**FINAL REPORT [Insert Country]:**

**FFF PHASE I**

**[Name of Facilitator]**

**[Please follow the instructions in yellow and then delete all yellow text. Leave the black text in place. Please be as concrete and numerical as possible and pay particular attention to the sections on baselines and indicators of progress at IMPACT and OUTCOME levels]**

**1. Vision, desired impact and outcomes of the FFF**

The FFF **vision** is that “*Smallholders, communities and indigenous people’s organisations have improved their livelihoods and the decision-making over forest and farm landscapes”.* The **impact** that FFF would like to achieve is that **“**Smallholder, women, community and Indigenous Peoples groups have improved income and food security from sustainable forest and farm management”.

FFF **activities** are organised under **three pillars, four outcomes, and nine outputs** as follows:

Outcome 2

Producers are organized for sustainable business

Outcome 1

Producers are organized for policy dialogue

Outcome 3

Cross-sectorial policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

Outcome 4

National and global agendas are informed about the priorities of local producers

Pillar 1: Strengthen producer organizations for business and policy engagement

Pillar 2: Catalyze multi-sectorial policy platforms

Pillar 3: Link local voices to global processes.

Output 1.1 Dispersed local producers are organized into effective and gender inclusive groups

Output 1.2 Producer groups work together with government and private sector to improve policy

Output 2.1 Producer organizations know about business and can access finance.

Output 2.2 Establishment of services in support of small forest businesses

Output 2.3 Experience sharing between producer organizations in-country

Output 3.1 Establishment and coordination of multi-sectorial policy platforms

Output 3.2 Increased information sharing results in improved understanding and better policies for producer organizations

Output 4.1 Organizations representing local producers influence global processes,

Output 4.2 Learning and practices are shared within and between countries and regions, and globally

The intention of this **final synthesis report** written by national facilitators is to use an agreed format and set of indicators and learning questions to summarise in-country FFF progress under each output. The report has been drafted and presented at an annual stakeholder meeting prior to the conclusion of FFF Phase I to discuss and validate the findings. The report will form the basis for decisions about the countries continuation into FFF Phase II.

**2. Introduction to FFF in XXX country**

[1- page max - Please insert a short stand-alone half page summary for a general audience of how and why FFF started to work in your country, what main FFPO challenges it was set up to address, and what main policy opportunities it sought to take advantage of.

Please summarise the name of each FFPO with whom you developed an LoA, what the budget was, and what the LoA aimed to achieve – this could be in the form of a table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Name of FFPO or LoA recipient | Budget | Aim – in one sentence |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

]

# **3. Summary Page – Impacts achieved**

[1 page max - This is the first of two key pages which will *summarise* the total impact of what you achieved through FFF Phase I in terms of livelihoods (income, security) and forests (sustainability). It should be short, sharp and brilliant – and capture the main success stories that you would want to share with other countries! Before you write this section, fill in the M&L tables below. Please then provide the following information:

**Pillar 1. FFPOs organized for sustainable business**

PILLAR 1. Names of FFPOs supported, numbers of members (men / women) what they produced, plus one sentence highlight for each on what FFF support achieved in terms of better livelihoods or forest sustainability – with numbers (income, hectares) where possible.

**Pillar 2. FFPOs organized to improve policy outcomes**

PILLAR 2. Names and interactions between policy platforms created or supported by FFF, plus one sentence highlight of the main policies influenced and how that improved livelihoods or forest sustainability – with numbers (income, hectares) where possible.

**Pillar 3. FFPOs organized to exchange and improve knowledge**

PILLAR 3. Nature and number of exchanges or participation in events regionally or internationally, plus one sentence highlights of main changes adopted by FFPOs or the agendas they intended to influence and how that improved livelihoods and forest sustainability – with numbers (income, hectares) where possible.

# **4. Summary page – Lessons learned**

[1 page max. Before you write this section, fill in the M&L tables below, please pay particular attention to answering the reflective learning questions. Use those answers to think through what the main lessons have been about supporting FFPOs to improve livelihoods and forest sustainability (what has worked, what could be done differently, what was unexpectedly useful). This is your chance to tell the reader why the approach you developed in FFF was so successful – and deserves continued funding].

