities, needs and gaps to be filled by GFP.

The “needs analysis” has taken the form of “people’s diagnostics” in **Ghana** and **Mozambique**, whilst it has built on and offered an opportunity to review and refresh national analyses already carried out in **Guatemala** and **Liberia**.

This country driven approach has proven to be able to root GFP in existing projects, to amalgamate different actors and to encourage ownership of the initiative.

### 2.2 Building new partnerships

#### **International Level: stimulating international support for Locally Controlled Forestry (LCF).**

GFP has raised the profile and highlighted the value of investing in investing in locally controlled forestry. It has pursued this with three international "rights-holder" groups, called the G3 being: the International Alliance for Indigenous and Tribal People of Tropical Forest (IAITPTF), the International Family Forest Alliance (IFFA) and The Global Alliance for Community Forests (GACF).

These alliances, represent an estimated one billion people, one quarter of the world’s forests and \$75 - \$100 billion/year in goods and services, and have begun to find a collective voice. With 5 dialogues under its belt on critical issues organised by The Forests Dialogue<sup>3</sup> - in Belgium, Panama, Nepal, Macedonia and, in late May 2010, the UK - GFP is steering real momentum amongst both rights holder groups and a range of investors to pursue paths to collaboration on mutually-productive investment.

---

<sup>2</sup> To have an overview of the members of the multistakeholders platforms in each GFP country see: <http://www.growingforestpartnerships.org/local-partners>

<sup>3</sup> To know more about the Forests Dialogue: <http://environment.yale.edu/tfd/about/history/>

The “rights holder” groups have now formed an international platform, named the G3, that is crafting joint agendas and global strategies to influence international policy dialogue and look at dynamic financial mechanisms (including REDD) to ensure that funds are invested at local level and benefit smallholders, indigenous people and local communities<sup>4</sup>.

### **National level: catalysing existing initiatives and opening up new alliances**

In **Guatemala**, GFP has supported the creation of a National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations. The *Alianza* represents more than 400 community groups which have a membership of around 77,000 people who depend on forests. The *Alianza* has provided a stronger platform for IP and community groups to be involved in national decision making processes especially with respect to exploration of finance instruments to benefit smallholders and forest communities (including REDD) and capacity strengthening of forest communities. The *Alianza* is ensuring that the voices of marginalized groups are more clearly heard at national and international level.

In **Mozambique**, Centro Terra Viva, (a local NGO which is facilitating the GFP process), has been instrumental in the creation of a national steering committee group that includes government, civil society community representatives and the private sector. This new inter-institutional and multi-stakeholder platform has prepared the ground for cementing a partnership sharing experience between Brazil and Mozambique, the “South-South REDD”. With input from GFP and financial support from the Norwegian Government, this initiative has catalysed and united all supporters of REDD in an umbrella of alliances that are now crafting the National REDD strategy.

In **Liberia**, the GFP process has been able to complement exciting developments in national legislation and policy. Although there was not a “peoples diagnostic” process, a consultation process has taken place in which a range of stakeholders identified key gaps in the rapid developments underway and strategies to fill some of the most significant ones. Although GFP started only 6 months ago things are moving fast: GFP resources have supported analysis and discussion at a national level by Community Forest Development Committees who have subsequently formed a national Union and a detailed work plan to tackle other issues is now underway.

### **2.3 Forging communication pathways**

GFP communication pathways can be summarized in 3 main phases:

2008-2009. In the first phase of GFP, communications has demonstrated that there was a genuine interest in partnerships development as a country-driven process. Communications has been focussed on listening, recording reflections, and sharing ideas.

2009-2010 – (current phase). The second phase has focused on supporting GFP country teams by providing support in shaping their communication strategies and finding *ad hoc* mechanisms to ensure a flow of communication from the local to the global level.

2011. The third phase will be critical for maintaining momentum and for keeping involving and influencing all key stakeholders. In this phase communications efforts will be devoted to sharing lessons learned on how the partnership models have delivered a difference/ change within GFP working network and beyond.

