



Towards a global forest partnership: Consultation, assessment and recommendations

by the International Institute for
Environment and Development (IIED)

Summary

July 2008



International
Institute for
Environment and
Development

Summary

Towards a global forest partnership: Consultation, assessment and recommendations

Summary

Overview

IIED conducted an independent consultation of the World Bank's preliminary idea of a new global forest partnership. This report presents the findings – suggesting an approach that responds positively to stakeholders' opinions and to analysis of recent experience. The assessment is based on: surveys of stakeholder opinions, through interviews and focus groups in seven countries (Mozambique, Ghana, Brazil, Guyana, India, China, Russia); a supplementary survey of indigenous peoples in Latin America, Asia and Africa; IIED-led interviews with international organisations and finance bodies; a website-based survey open to all interested parties; and analyses of existing partnerships and global forest initiatives. IIED is very grateful for the more than six hundred detailed responses received and for the excellent collaboration of World Bank colleagues and the Exploratory Group that guided the work.

This paper proposes the participatory development of an inclusive, forest stakeholder-driven partnership with global ambition. This could be expected to empower forest stakeholders by: making real connections within the forest sector and across other sectors; increasing responsibility for, and local benefits from, forest global public goods; and by improving the quantity and quality of forest investment. Key elements in a concerted three-year development process are proposed:

- *A global forest partnership Development Group* comprising leading individuals from low- and middle-income countries, working alongside those from a few progressive international governmental, civil society and private organisations.
- *Pilot participatory country processes* focused around 'peoples' forest diagnostics', exploring the real causes of forest problems and identifying policies, institutions and management solutions that work best.
- *Global thematic work* to draw on country processes and engage with areas of international policy flux.
- *Innovative mechanisms* – such as tiered forest stakeholders from national to regional to global levels; networks for research, learning and monitoring; and a menu-based mechanism for technical and financial support – developed and rolled out with the full launch of the gfp.

Informed by more credible, stakeholder-driven information and plans, the partnership may be expected to strongly influence international policy, as well as technical and financial institutions working in forestry, thereby improving their effectiveness and responsiveness to stakeholders. The World Bank – which floated the original GFP idea – would not be a central driver but, like other members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), will be encouraged to engage in the GFP development process. The Bank would have a particular role in funding that process and supporting the outcome.

1. The consultation – seeking stakeholders' views on the World Bank's initial idea of a Global Forest Partnership

Forests and expectations of them are changing rapidly. Attention is increasingly turning to climate change and some new sources of finance are emerging to try to mitigate climate change through forestry. Major changes in forest area and use are expected due to huge growth in demand for food, biofuels, and carbon storage. Forest-dependent communities are claiming their rights to determine forest use. In the face of these changes, there is increasing frustration at the historical failure of actors in the forest community at large to adapt and develop integrated approaches to forest management that really work on the ground.

In recognising these changes, the World Bank took the view that a new approach is urgently needed in the forest sector – one that links changing local needs with the global forest agenda, to capture the value of forests, to reduce incentives for degradation, and to improve the resilience of forest ecosystems and forest-dependent households. Believing that this would require reinforced collaboration between civil society, the private sector, governments and donors at both regional and global levels, the Bank developed an initial concept for a GFP.

To assess whether other stakeholders agreed that such a major shift to effective partnership was needed, and to begin to explore the form that such a shift would take, the World Bank requested IIED to conduct an independent assessment of their GFP concept.

IIED welcomed the chance to seek views and explore the idea. Work began in October 2007 with a concentrated three-month period of consultation with stakeholders. A dedicated website ensured the consultation was open to other interested parties. Although focused on the World Bank's GFP proposal, the consultation was flexible enough to allow stakeholders to suggest broader narratives and ideas. The consultation has been enriched by an independent IIED analysis of the lessons from global forest initiatives in general and partnerships in particular.

A seven-member IIED Team was set up to run the assessment. A further eight independent coordinators were appointed to conduct opinion surveys in seven key low- and middle-income countries and among forest people's groups. Two meetings of a specially constituted, multi-stakeholder GFP Exploratory Committee appointed by the World Bank were held in October 2007 and January 2008 to offer IIED valuable process guidance. The Exploratory Committee also reviewed this draft report in May 2008.

Early priority was given to developing a detailed communications strategy so that as many stakeholders as possible would have access to the consultation in spite of the short time available:

- A 16-page consultation document summarising the World Bank's draft proposal, and a questionnaire seeking views on that proposal, were posted on a website (www.iiedgfpcconsultation.org) in English, French and Spanish. Country processes produced their own Portuguese, Russian and Chinese consultation documents.