**5. Monitoring and Learning – Final Assessment Table (FAT)**

[Please fill in every section of this table – paying particular attention this time to the grey impact and coloured outcome sections]

| **Result level** | **Measurable Indicators** | **Baseline conditions – How were things when FFF started for each indicator marked in bold?** | **Progress for each indicator by the end of the first phase of FFF** | **How do you know this? (evidence – reports, presentations etc.)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact:**  *Smallholder, women, community and Indigenous Peoples groups have improved income and food security from sustainable forest and farm management* | *Impact indicator 1*: Perception of changes in **business marketing capacity and income** (females and males) |  |  |  |
| *Impact indicator 2*: Perceptions of changes in **diversity and abundance of forest resources** (male/female) |  |  |  |
| *Impact indicator 3*: Perceptions of changes in the level of **diversity of income generation activities** |  |  |  |
| **Pillar 1: Strengthening producer groups for business and policy engagement** | | | | |
| **Outcome 1:**  *Producers are organised for policy engagement* | *Were there any examples of specific new or changed* ***policies, regulations and rules*** *enacted (including access to resources, land titles, community forestry certificates) that resulted from policy engagements by forest farm producer representatives (OI1.1)* |  |  |  |
| *Has this policy work resulted in any relevant* ***principles for sustainable forest and farm management*** *being mainstreamed into national policies and planning? (OI1.2)* |  |  |  |
| Output 1.1  *Dispersed local producers are organised into effective and gender inclusive groups* | **Learning questions Output 1.1**  What encourages people to join groups or discouraged them and why? (LQ1.1.1)  How can groups best be encouraged to associate at higher levels (e.g. regional or national federations?) (LQ1.1.2)  How can representativeness in producer groups be increased (e.g. for women, youth etc)? (LQ1.1.3)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result: | | | |
| How many forest **producer groups** were formed, using what names, and where? How many male and female members do they have? Describe the main steps in the process (I1.1.1) |  |  |  |
| Did the **group(s) representation** adequately reflect everyone? (Women? Youth? Marginalised groups?) (I1.1.2) |  |  |  |
| How many **women leaders** were there out of all leaders? (I1.1.3 and 1.1.4) |  |  |  |
| How many **meetings to decide on their priorities** did the group hold and what were they? Describe the groups priorities and main activities to date (I1.1.5) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| Output 1.2  *Producer groups work together with Government and Private sector to improve policy* | **Learning questions Output 1.2**  What do local forest farm producer organizations need more of, to link together to plan effectively at regional and national levels? (LQ1.2.1)  How is consultation about policy issues with Forest farm producer group members carried out and is it reaching the harder to reach? (LQ1.2.2)  How can truly collaborative policy dialogues be designed and structured in ways that respect the role of forest farm producers? (LQ1.2.3)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| How many **policy meetings attended by representatives of forest and farm producer groups** were there? (I1.2.1) |  |  |  |
| How many were the particular **policies / policy processes targeted by representatives of forest farm producer organisations**? What were these? What specific changes to those policies / processes did those representatives wish to see? (I1.2.2) |  |  |  |
| What was the **number of either men and women from forest and farm producer groups that held a decision making position** in the targeted policy making process? (I1.2.3) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2:  *Producers are organised for business* | *How many forest farm producer organisations have either* ***diversified or added value to their products*** *in some way through the activities of FFF (verified through perception of FFPOs)? (OI2.1)* |  |  |  |
| *How many forest farm producer organisations are now* ***accessing new finance*** *through the work of the FFF (broken down into male and female members)? (OI2.2)* |  |  |  |
| Output 2.1  *Producer organizations know about business and can access finance* | **Learning questions Output 2.1**  What are the best tactics to increase knowledge among forest farm producer organisations about the practicalities of business development? (LQ2.1.1)  Do forest farm producer organisations have access to and control over funding to support business development and what more can be done? (LQ2.1.2)  Is support funding being allocated to the priorities identified by forest farm producer organisations? (LQ2.1.3)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| Following FFF intervention, what is the perception of forest farm producers of their improved **ability to access markets** (I2.1.1) |  |  |  |
| How many **sustainable business plans** were developed by forest farm producer organisations as a result of FFF activities? (I2.1.2) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| Output 2.2  *Establishment of services in support of small forest businesses* | **Learning questions Output 2.2**  Is the variety and nature of business and technical service provision useful and improving for forest farm producer organisations through FFF facilitation? (LQ2.2.1)  What is needed to improve access of forest farm producer organisations to such service provision? (LQ2.2.2)  Is access to finance improving for forest farm producer organisations? (LQ2.2.3)  How has increased investment at a local level impacted forest ecosystems? (LQ2.2.4)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| How many new resources and / or actors have been linked or engaged for **service provision** by forest farm producer organisations through the work of FFF? (I2.2.1) |  |  |  |