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information see : <http://www.growingforestpartnerships.org/locally-controlled-forestry>

GFP communication strategy has been built along four main objectives:

1. *Communications for consultation and engagement*  
The activities developed around this communication volet – such as **the Canopy of Friends**, and **country diagnostics** - have had as a scope to engage others, consulting on their ideas on what a partnership might look like. Key communications activities have included capturing these thoughts and ideas, exchanging them and brokering discussion across networks, sectors and countries.
2. *Communications for transparency* –Key activities have focussed on regular updates through the **web site, newsletters and briefings**, to ensure that the partnership idea was represented in key international *fora* and seizing opportunities for promoting the locally driven partnership concept.
3. *Communications for influencing* – As new ideas for partnership begin to mobilise, work on improving policy environments need to get underway. Key activities have been focusing in helping to map key policy and media environments and identify key champions in different countries. Activities have included participation to **international events, workshops, seminars, and working with the media** (training of journalists)
4. *Communications for sharing information and ideas* – As ideas and experiences are collected and collated, activities will be focussed on packaging some of this experience in useable communication products - either in print or other technologies – for sharing across the sector and engaging new stakeholders, with the aim of scaling up ideas.

## 2.4 Increasing understanding of “Theory of Change” (M&E)

GFP has developed a “Theory of Change” (ToC)<sup>5</sup> Monitoring & Evaluation framework to monitor GFP partnership building process at country and international level against its initial five expected results:

1. Forest stakeholders create shared visions, actions and outcomes to strengthen partnerships among themselves and with other sectors.
2. Marginalised groups are actively involved in forest decision-making processes and governance improvements
3. Forest rights holders, managers and users succeed in accessing financing opportunities based on their own locally-, regionally- or nationally-defined priorities.
4. Local, regional and country level processes bridge the gap to international initiatives and become effective in shaping international contributions to forest issues at the country level and internationally.
5. International institutions provide better country-level support to participatory national efforts through improved synergies among international initiatives in-country.

---

<sup>5</sup> A ‘theory of change’ (ToC) shows how certain *input* will produce specific *outputs* which are hoped to lead to specific *outcomes* that will ultimately have *impacts*. A basic TOC explains how a group of early and intermediate achievements sets the stage for producing long-range results. TOC maps out an initiative through 5 stages: i) Identifying long-term goals or aspirations and the assumptions behind them; ii) Backwards mapping to the preconditions or requirements necessary to achieve the goals; iii) Identifying the interventions that the initiative will perform to create your desired change; iv) Developing indicators to measure the outcomes that best demonstrate the performance of the initiative and v) Writing a narrative to explain the logic of the initiative.

This framework is to be considered as a key means to generate information on approaches that work which the wider community can pick up, and respond to the objectives of:

- building a *record* of decisions taken, consequences of those decisions and progress made – important in a multi-actor, multi-country initiative with many possible outcomes
- providing *lessons* from the various GFP processes and activities – for their continuous improvement, and to enrich our guidance on partnerships
- providing stakeholder *feedback* on GFP's added value – to continue the spirit of openness that characterised the initial GFP consultation
- enabling *reporting* to the Reference Group, donors and stakeholders – ensuring GFP's effectiveness and transparency
- establishing a *framework of desirable outcomes* to look for – thus to enable *course correction* – based on all the above inputs
- providing for *accountability* – *internal* between the CG, RG, consultants and immediate partners, and *external* to donors and stakeholders, (but not privileging donors or it will distort the system and the team's interest in doing the M&E)

**Monitoring** practicalities have included: i) *identifying a limited number of key indicators*; ii) *Recording of baseline information* and iii) putting in place systems to record and regularly report on them<sup>6</sup>.

Members of the CG and country partners stressed in May 2010 the importance of making *The Theory of Change* well understood and harmonizing the overall GFP M&E and communications processes as well as capturing each country experience and sharing the lessons learned within the other GFP countries and at international level.

To respond to these needs IIED has decided to organise a series of in-country training/awareness-raising workshops which are taking place in 2010. Each workshop is organised in close collaboration with country partners, FAO and IUCN, and involves all relevant GFP country stakeholders. So far, two workshops have taken place; in Mozambique (21-23 July) and Liberia (4-7 August). Guatemala and Ghana are to follow before the end of 2010.

The rationale of these workshops is: (i) to create a common understanding of M&E principles across the GFP network; (ii) to produce a dynamic and flexible framework that responds to specific country needs and that can at the same be shared amongst GFP countries; and (iii) to link M&E outcomes with adequate communication strategies.