- Dozens of global, regional and national newsletters, websites and events were used, with agreement by their sponsors, to inform stakeholders of the GFP consultation and to encourage inputs.
- IIED contacted and interviewed key figures globally, covering major players in (inter)governmental, donor, NGO, business and research fields – including World Bank Group staff in the regions. Direct interviews, focus groups and email correspondence were used.
- A consistent framework for stakeholder surveys was used in seven countries – Mozambique, Ghana, Brazil, Guyana, India, China, Russia – as well as a process designed for indigenous peoples in Latin America, Asia and Africa managed by the Forest Peoples Programme (FPP). These also utilised interviews and focus groups.

A total of 635 detailed responses were received. A very large volume of information was obtained, and IIED is very grateful to all respondents. Stakeholder coverage was good, although many donors and investors were reluctant to offer feedback until a refined concept was developed in 2008, and private sector inputs were lower than hoped for. Regional coverage was good, too – the biggest response came from Latin America at 34% of all responses, followed by Africa at 19%, Asia 15%, international organisations 15%, Europe 7% and Russia/former CIS 6%. The responses were systematically analysed to capture views on the GFP proposal by eight stakeholder types and by country, each of which are summarised in Annexes to this report.

The IIED Team's draft assessment and recommendations were posted on the consultation website in February 2008 – further feedback was invited and pursued. In addition, IIED explored the lessons from partnership approaches to identify governance and operational options; and global and transnational forest initiatives that already cover some of the ground that stakeholders suggest a global forest partnership¹ might cover.

Several limitations to the consultation and assessment process can be noted:

- The time and resources available were less than are allotted for more formal World Bank consultations (e.g. for meeting the Bank's Operational Procedures for consulting with indigenous peoples).
- The World Bank's original GFP proposal was neither provocative enough to elicit a wide range of truly innovative ideas, nor detailed enough to attract precise suggestions or commitments for GFP governance and operations.
- Two themes resonate through the Bank's proposal: the need for the Bank to update its forest business; and the generic potential of working in partnerships at global level. Similarly, some respondents' answers conflated their views on the Bank with their reactions to the proposal's substance.

However, in all, the exercise was well received by respondents, who appreciated the efforts of the World Bank, IIED, country partners and the FPP. Many said that the consultation created both an opportunity and obligation to continue with a participatory approach, and others hoped that the success of this exercise would encourage similar consultative approaches in shaping other global initiatives too.

¹ We use the capitalised term 'the GFP' when referring to the World Bank's specific, original proposal, and 'a gfp' when talking of the broader notion.

2. Findings – a majority of respondents think a global forest partnership would be valuable if it has close links to local priorities

Despite a wide spread of opinions, there was considerable commonality within and between all stakeholder groups as follows.

Consensus that a global forest partnership (gfp) is needed

Justified: Most stakeholders believe that a GFP is justified in principle, largely because current isolated forest initiatives are just not solving a large number of entrenched and escalating forest problems effectively. After 15 years of international talks – shaping ideas and agreements on forests – the time has come for collaborative action, especially to recognise and engage forest stakeholders; build capacities; improve governance; and attract greater investment, so that multiple forest values are developed and sustained.

Bottom-up action: Stakeholders would welcome a GFP if it were more focused on forest stakeholders – around forest-dependent groups and/or ‘defenders of forests’ in other sectors – than suggested in the original GFP proposition. While many said that a GFP should respond to, and integrate efficiently with, existing initiatives, notably the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and national forest programmes (NFPs), more importantly it would need to offer a substantial and new focus on *action* involving forest-dependent stakeholders if it is really to add value.

Cross-sectoral: Similarly, many believed that a new forest partnership would be more robust if it recognised that forests are resources that affect – and are affected by – society as a whole. A GFP would therefore have to reach beyond the ‘forest sector’ alone to cover cross-sectoral issues, recognising and enabling landscape links and multiple livelihoods.

Designed through participation: A majority felt that developing a highly compelling justification for a GFP, launching it, and moving it forward into action, could only be achieved in a credible way through a participatory development process that builds on the current consultation.

Better organised WB forestry work: A majority asserted that there was a separate need and demand for forestry improvements within the World Bank itself, especially if it were to play a role within a GFP – but that, on its own, this was no justification for a global partnership.

A minority felt that no form of GFP is justified, based variously on perceptions: that previous global alliances have been inadequate; that existing viable mechanisms must be supported, not new ones invented (that GFP was a solution in search of a problem); that potential priorities identified by the World Bank could not be addressed in the ways proposed; and that a GFP was unlikely to overcome negative experiences with international organisations including the World Bank.

