



Forest and Farm Facility

Virtual Retreat 1, 3, 7, and 8 December 2020



Day 1 - 1st December 2020

Session Output 1.1— The FFPOs have clear advocacy agendas that represent all their members' interest

FFPOs making their voice heard and raising the interests of their members in Government agendas at country and regional level

In Ghana, GhaFFap members have a working relationship with members of the parliament to provide inputs to the draft Agricultural national law. FFPOs are trying to use their role strategically aiming at increasing recognition and voice to advocate for needs. The approach is action oriented and always pushing to achieve their objective in advocacy.

In Nepal, FECOFUN has a strong voice in raising the issues and in providing strategies to the Government. For examples, the inclusion of the voice of community forestry is due to the large base of FECOFUN with good capacity and knowledge of the issues. FECOFUN has been lobbying for a reconsideration of the criteria of the Scientific Forest Management programme which has been going against by the forestry community because this is decreasing timber value. Such formula is not harvesting timber value but rather removing the ownership identity form the communities. The management is also not transparent.

In Bolivia, the honey in Santa Cruz represents a new initiative to develop a national incentive programme to strengthen the honey production in that region and then nationally. Similar to the incentive programmes for cacao, coffee in Chiquitania.

AFA supported national members to be part of the national farmers associations to ensure young farmers' needs were included. This is a good experience of youth empowerment.

Questions:

1. Has the greater inclusion of women's and youth changed the focus and priorities of the FFPOs in countries?
2. Has an advocacy strategy been identified in the countries?

AMPB: In the context of COVID, the role of the women was crucial for the policy and advocacy action because they influenced the local Government. In Costa Rica and Panama, there is a programme for climate resilience where representatives of women's group discussed the issues at local level first.

Session Output 1.2- Cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder policy processes strengthened with better representation from forest and farm producers

FFF support to cross-sectoral processes are ongoing despite Covid-19 set backs

In Ecuador, FFPOs are supported in the NAPO province to involve them in the national and local exchange with other producers to involve them in the dedicated programmes. Through such initiative the FFPOs show how the Chakra system work and also ensure the legacy of the ancestral knowledge which is based upon.

In Bolivia, the national development bank is now active and the FFPOs were supported in accessing the financial services offered. In addition, discussions with the Government are ongoing to adequately involve FFPOS in the Covid-19 agriculture recovery in the implementation phase.

In Vietnam, the advocacy through the multistakeholder cross-sectoral roundtables has good results and works systematically at several level (commune, district and province level).

Question: What are the challenges in trying to influence the policy and legislative processes by the FFPOs given the number of factors (elections and agendas) that often lead the Government agenda?

In Zambia, through the FFF work the government became interested in changing the charcoal law. Government representatives were invited to witness the value chain process which triggered reflections at institutional level. In particular, the work on the policy agenda was recognized being valid in terms of ideas, methodology. Beyond this level in fact we (FFF facilitators) find it challenging to influence the processes.

In Togo, we focus on sustainable management of protected area, which is often threatened by the crop agriculture. The strategy of involving the local government in the platforms of the different stakeholders such as cotton producers and the FFPOs has being successful in sharing values and discussing of and sustainable natural resources management.

Session Output 2.1- FFPOs have capacity to deliver targeted business incubation services to their members

FFPOs contributed to the business incubation services sharing – in some cases- innovative business mentality and models. Civil and land rights at risks of violations in the name of Covid-19 precautionary measures by the Governments.

Enterprise development section in **Bolivia, Kenya and Nepal** show results such as entrepreneurs, the business schools and incubation centres. Is there a real sign that FFPO are taking over the business responsibilities?

In Vietnam, is there a business incubation centre. Are these business schools really making the difference?

Answer: these are the first steps to build the business incubation inside the VNFU decentralized offices. The countries and the organizations have seen the need to have a much more business mentality and to think about businesses, not just production.

In the aftermath of the Covid-19 crisis the organizations are ready to seize the business opportunities to help governments in reactivating the economy.

In Bolivia, Family Farming production has become even more central in the government agenda.