Each workshop proceeds using the same format. Workshops last two and a half days and take an interactive approach, with both theoretical and practical sessions. The first day is dedicated to presentations on basic M&E concepts and practical exercises to test the ToC against GFP work plans. The second day is devoted to presentations on basic communication tools and techniques, and includes guided debates, a practical exercise on analysing audiences, crafting the right message for the right audience, and development of an outline of a communication strategy. The third day focuses on how to link M&E outcomes and communication strategies. The workshops have served to support partners in identifying indicators and keeping track of progress. This has entailed the actors involved agreeing on what their long term goal is for the work that they are doing together and identifying the key

---

<sup>6</sup> *Regular reporting on indicators*: 1. *Quarterly progress reports* on activities prepared by each of IIED, IUCN, FAO on their own work. Ditto for country/thematic teams; 2. *Synthesis for the RG by IIED* (as M&E lead) as half-yearly reports, noting any conflicts or special synergies and areas for action as identified by partners or stakeholders; and 3. *Public highlights* via newsletters and annual report on progress

steps and levers required to get to that goal and the assumptions that they are making about why those steps will lead to that goal.

### 3. LESSONS LEARNED

#### 3.1 Starting up GFP process in pilot countries: expanding participation to include relevant stakeholders and integrate into existing activities

In-country inception processes have developed in different ways depending on country needs, country readiness to support GFP processes and leading agencies. The last of these has had an impact on how processes have been steered.

In the case of **Guatemala**, FAO used its consolidated network of partners to support the creation of the the Alliance of Community Forest Organizations - bringing together members of community and indigenous organisations all over Guatemala and representing more than 400 community groups, which have a membership of around 77,000 people who depend on forests. The *Alianza* was formed in September 2009 with GFP support and continues to mainstream GFP activities and link them with current national forest policies, gaps and priorities. Over the past few months, GFP activities have focused on two main areas: exploration of finance instruments to benefit smallholders and forest communities; and capacity strengthening of forest communities.

In the case of **Mozambique** – where IIED was directly involved – it was decided to mainstream GFP process through an existing group of NGOs that served as a base to create the GFP national catalytic group. GFP catalytic group brings together different stakeholders, including the government, local NGOs and international organizations and private enterprise. The group is coordinated by a local NGO, Centro Terra Viva. This group has met three times, once to discuss the means through which the consultation process should take place, another to share its results, and finally to present final outcomes and define an implementation strategy. After this process, local stakeholders decided to centre GFP Mozambique around the theme of “participatory management of natural resources and forest enterprises”. The group also made the decision to, whenever possible, build on existing resources, such as existing community-based management committees.

In **Liberia**, “people’s diagnostics” were not developed but a series of participatory workshops were set up and through these workshops and meetings a national platform of multi-stakeholders was created. Consensus was reached that the composition of the Task Force must include representatives from the Government, CSO, Research Institutions (Universities and Colleges), Women Groups, Student Groups, Local and International NGOs, EPA, Private Sector and the Community Forest Development Committee. At the launching of the GFP Liberia in February, 2010, priority issues and gaps in the forestry sector were identified in addition to suggestions of the necessary measures required to address them. The determination of the priority issues were based on the findings of the Strategic Environmental (SEA) study undertaken by the IUCN (2009) in addition to the priority issues identified during the nfp launching workshop in September, 2009.

In **Ghana**, the facilitating agency, IUCN convened representatives from civil society, forest communities, government and the private sector who then ran a diagnostic process, coordinating efforts around an issues-based approach concerning access and rights to forest resources.

Looking at these different inception processes a couple of common lesson learned to be drawn:

- “No glove” fits all: it is crucial to understand the country context, the country needs and gaps and try to respond to those needs in a participatory manner, involving all key stakeholders
- Building activities on existing studies and diagnostic processes (e.g. in Liberia the workshop to establish GFP priorities used the SEA) and strengthen existing networks (e.g. in Mozambique GFP has strengthened the network of *Amigos da Floresta* and created opportunities to expand it through the REDD South-South project which includes new actors such as **LIST THEM**) has proved to be essential in creating a sense of ownership of GFP amongst stakeholders and anchoring the initiative to the country reality
- All countries have developed different approaches to GFP but at a very general level very similar desired outcomes: to influence policy towards a more equitable use of forest resources
- The time needed to create these multistakeholders platform and for them to gain ownership of GFP was definitely underestimated

### 3.2 Building new partnerships

#### 3.2.1 Internal/operational processes

At an internal operational level GFP brings together FAO, IUCN, the World Bank and IIED (the Catalytic Group). These four organisations have been working together in such a joint process for the first time and this has necessitated a learning process in terms of familiarisation and coordination of ways of working and harmonization of administrative procedures (managing funds and reporting frameworks).