| What is the **main type of service provision being offered** to forest farm producer organisations? (how is this serving both men and women?) (I2.2.2) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| Output 2.3  *Experience sharing between producer organizations in-country* | **Learning questions Output 2.3**  What made the exchange visits useful for that forest farm producer organisation? (RQ2.3.1)  What topic should exchange visits focus on in the future and why? (RQ2.3.2)  How frequent and long, should these exchanges be? (RQ2.3.3)  Changes or adaptation in that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| Describe highlights from any **in-country exchange visits** that forest farm producer organisations took part in? (I2.3.1) |  |  |  |
| What **new practices, plans and systems adopted afterwards** were there from the place where they visited? (I2.3.2) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| **Pillar 2: Catalyzing multi-sectorial policy platforms** | | | | |
| Outcome 3:  *Cross-sectorial policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management* | *Indicator 3.1: # of* ***new or changed policies, regulations, rules*** *enacted improving the national enabling environment and enhancing POs ability for SFM and livelihoods* |  |  |  |
| Output 3.1 *Establishment and coordination of multi-sectorial policy platforms* | **Learning questions Output 3.1**  How can different ministries be most effectively brought together to make integrated decisions over forest landscapes and how can the momentum be maintained? (LQ3.1.1)  What factors ensure effective participation by all parties? (LQ3.1.2)  What role do forest farm producer organisation representatives play and how is this changing over time? (LQ3.1.3)  How is the participation of forest farm producer organisations changing decision making and what specific examples exist of this? (LQ3.1.4)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| How many **multi-sectoral policy fora** have been established and or strengthened at country and regional levels? Please describe their names and main objectives. (I3.1.1) |  |  |  |
| What has been the **nature and level of direct representation** by forest farm producer group (female and male members) in key platforms (I3.1.2) |  |  |  |
| How many **decisions taken that directly reflect Forest Farm producer organisation presence and inputs** have there been? Please describe what these were (I3.1.3) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| Output 3.2  *Increased information sharing results in improved understanding and better policies for producer organisations* | **Learning questions Output 3.2**  What changes at the landscape level and the community level best illustrate improved information sharing processes? (LQ3.2.1)  Are benefits from participation in these platforms real and tangible – and if so, what is the evidence for this? (LQ3.2.2)  Are some being left out of the process and benefits? If so how can we correct this? (LQ3.2.3)  Have any inter-ministerial inconsistencies and jurisdiction (legislation etc) affecting POs been identified and resolved? (LQ3.2.4)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| To what extent do producers perceive an increase in their **understanding of how government operates** – through participation in policy platforms? (I3.2.1) |  |  |  |
| How many **new networks/contacts resulting in new opportunities for forest farm producer organisations** have been gained through participation in these platforms? (I3.2.2) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| **Pillar 3: Linking local voices to global processes** | | | | |
| Outcome 4: *National and global agendas are informed about the priorities of local producers* | *Indicator 4.1: # of* ***regional and global decision making processes*** *engaged and aware of PO priorities* |  |  |  |
| *Indicator 4.2:* ***representation of POs at regional and global initiatives*** |  |  |  |
| Output 4.1 *Organizations representing local producers influence global processes* | **Learning questions Output 4.1**  Are existing communication channels linking forest farm producer organisations to global processes easy to access and effective – how can these be facilitated? (LQ4.1.1)  How are international or national initiatives on forests reflecting the knowledge and needs of forest farm producer organisations (LQ4.1.2)  How do we increase two way communication so experiences are shared back to constituencies and members? (LQ4.1.3)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| How many **strategies and / or mechanisms for representative planning and advocacy** been developed either regionally / globally? (I4.1.1) |  |  |  |
| To what extent did representatives of forest farm producer organisations provide **report backs from regional and global levels to constituencies** at national and local levels? (I4.1.2) |  |  |  |
| What examples are there where **global policies and mechanisms vital to forest farm producer organisations were shaped** through FFF supported engagements? (I4.1.3) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |
| Output 4.2  *Learning and practices are shared within and between countries and regions, and globally* | **Learning questions Output 4.2**  Is there a regular and effective communication between producer groups and international institutions? (LQ4.2.1)  What kind of information sharing, duration and numbers at information sharing events is most useful to forest farm producer organisations based on feedback from them? (LQ4.2.2)  How can priorities be established and shared to help guide decision making on where to invest time and resources in the future? (LQ4.2.3)  Changes or adaptation that were made to FFF activities as a result | | | |
| How many targeted FFF related **communication materials** have been carried out to spread findings beyond one country? (I4.2.1) |  |  |  |
| How many **information sharing events** between forest farm producer organisations from different countries?. (I4.2.2) |  |  |  |
| Describe **highlights from each of those information sharing events**? (I4.2.3) |  |  |  |
| *Country level indicator to be added if required* |  |  |  |