Kenya, Covid-19 posed challenges but also benefits. For example, the lemon and ginger farmers benefitted from the market shifts in terms of high demand. In Bolivia, also the price increased benefitted few farmers but this must be built up with strong network.

In Nepal, a business advisory committee embedded in FECUFUN is giving advise to entrepreneurs and farmers to identify viable products in the Covid-19 era.

Business incubation **in Togo** gives the energy to the CTOP affiliated organizations to be supported and then regional incubation centres were developed. CTOP used this knowledge and experience to develop synergies with other organizations and eventually resulted in supporting 201 business plan in 2019.

Civil and land rights at risks

Levis, **APMB** reported that in order to reactivate the economy due to Covid-19 setbacks many governments (which countries?) enacted policies violating community rights and that is a threat.

Day 2 - 3rd December

Session Output 2.2 - FFPOs (and their members) have improved access to business, marketing and financial services.

Experiences on financial services from the countries

Ghana presented how VSLA functions: each member of a group does a contribution and the funds remains physically in a sealed box. 90% of VSLA groups are made by women. At the end of the year the group will share out the percentual measure they contributed. These internal loans could fund group work when access to banks remains difficult. At the end of the year this is a potential for investment. In Ghana the VSLA type of investment still fails to be used for the collective interest.

In Ecuador, with UNORCAC the revolving fund started to be used by the women's groups. What were the challenges? These were FAO bureaucracy related. The Covid-19 crises shifted the focus on food production and delivery leaving aside anything else.

Question from Hugo: Has there been cases where FFPOs come together as clusters to jointly apply for loans/finance? Is a case to be made for the FFPO trying to go from individual to collective base (several FFPOs) to improve their chance of collateral? It is difficult to merge value chains, landscapes and interest of several FFPOS.

Zambia: ZNFU had put in place a financial scheme described by Hugo. This was done for specific food commodities which were assessed by the bank. The Swedish Government acted as guarantee.

Session Output 3.1- FFPOs contribution in climate and landscape level programs has increased the outreach of these programs

Challenges in mitigating climate change by the FFPOS effects seems to be in the area of knowledge

Bolivia had been hardly hit by wild fires since two years. In the Chiquitania region 5 million Ha of land are burnt. In order to normalize and streamline the burning for agricultural purposes (push from forest land to crop land) the Government is failing in producing such law.

Question from Pauline: Is there a weakness from FFPO in demonstrating capacities to have climate change knowledge. Is it awareness or the knowledge that is missing?

In Zambia, there are gaps in sharing and interpreting the knowledge as this is available. In Madagascar, farmers have learnt about climate change thanks to FFF only recently.

Session Output 3.2- FFPOs have mainstreamed climate change into their operations

Question by Jhony, How can FFF move beyond delivering trainings and expand the focus on the impacts to be achieved thanks to those trainings.

In Ghana, there is a good example of some planning and potential interventions for Forest and Landscape Restoration (FLR).

The agroecology transition is important to achieve output 3.2. Many FFF countries reported on this topic. Is this the way to go?

Action Points:

- Elvis to share more info on VSLA how does it work
- Kisoyan mentioned to request the amount of Ha for FFPO directly in the LoA and land measurements

Gender session

The need to work more on women's access to productive resources is a challenge for FFF

The gender continuum allowed FFF to design the gender strategy for phase II. The programme moved from being gender aware. The question is: Where do we see FFF now?

There is no consensus on where FFF should be placed on the gender continuum. Somewhere between the gender responsive and gender transformative phase, probably.

Gender is a core objective of the programme. However, the FFF logframe does not include any specific indicators and does not monitor the mainstreaming of gender principles thoroughly.

In the Savannah zone of **Ghana**, the shea produced by women has now been taken at landscape scale. Protecting women's value chains has been a priority in 2020. In **Zambia** the FFPOs can be estimated being on 30 percent on gender transformative and 70 percent on gender transformative. At analytical level we should work on the drivers for inequality.

The access of women to productive resources (including land, but also access to finance, information and extension services) is one of the key challenges in partner countries. In 2019-20, these challenges have been worked on to some extend.

Question from Anna: We want to know where the challenges lay at country level? Is it linked to economic empowerment?