The generation of a common understanding and overcoming the difficulties and delays due to the Catalytic Group members’ different background, and different rules and procedures in managing funds, reporting and implementing activities has proven to be a complex but enriching process. A lesson learned is that these factors should never be underestimated.

We are now at a stage where the preconditions to make GFP advance in a fluid and efficient manner have been outlined, but nonetheless there is still work needed on ensuring smooth internal processes that allow for both speed and adequate inclusion.

The upcoming Mid Term Review, assessing the progress made and making recommendation for further implementation, will be an important step in this direction.

Key lessons learned so far include:

- Time spent at the start of a process to develop a common vision is time saved in future months, even if it appears to be repetitive at the time
- Having one key contact person in place in each organisation in a partnership facilitates communication
- Organisations that are members of partnerships have to commit time and resources to ensure that there is the sharing of information and ideas internally (within the organisation: e.g. regional and national offices)
- It is important to allow flexibility in managing funds and establishing a reporting framework and schedule
- Short but brief communications often have proven the way to ensure the most effective operation of a partnership when it comes to co-ordination between institutions: e.g., regular phone or skype calls keep all partners up-to-date

#### 3.2.2 National level

GFP working experience suggests taking into account the following points when establishing new or strengthening existing partnerships at the national level:

- Identify a credible and accountable GFP champion (person, organisation, group - with appropriate country knowledge and relevant contacts) to mainstream the process and regularly communicate and transfer information
- There are multiple opportunities to build on and mobilise existing networks – often many priorities within countries forest sector have already been identified but it is the funding that needs to be directed
- Don't underestimate the time factor: creating multistakeholder platforms and reaching out to marginalized groups is a lengthy endeavour

### 3.2.3 International level

The getting together of the G3 “rights holders” (the International Alliance for Indigenous and Tribal People of Tropical Forest (IAITPTF) the International Family Forest Alliance (IFFA) and The Global Alliance for Community Forests (GACF)) is a main achievement of GFP in achieving new international partnerships.

There is significant opportunity to utilize GFP processes in enhancing new international partnerships through exchanges/sharing lessons learned between GFP countries and beyond to international *fora*.

Lessons learned include:

- The apparent impact of the ILCF process in bringing together the G3 is probably due to its timing: the individual alliances were all in a situation in which they were ready to explore new partnerships and opportunities and each group had sufficient internal strength and vision to engage effectively.
- Continued need and value of dialogue to build trust and ownership of vision; GFP value addition can be provided through actions around dialogue allowing more in depth analysis
- Creating a space for new partners to meet together and develop their own visions and directions without external interference has proven essential; hence GFP supported G3 representatives to meet face to face for closed door discussions.

### 3.3. Increasing understanding of “Theory of Change” (M&E)

In-country M&E has basically just started (with the exception of **Guatemala** and **Mozambique**) as workplans have recently been agreed and their implementation it is at an embryonic stage (**Ghana** and **Liberia**). As outlined in several sections of this document the action plans have proven to be a lengthy process.

We hope that by encouraging in-country stakeholders to outline what change they expect to come from being engaged in GFP and to identify exactly how they will know that they are on the way to delivering that change, involvement in M&E will actually help national stakeholders to track the changes that these partnerships aim to deliver.

The particular role of IIED, which is to support monitoring and evaluation, communications and process enhancement, is different from the two implementing agencies, FAO and IUCN. The M&E training workshops taking place currently in 2010 aim to support country teams to articulate clearly what they expect to achieve via GFP – what change they expect to make, to identify the key steps and indicators along the route to that change and to outline mechanisms to create links between communications and M&E activities.

What remains to be done is for each in-country team to fine tune indicators and identify the key milestones they intend to reach along the way and how they will know that they have got there.