**6. The monitoring and learning process – and response to mid-term evaluation**

[Please provide a short paragraph about how you managed the monitoring and learning process in your country on an annual basis, what worked well and how it could be improved in the future

Please describe how you addressed the main recommendations of the mid-term evaluation – specifically to:

* How you continued building *political momentum* to support the development priorities of forest and farm smallholders
* How you improved the *value chain development* approach by adding elements which focus on value addition, processing and market linkages
* How you enhance support to the development of *women’s entrepreneurship* in forest and farm-based value chains
* How you improved *inclusion of youth* in FFPO activities]

**7. One best human interest story**

[From all the work you have done, write one single one-page story which tells how a particular person or group benefitted from the work of FFF Phase I and what steps made that happen. Add a nice photo if available].

**8. Lessons learned that need to be applied in FFF Phase II**

[Please think about the lessons that you have learned during the implementation of FFF Phase I, both what went well, and where you felt there was a need for a different approach. Please record these lessons under the headings ‘Things to do more of’ and ‘Things that need to be adjusted’]

**9. Future sustainability**

[Please record any decisions that have been taken during the final M&L meeting day 2 with in-country partners and donors – about the sort of ongoing support that can be expected outside FFF for the continuation of the work to build on the foundation established by FFF Phase I. The stronger the in-country support for ongoing work is, the stronger the justification will be for FFF to continue its programme of work in that country]

**10. Documentation**

[Please provide a complete list of any reports, published or unpublished (including minutes of meetings), that the FFF programme has developed during its in-country activities – using the format described below. This list should be a complete record of anything written down. Please include copies of any new documents not already sent to FFF in annex 1

Name of authoring person (s) or institution (s). (Year) Title of document. Type of document. Institution, town, country. Available at: [include website or institution where document is stored]

For example

MERN (2014) National exchange of forest and farm producer organisations in Myanmar in Kalaw Township, Shan State from 1-3 April 2014. Project report.Myanmar Environmental Rehabilitation and conservation Network, Yangon, Myanmar. Available from FFF office, FAO, Rome.]

**Annex 1…Insert full project documents as annexes**