The cross-cutting nature of gender makes it often not that visible in the reporting. Furthermore, outcome 3 has so far seen a slower involvement of women in the FFF activities with FFPOs.

Action Points on Gender:

- Among the mitigation measures, communication tools can be helpful to provide women the adequate literacy to overcome barriers. Visual communication can be useful.
- Share more gender and tenure information with Aurélien (ROPPA).
- Anna to share the gender tool with everyone.
- Take this interesting discussion on gender forward and develop a strategy to better monitor progress with regards to gender equality in FFF implementation.

Day 3 - 7th December

Session Output 4.1 - FFPOs have systems in place to provide social and cultural services (targeting the most vulnerable members)

Social services are diverse and reflect values that are different to direct economic output

In Bolivia technical assistance is complementary and provided by the Government to the FFPOs producing coffee and cocoa. As this assistance does not get to every FFPO, FFF complements such assistance to prioritize the production activities.

In Togo, the ecosystems services where the tourists come and experience with social tourism, living with communities. Covid -19 posed challenges to meet the travel restrictions and affect the income of the FFPOs and communities.

Action points:

To allow more specific support towards services that are not necessarily productive oriented (the business) but that can allow for investment in social and cultural services that we know FFPO's value and often do channel investment (however small or big) towards. By not specifying what to monitor here, we allow for that cultural and social diversity that we know exist. Maintaining the flexibility to choose how to invest in these services seem important, as they are so diverse and reflect values that are different to direct economic output.

Session Output 4.2 - FFPOs link their social and cultural development agenda to national SDG process and other governmental development processes

There is need to refocus output 4.2 as seems not to allow the results to emerge clearly

Reporting against this output happens also under other outputs, this should therefore be addressed.

Togo and Madagascar are indirectly reporting on O4 as they will have O4 in their work from their second year.

Communication related results seem not so visible in the reporting for this output. However, we still have time to complete the annual report.

2020 has been a special year and collective action has demonstrated to be more important than ever. However, FFF communication needs to be shown and gain more visibility, especially at

country level. The same approach should be implemented within FAO. For example, the Hand in Hand initiative should reflect more the notion of small private sector. This can be done also through communicating the results.

Action points:

- Need to gather information from the FFPOs and with COVID this has become more challenging.
- Need to support FFPOs to promote social services and work with Covid-19 and to contribute to the SDGs.

Communication Session

IIED has been more responsive to the communication needs of the FFPOs.

Communication team wants to improve the analysis of the levels of the results.

Facilitators in the countries underlines a lack of communication specialists and capacities locally.

IUCN has invested a lot of energy in the story map and highlighted that more data gathering on FFPOs would contribute enormously to advocate for FFPOs.

There are fantastic stories received from countries and NFOI (FAO Forestry outreach team) is proud to make it visible with FFF team. They rely on the first-hand info coming from the facilitators (even bullet points). FFF is one of the rare programme of FAO to deliver such concrete achievements on the ground.

Major national events were well covered by FAO regional and national offices who published press releases and webstories, with support with NFOI and FFF teams. Country teams have successfully placed national events news in the local press. Ways to share regularly successful activities undertaken under LoAs that would deserve promotion at global level done by the FFF communication team need to be discussed.

Discussion:

How can we improve information flow between facilitator and FFF communication team? What would be the most appropriate channel to provide insights from the ground in order to promote and analyze results regularly during the year and not only at the end of the year?

A specific budget for communication in the LoAs could help in promoting locally and globally the results. Communication should be budgeted in LoAs if there is a clear objective in the communication LoA work plan. However, there might be communication indirect activities and results that cannot be foreseen when designing the work plan of an LoA.

Dedicated communication platforms are existing and FFF could use them. For example, in Kenya, the Christian organization allowed FF SPAK to post on its wall the climate change adaptation activities. Twitter accounts of FFPOs could also be used more.

Specific communication strategies could be developed for each FFPOs with ComDev support. The cross cutting support on the ground is needed.

The software Wochit will be used to develop short videos to document country activities at low cost. 15 videos are planned for next year. Facilitators are invited to send to FFF team some footage recorded with smartphone during their field mission.