Lessons learned include:

- Informal M&E processes, such as the regular phone calls, email and Skype discussions, ad hoc meetings, are incredibly valuable. They are not collated under the heading

“M&E” in any reports, but they do serve that function as partners update one another, discuss progress and correct the course of various elements of the initiative

- It would be more effective for each organisation of the CG to appropriate and mainstream the M&E framework. Monitoring a process implies having a say or at least being involved in how the process is built - which means the actions that are leading to reaching the process goals.

### 3.4 Forging communication pathways

#### 3.4.1 Internal/operational processes

The main lesson learned is that efficient and transparent internal communication is essential not only to guarantee the initiative’s operations but also to gain credibility with in-country and international partners. Conference calls, briefings and regular meetings of the Catalytic and Reference Groups have been instrumental in reaching understanding and building consensus on the strategic and operational aspects of GFP’s implementation.

#### 3.4.2 National communication

First hand experience has proven that GFP is a complex communication initiative for three main reasons:

1. **is a multipurpose initiative** (GFP communication objectives are: i) Enable relevant stakeholders to have access to knowledge and information to better understand their role in the sustainable management of forest resources; ii) promote local control and management of natural resources and iii) strengthen capacity and promote informed decision-making communities);
2. **operates at different levels (policy, research and project management) and**
3. **involves different stakeholders** (communities, governments, civil society, private sector)

We are still in the process of understanding each country context and create ad hoc communication mechanisms able to use adequate tools and effective messages to reach the different audiences and the communication flow from the local to the global needs to be strengthened.

We also have understood that:

- Well structured national work-plans facilitate strong national communication
- Communication is much more effective when each member of the Catalytic Group uses its existing communications network to replicate messages and to
- Communication is much more effective if there an analysis of the audience profiles and needs and if there is an assessment of the impact of communication tools
- Training of journalists, media involvement, and diversification of communications tools are essential ingredients to connect the local with the national level and generally to improve the flow of information.

#### 3.4.3 International level

Communication at international level has focused on the following actions: i) **getting GFP known** (web site, newsletters, international events); ii) **giving access to information to partners and creating links for encounters between the local and international levels** (GFP has represented an opportunity for several country partners to participate to international events/meetings and workshops and to acquire information and exchange knowledge); and iii) **contributing to the dissemination of innovative concepts** (GFP has been very pro-active in animating the debate on Locally Controlled Forestry and has provided support to the rights holders groups to strengthen their role within the forestry sector at international and regional level).

## **4. CHALLENGES**

### **a. Operational aspects of the partnership**

It has been a challenge to harmonize the GFP vision and approach across the various administrative structures and working procedures and cultures. It has thus been a very important learning process for all concerned.

Despite the fact a leading agency is in place in each country, GFP has endeavoured to involve all members of the Catalytic Group in all stages in each country; drafting work plans, deciding on priorities and implementation.

The lesson learned is that we can not underestimate how much time and “diplomacy efforts” are implied in joint programming and joint implementing processes.

### **b. Timing**

Multi-institutional partnerships and the mutual trust required for successful collaboration, takes time to develop. The strict deadlines for spending imposed by Bank’s internal rules have impinged on delivery. The Catalytic Group partners and IIED have tried to be flexible and responsive to grassroots priorities and to support people close to the forest to develop and direct their own agendas and partnerships. However, the rigid deadlines and inflexibility of funding does not reflect these in-country and on-site requirements. In the future, if smaller local organisations become more involved as implementers or members of the Catalytic Group themselves, this may represent a very serious barrier to progress.

### **d. Funding**

In 2008, when the project was in development, the Bank proposed an outline budget of \$15 million over three years, and grants totalling some \$3.8 million for the first year were allocated. Subsequent cuts across the board reduced funding for the project (in line with many other projects). In early July IIED, IUCN and the FAO learnt that the second year’s grant was to be \$3.5 million and in March 2010 that the third year’s grant was to be \$3 million (a reduction of just over US\$ 5 million on the original proposal). Maintaining the trust of partners and delivering with the same scope and ambition as originally planned has therefore become challenging. The CG is working to ensure that the positive partnership platforms that have been developed feed usefully into new international initiatives to ensure real impact.

The unforeseen budget cut has proven to be difficult for in-country partners, who expect consistency in order to be able to plan and implement GFP activities.

The Bank rules and regulations on spending of funds have also been complicated for small grassroots organizations. More flexibility is needed in order to meet smaller organizational needs and to enable them to have a more proactive role as implementers or as members of the Catalytic Group. The funding mechanism of the DGF has not been suitable for a participatory initiative like GFP. The restrictions on funding expenditure in a year (plus no guarantee going into the following year) mean that countries have focused on what is possible within the year.