Views on objectives – broad themes, with targets articulated locally

Agreement on broad themes: Most respondents felt that the objectives in the World Bank’s GFP proposal were sound but too broad, adding little to what has already been agreed globally through the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF), and were too vague to be a clear response to diverse local and national needs. Five themes were confirmed as important, with high levels of agreement across stakeholder categories and countries: (i) governance and capacity improvements including learning and knowledge-sharing networks; (ii) better contribution of forests to enduring poverty reduction; (iii) mainstreaming

of forestry in macro level policy and planning; (iv) climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry; and (v) improving resource mobilisation for sustainable forestry, especially making carbon and environmental funds and markets work for sustainable forestry and livelihoods, and establishing innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable forestry. In terms of preferred activities, most respondents expressed the need for long-term continuity of a large menu of possible activities to suit the precise needs of different countries, in part to counteract the changing ‘fashions’ of donors and international initiatives.

Express the intended outcomes in bottom-up terms: The proposed GFP *targets* were also thought to be too broad, ambiguous and unrealistic, although they did embrace a valid set of actions. A preference was expressed for targets based on specific national and thematic outcomes that would be agreed under a gfp.

Need for a unifying vision: A majority felt the need for some kind of shared, overarching vision, principles or goal to unite partners in a gfp – with an overall focus on (a) linking effective local, national and global initiatives in order to (b) increase forest value for stakeholders, especially for poor groups.

Views on risks in establishing a global forest partnership

Need to slow the process to promote inclusion (but not too slow): There was widespread concern that any ‘global’ construct risks domination by powerful actors and/or the exclusion of other stakeholders/initiatives – notably disenfranchised forest stakeholders. These risks were thought to be highest if the gfp establishment process is rushed and/or led by one organisation alone (which the World Bank recognised, hence its original intention to engage with others). Further risks concern inefficiencies, notably diverting effort and funds away from initiatives that currently work well; and risks associated with some aspects of UN-style governance being applied to a gfp (which a significant number of respondents consider might be too slow and unresponsive to fast-growing pressures on forests, with high transaction costs).

Views on partners and governance of a global forest partnership

With the goals, targets and activities of the original GFP idea thought to be vague, most stakeholders felt it was premature to make specific recommendations concerning partners and governance. A number of useful *governance principles* were expressed both for developing a gfp and for running it (see section 5 below), but relatively few structures were offered. The structural ideas fall into five basic groups, most of them mutually compatible:

1. A group of progressive leaders in forestry and other sectors – to break through political and bureaucratic deadlocks.
2. A movement with forest-dependent/poor groups at the centre – to improve relevance and equity in global forest initiatives.
3. A local–global multi-stakeholder platform – to improve communications and resource flows.
4. A facility to link networks and broker deals – to accelerate action.
5. A reinvigorated Collaborative Partnership on Forests (or core of the CPF) – with other players added to make it more effective².

² The Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) is a partnership of 14 major (mainly UN) forest-related international organisations. Its objectives are to support the work of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and member countries; and enhance cooperation and coordination on forest issues.

Many respondents suggested they would be willing to consider entering a global forest partnership were it to have some or all of such features, and to evolve in a participatory way. Several identified what they could bring to it. In addition, but not as a substitute for these, there were also significant 'votes' for a forestry 'umbrella' mechanism within the World Bank – to improve the effectiveness of its various forestry operations and partnerships.

Views on funding of a global forest partnership

There was strong agreement on the need to increase resource flows for pro-poor sustainable forestry, and especially to help poor groups to attract and make best use of emerging carbon funds aimed at Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and other approaches. A gfp would be justified if it improved the efficiency and effectiveness of existing and future resource flows (public and private) through improving agreement on objectives and principles and getting resources to forest stakeholders.

However, some said that a gfp itself should not include a significant financial mechanism, either because it could distract attention from other issues (notably forest governance), or because a future partnership should be robust to financial shortfalls in an increasingly uncertain environment (in this case, a gfp being more about knowledge and information).

Views on World Bank roles in a global forest partnership

Respondents in most categories generally agreed that it would be desirable, or at least acceptable, for the World Bank to be *one* of the facilitators of gfp development – but only if the Bank's declared intention to undertake this with others was carried out in practice. If and when a gfp was up and running, the Bank's comparative advantage in convening finance authorities, other sectors, and national political leaders is widely thought to be an advantage to ensuring that a gfp would be influential. The Bank's experience of developing and operating innovative finance instruments, and managing trust funds, is also widely identified as useful for a gfp.