Human stories will be continued to be developed as they allow to raise awareness about the role of rural farmer and their organizations, and are a good way to call for action, and to engage and connect with audiences

Action Points:

- Identification with facilitators of next human stories.
- Facilitator to send to FFF communication team footage for country video.
- Facilitators to alert FFF communication team when major successful activities deserve promotion/outreach at global level.

Messages collected through the chat:

FFF mission

- FFF is positioning FFPOs at the center of climate change resilient livelihood and resilient landscapes
- Building FFPO capacity for resilient livelihoods
- Enhanced FFPOs in business incubation with Forest and Landscape Restoration

FFF impact

- FFF increases direct funding to FFPO by private sector organizations and donors for livelihoods improvement and landscape management.
- Empowered and prosperous communities in secure ecosystems

Key messages

- Strength in numbers, basket of products, resilient landscapes and livelihoods
- Building prosperity

Day 4- 8th December

Update on spent 2020 budget, LoAs, FORIS

Action points

- FFF coaches and Tatiana to send to facilitators supplementary information on how to prepare the workplan for the whole year. In the meant time we will be working on the country budget.
- Thang, Issifou and Francesca to look into problems with saving their inputs in FORIS

Question from Vincent: Will the Direct Beneficiaries Grants (DBGs) be included in the work planning of 2021? We have the manual cleared and this is ready to be piloted on the ground in Kenya and other countries, if willing.

In Nepal the Service provider have to be included in a national register that makes the LoA process with FAO challenging. Hopefully DBGs can be excluded from this national registration process. That is way in Nepal use Contracts category.

Work Plan session

The following are the inputs from each facilitator shared in plenary about the strong and innovative ideas they learnt from other facilitators during this retreat. These potential areas of work could be included in the country work plan or regional or global exchanges for 2021.

Geoffrey- Socio economic perspective on charcoal (Agricultura and Vita) presented by Vincent.

Action points: More information to the requested to Vincent. Also, synergies to be explored for Tanzania and Zambia.

Elvis - Zambian and Kenyan models are interesting about charcoal experience which might have an uptake in Ghana. Also, Zambia has a lot to teach from their collaboration with financial institutions.

Kisoyan - all the ideas look great! Interested on what Ecuador is doing in supporting indigenous communities to support the equitable value chains and eco-labeling. Also, in Ghana the experience on access to finance e.g. VSLA. The challenge would be to contextualize.

Vincent - in Madagascar the network for women's organizations is something we are also interested. In Kenya it is interesting the basket of products to mitigate disasters.

Andry - the initiative from Ghana about green and sustainable charcoal as in Madagascar at the east coast this is poorly managed and interest in Togo on investment in appropriate equipment.

Issifou - the basket of product from Kenya. The sustainable charcoal production is also interesting. At regional level the land tenure security can help to address these issues to better implement outcome 3. Also interest in VSLA presented by Ghana.

Virginia - VSLA in Ghana is good for Ecuador to learn how to improve the access to financial mechanisms for FFPOs to highlight that there are other sources of finance besides grants which also relates to improve the accountability of the FFPOs. This a topic for a regional exchange.

Boris - Basket of Products and the basket of finance for basket of products in Kenya are interesting to recuperate the effect of climate change and Covid-19 . The short value chain initiative could also be interesting to work on in Bolivia.

Thang - the tree inventory from Tanzania and Kenya. If trees can become valuable, they can be used to increase financial opportunities (collateral).

Racchya - 1) the basket of products to develop the entrepreneurial aspect of it; 2) FFPOs contribution to ecosystem services for conservation from Ecuador; 3) promotion of eco-tourism post-Covid.

Questions from Hugo Navajas, Mid Term Evaluation of FFF

Action points to all facilitators to send inputs by December 31. This is a voluntary contribution which would help the Mid Term Evaluation of FFF.