### **e. Forging communication pathways**

#### **Internal**

It has also taken time to establish a communications protocol with the Catalytic Group and the RG. The Catalytic Group partners (IUCN, IIED, FAO) have involved their own networks at the local level; however the role of the World Bank still needs to be defined in terms of

more active engagement with regional and national Bank staff. This is important for project integration on the ground.

### **National level**

The development of the outline of in country communication strategies has just began. The results of the workshops are revealing that in each country the communication challenges are similar: i) Technical accessibility/digital divide; ii) need for ad hoc training for journalists and media people; iii) access to additional funding; iv) access to tool to send and receive communications.

Obviously GFP can not solve challenges related to digital divide or illiteracy rates but it can certainly help in talking the issues of capacity strengthening of media professionals and support country teams in finding mechanisms to find space of expressions and create a flow of communication.

In the near future it would be relevant to establish a new partnership between GFP task forces and professional communications institutions, considering both private and governmental to make the best use of available resources. In the case of Mozambique, a partnership with the Ministry of Communication could be instrumental in negotiating preferential fees for the use of community radios.

### **International**

GFP has been featured internationally through its web site, presentations of the initiative at international events (COP 15, CoFo etc) and publication of the newsletters.

That said, continuity and frequency in updating information and releasing publications have been amongst the major challenges in mainstreaming GFP presence at the international level.

The recruitment of a person dedicated to ensuring the timely a constant communication flow should ensure a good communication flow in the future.

Another challenge has been the fact of not having concrete information from the pilot countries until very recently – when the workplans were agreed and activities started.

The M&E and communication workshops have been instrumental in identifying communication focal points involved in the implementation of GFP. Their role will be to “push and pull” information: send regular updates on how the initiative is progressing and gather and transfer information to be disseminated amongst GFP actors

### **f. Increasing understanding of “Theory of Change” (M&E)**

This has been one of the more challenging aspects of GFP development.

The difficulty of creating a harmonised M&E framework across GFP network is intrinsic to the nature of the initiative:

- There is a challenge in developing criteria for evaluation that are comparable between countries (as each country has developed GFP in its own particular way and at different stages) and across different types of partnerships.
- The concept of monitoring impacts in a constant evolving process (and not single activities) is still a novel concept and much efforts (time and resources) has gone in trying to create a common understanding of what the Theory of Change and what its implementation requires from country and international partners. Surely more work needs to be done in this direction as we are far from having reached an harmonised framework.
- Each country project has its own indicators and monitoring and reporting frameworks (mainly depending from the requirements of the implementing agencies) and it has

proven challenging to insert in these already established M&E frameworks new indicators and baselines.

- Having one organization, independent from supporting national activities, but responsible for analyzing what's happening in the different pilots, draw conclusions on the achievements of national and international partnerships and their has proven to be challenging.

## **OPPORTUNITIES**

### **a. Engagement in “Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry” and in-country processes**

GFP has supported a broad dialogue on Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry (ILCF). Before 2009, the institutional landscape in support of such investment was fragmented - with isolated attempts by development agencies and investors. By using The Forest Dialogue platform and convening a series of dialogues on ILCF in Belgium, Panama, Nepal and Macedonia, it was possible for the first time to bring together representatives of three highly significant alliances representing locally controlled forestry: the International Family Forest Alliance (IFFA), the Global Alliance on Community Forestry (GACF) and the International Alliance for Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests (IAITPTF). Together representing an estimated one billion people, one quarter of the world's forests and \$75 - \$100 billion/year in goods and services, these alliances have begun to appreciate the scale of their mutual interests and agendas. One year later, there is a highly evolved joint mission among these three 'rights-holder' groups (or G3 as they have become known) to: (i) Promote the G3 and participation in policy-making processes; (ii) Recognise and respect for the forest and land rights of indigenous, tribal people, communities and family forest owners; (iii) Support organising and organisations of rights holders; (iv) Share knowledge and best practices; (v) Pursue access to markets and the right to economic utilisation of the forest resources; (vi) Promote sustainable forest management and locally controlled forestry and; (vii) Foster world wide solidarity between indigenous, tribal people, communities and forest owner families.