- How can the FFF best support medium-term processes within a small grants framework, as reflected in the LoA modality? For example, how can the program best influence or accompany policy/legislative cycles, or build climate resilience on a landscape scale in ways that can be measured over time?
- Are there operational or administrative aspects that you feel require adjustments during the remainder of Phase II? For example, there were discussions on adjusting the LoA modality, lowering the level of "FAO bureaucracy", and piloting the Direct Beneficiary Grant (DBG) as a "user friendly" alternative to the LoA. Are there other options for providing support in a more cost-effective manner - for example by supporting groups of FFPOs on initiatives of common interest (pooling resources and logistics, sharing services and technical expertise) in a manner that improves delivery or reduces administrative costs?
- Is there a case to be made for earmarking a small portion of the LoA grants for micro-investment/acquisition of equipment by FFPOs? Some stakeholders have suggested this as a way to improve LoA delivery and effectiveness.
- How can the FFF's gender approach be strengthened to improve the FFFs relevance and contribution to the transformation stage of the gender continuum?
- Are there any suggestions for improving the link/contribution of the Monitoring & Learning processes to the delivery of programme outcomes?
- Does the Theory of Change offer a useful tool for programme planning and implementation at the country level? Do you feel that the utility of the ToC can be strengthened, and if so how?
- Managing growth: What aspects of the FFF may need to be adjusted if the programme expands its resource base with additional funding, and incorporates new countries or broadens activities in core countries? What changes are suggested to cope with the increased dynamic and workload?

Concluding remarks from David Kaimowitz

Interesting to listen to get the chance to meet each of the participants. There is a unity in the diversity in the fact that we are different individuals coming from different contexts with a common mission and commitment to support grassroots organizations to meet the challenges they are facing. We share the belief that coming together at local level is key. Like plant and animal systems, together we support each other, we complement each other in a generous manner. We all are willing to create a healthy working environment to share and to really try to bring what is best from your own experience. This approach is extremely motivating. What defines peoples is not the external challenges they face (it could be COVID, FAO bureaucracy, or changes in government) but their ability to find creative solutions that allow to move ahead. It can be for example, as we heard a metal box in a village where women put money in it or a complex grant mechanism.

We have discussed at policy level how taxations and finance can be challenging but also how grassroots organizations are better heard in policy discussions.

In business incubation how do we improve the inclusivity for FFPOs to try to raise funding from a different sources of capital, and marketing questions whether short distance or e-commerce.

On the climate change I have the sense that we have more work to do on clear set of messages about what we bring to the table, in particular on climate adaptation and restoration.

Outcome 4 is really important. There is a question on indicators. We need to recognize that “rural” is not only producer organization. People get together not only to produce and get better access to the market, but for cohesions, for identity, and gender reasons. There is an overall need for organization. . Have we asked the basic questions on women’s rights?

On monitoring: it is very important to define indicators to get what we need to be able to tell our stories, lessons and key policy messages to be shared with different audiences to push our agenda forward. It is a communication issue. We need to think what will serve us politically, and to bring this complex issue to policy makers.

Communication is key but we are a very small programme with limited budget, therefore we need to be strategic. We should not add more products but we should be cutting out. We need to think how to position FFPOs politically and economically, and what is going to move our agenda forward.

Resource mobilization is not RM for FFF but is for the communities, for the organizations. How can we use our resources to make these FFPOs able to leverage at scale, and to get millions to continue focusing on their work.

There is a possibility to bring all this together. How do we want to convince about the importance of grassroots democracy for climate resilience and improved livelihoods to get more support to FFPOs.