The ILCF process is generating enthusiasm and momentum, in particular from the three rights holder groups, who are actively engaging and advancing their agenda independently.

### **b. REDD**

REDD and the related discussions offer enormous potential to change the forest funding landscape as well as to positively impact on policy and forest use. In every country where GFP is operating as well as at the international level, REDD is almost unavoidable. REDD can offer great opportunities for new and well resourced partnerships that are attempting innovative approaches and GFP can – on the other hand – the experience of building country driven processes and cross-sectoral/multistakeholders platforms, that could indeed be very well serve REDD processes.

### **d. Catalysing other funds**

GFP is leveraging additional funding for certain initiatives:

- The **Christensen Fund** has supported the rights holders groups to deliver some of the ideas they have developed with the support of GFP.
- The **Locally Controlled Forestry** concept, complemented by the development of a branding design already generating a great deal of interest.
- In **Mozambique**, the Norwegian Embassy has stepped in with a major programme of support for the National REDD Strategy that arose through discussions amongst members of the GFP working group.
- In-country activities in **Guatemala** have leveraged additional funds up to 20% from different organizations (see work plans).

- In **Ghana** partners are exploring the potential to link **GFP with the VPA, PPR (Chris please confirm!)**

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENATIONS

A complex and diverse institutional landscape combined with varying conditions on the ground in GFP countries have resulted in a challenging but productive process, enriching for stakeholders and the Catalytic and Reference Group members alike. Progress has been made, although many more challenges lie ahead.

The GFP initiative began with a very wide remit, covering complex issues such as land tenure, human rights, deforestation, low-carbon initiatives and various development issues. Resources were made available but the complexity of the initiative was certainly underestimated. The scope was enormously broad, the time allotted too short and the budget cut very significant (almost one third of the original agreed sum).

The country diagnostics and consultations processes have helped to identify specific GFP objectives that respond to country needs and so helped to better define the niche of the initiative.

We are very much aware that each partnership process has developed in a slightly different way, according to each individual country's particular context. This makes it imperative for the next GFP phase to capture the richness of this diversity by creating opportunities for: **exchanging, sharing learning and capitalising** on the experiences accumulated so far.

This process can be accomplished by: i) facilitating a series of encounters within GFP country teams; ii) creating a programme of exchanges amongst GFP countries and countries that could benefit from GFP lessons learned (a set of criteria has been developed for these exchanges and the countries involved are: Guatemala/Peru, Nepal/Laos, and Burkina Faso/Liberia/Ghana; iii) linking GFP in-country networks with the "rights holders groups"; iv) using international *fora* as opportunities to showcase the value added by GFP partnerships; and v) promoting a better and more interactive flow of information and communication through the new initiatives like the [growingforestpartnership.org](http://growingforestpartnership.org) website, national videos and the GFP newsletters.

By documenting and disseminating the lessons learned, the CG aims to capture the essence, the nature of GFP and to be able to prove that GFP is growing and leading to relevant changes at country and international levels and that the models used can be applied and used in a number of other initiatives and contexts.

### Recommendations

- Increased CG identification with a GFP vision and strategy, with less emphasis on individual member group identities, to enhance joint programming and implementation.
- Harmonization of M&E and communication processes within pilot countries.
- Further work towards creating a flow of communication to ensure an exchange of knowledge and information from the local to the global levels.
- Concentration on concrete impacts of projects – monitoring and evaluation, strengthening existing processes and platforms when possible rather than creating new ones, clarifying focus on investing in locally controlled forestry.
- Support the implementation of the work plan agreed with the ILCF stakeholders (G3 and investors) and develop: 1. typology of investment models; 2. ILCF principles or guidelines; 3. an investment process model; and 4. information on innovative mechanisms for increasing and securing investment.

- Steer the development of key tools, analyses, and initiatives to better use and link existing data, in close consultation with the G3 and potential investors, to guide and support greater and improved investment in locally controlled forestry.
- Provide support to the rights holders groups to strengthen their role, recognition and influence networks and policy influence within the forestry sector at international and regional level. Create knowledge on ILCF.
- Strengthening links with other innovative and partnership initiatives so as to increase shared learning.
- Developing a longer term strategy for post-2011 work and diversifying income sources should be a priority (e.g. work on funding mechanisms), as the existing dependence on a single donor poses serious sustainability risks.