Agenda

FFF Virtual Retreat 2020

Coordinator retreat and note taker: Francesca Guarascio

Time	Topic	Chair /Time
Day One - 1st December, 2020		
14:00-14:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening remarks Introduction of new FFF manager Full team welcoming including OED lead evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sophie welcoming (2 minutes) Andrew opening remarks (5 minutes) David (10 minutes) Sophie moderates presentation of participants (15 minutes) <p>Jhony Agenda, objectives, how will be the discussions around the outputs, role of the time keeper (10 minutes)</p>
14:45– 17:00 Time keeper Virginia	<p>Discussion based on the power point presentations on</p> <p>Outputs 1.1</p> <p>Output 1.2</p> <p>Output 2.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Output 1.1 Chair Racchya – Nepal (45 minutes = 15 min presentation and 30 min discussion) Output 1. 2 Chair Thang – Vietnam (45 minutes) Output 2.1 Chair Boris – Bolivia (45 minutes) Pauline will support the chairs on regional level results/challenges The chairs will include and present any results and challenges on Indigenous People/Ethnic Minorities in each output Anna will support the chairs of the session with Learning Questions
17:00 – 17:15	Highlights of the 1 st day exchange	Noora, Agricord
<p>Day Two – 3rd December 2020</p> <p>https://fao.zoom.us/j/94554873234</p> <p>Meeting ID: 945 5487 3234</p> <p>Passcode: RetreatFFF</p> <p>Moderator Kisoyan</p>		
14:00 – 16:15	<p>Discussion based on the power point presentations on</p> <p>Output 2.2.</p> <p>Output 3.1</p> <p>Output 3.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Output 2.2 Chair Virginia – Ecuador (45 minutes) Output 3.1 Chair Andry – Madagascar (45 minutes) Output 3.2 Chair Issifou – Togo (45minutes)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pauline will support the chairs on regional level results/challenges The chairs will include and present any results and challenges on Indigenous People/Ethnic Minorities in each output Duncan will support the chairs of the session with Learning Questions
16:15- 16:25	Tanzania FFF programme implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geofrey Bakanga (10 minutes)
16:25– 17:00	Focus on Gender results and challenges in all Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elvis- Ghana (45 minutes) <p>Svea & Anna to coordinate interventions with Elvis on gender related results/challenges for the remaining time)</p>
17:00 – 17:15	Highlights of the 2 nd day exchange	Pauline, IUCN
<p align="center">Day Three – 7th December, 2020 https://fao.zoom.us/j/94554873234 Meeting ID: 945 5487 3234 Passcode: RetreatFFF</p>		
14:00-15:15 Moderator Thang	<p>Discussion based on the power point presentations on Output 4.1</p> <p>Output 4.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Output 4.1 Vincent – Zambia (45minutes) Output 4.2 Kisoyan – Kenya (45 minutes) <p>Pauline will support the chairs on regional level results/challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chairs will include and present any results and challenges on Indigenous People/Ethnic Minorities in each output Anna will support the chairs of the session with Learning Questions
15:15 – 17:00	Join forces to implement the FFF Communication Strategy	Moderator Geofrey
15:15 – 15:30	1. Presentation of the FFF com team members (IIED, Com Dev, NFOI, IUCN, AgriCord and FFF HQ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marguerite (FFF) and team
15:30 – 15:35	2. FFF mission – Key messages (ongoing chat)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All participants using the chat.

15:35 – 16:30	3. Highlights of achievements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-creation and sharing knowledge • Strengthening local com capacities • Outreach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National – Global • Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duncan (IIED) - 10 minutes • Mario Acunzo (PSU)- 10minutes • Geoffrey - 15 minutes • Marguerite - 10 minutes
16:30 – 17:00	4. Roadmap to implement the FFF Communication strategy together <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitators list (support needed) • Human stories • Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mario and Marguerite • Marguerite
17:00 – 17:15	Highlights of the 3rd day exchange	Duncan, IIED
<p align="center">Day Four – 8th December 2020 Join Zoom Meeting https://fao.zoom.us/j/98583475386 Meeting ID: 985 8347 5386 Passcode: RetreatFFF</p> <p align="center">Moderator: Elvis</p>		
14:00-16:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on spent 2020 budget, LoAs, FORIS • Work plan 2021 - Identification of priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget - Zoraya (10 minutes) • Update on LoAs- Tatiana (10 minutes) • Update on LoAs in FORIS – Francesca (10 minutes) • Sophie, Jhony and Pauline to coordinate interventions with facilitators and partners on sharing priorities for discussion and synergies with other countries or regional partners (90 minutes)
16:00 – 17:30	Resource Mobilization Reflection from OED team Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giulia- Quick update on Resource Mobilization (10 minutes) • Hugo to share one question with the participants. Brief Q&A session (15 minutes)

	Closing remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duncan to moderate interventions from participants. Open discussion aiming at drawing conclusions towards the objectives of the retreat (50 minutes) • David, in-coming FFF Manager (15 minutes)
--	-----------------	---