The potential is also recognised for a gfp to be an instrument to influence the World Bank's own ambition to support 'sustainable and inclusive globalisation', building its capacity and coherence for working in an increasingly complex forestry world – beyond the Forests Team alone. Increasing forest dynamics have just as many implications for climate, biodiversity, water and agriculture as for the traditional concerns of wood production.

In spite of broad support for an active World Bank role in a gfp, there was strong opposition from certain NGOs, some government respondents, indigenous peoples, and a few donor staff in particular. They would object to the World Bank playing any kind of central 'directing' role in a gfp – although the World Bank has not, in fact, proposed any such role. These objections were often backed up by citing particular cases of inappropriate Bank policy and incoherent operations.

3. IIED's initial recommendation – improved capability of institutions in the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, notably the World Bank

It is clear that stakeholders want to see changes in the existing international institutions active in the forest sector. Regarding the World Bank, the assessment confirms many urgent needs that have also been identified by the Mid-term Review of the implementation of the World Bank's 2002 Forest Strategy, the deliberations of its External Advisory Group, and reviews of other international initiatives. These needs centre on the Bank's processes and mechanisms rather than its thematic priorities in forests. We recommend that the World Bank Group prepare and implement a revised Forest Sector Business Plan to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Improved coordination and harmonisation of forest partnerships and forest financing arrangements.
2. Incentives and other means for mainstreaming forests into country and regional strategies.
3. Removal of contradictions created by action in other sectors affecting forests.

In each of these, the Business Plan would treat forests not solely as technical issues concerning economic resources, but also as governance issues connected to the rights, knowledge and resources of forest-dependent stakeholders. Much can be done soon to make better use of the World Bank's strengths in ensuring that global opportunities for new 'climate investment funds' and 'carbon funds' result in improved investment in forests and forest-based livelihoods. High-level champions are needed in the Bank and its Board for this.

Similarly, there is a need for other international bodies working in forestry, notably the CPF, to be more responsive to stakeholder perspectives and needs so that forests are better mainstreamed into development decisions and forest stakeholders are better served. One way to do this is to complement the 'supplier' partnership of the CPF with a new 'demand' partnership of stakeholders – a gfp.

4. IIED's main recommendation – a full participatory process to set up a 'true' global forest partnership

The World Bank's GFP idea, in spirit, was timely. The *status quo* in international efforts to improve forests and forest-based livelihoods is no longer acceptable – there is a real need for action now. It is clear that a predominantly 'top-down' approach to international forest initiatives has not worked. It is also clear that 'bottom-up' approaches on their own face difficulties in achieving scale or consensus and critical mass to influence national and global institutions.

To link the various top-down and bottom-up drivers of sustainable forestry and livelihoods in a constructive way, IIED suggests a global partnership with central involvement of forest-dependent stakeholders. Linked to this is the above-mentioned need for transformation of key global players such as the World Bank to better meet rapidly changing needs of stakeholders. These two main recommendations could be treated separately, but great synergies could be achieved if pursued together:

'Peoples forestry' – a multi-stakeholder gfp

Building on what respondents have suggested, the partnership would link forest stewards and 'defenders of forests' in any sector with international sources of support (notably but not only the CPF) and a diversity of knowledge/advocacy networks, innovators, donors and investors. It would empower stakeholders by: facilitating participatory diagnostics, planning and budgeting; linking

and strengthening information systems; influencing forest and extra-sectoral policy both nationally and globally; identifying and mainstreaming local actions capable of producing global public goods; attracting investment so as to realise multiple forest values; and promoting the improved coordination and effectiveness of international initiatives.

This is a long-term, ambitious vision, entailing significant and unprecedented responsibilities on the part of the multiple stakeholders who hitherto have had little part in global initiatives. This kind of gfp is necessarily a highly participatory process. The World Bank could continue to be one facilitator of such a gfp, and ideally would help to fund its development of other leaders – at international and local levels, and notably from developing countries – that will be needed to ‘own’ and run a core grouping to organise gfp development. We explore this below.

Tentative vision and purpose of a gfp

A tentative vision that a participatory gfp development process will wish to interrogate and revise may be expressed as:

People’s forestry: empowering stakeholders to improve livelihoods and ecosystem services through collaborative local, national and international initiatives and supportive investment.

Potential added value of a gfp

The major outcome of a gfp could be more efficient and more equitable ways to reduce deforestation and forest degradation, with in-country stakeholders generating and sharing a *vision* for the use of forests and developing and/or acquiring the resources and capabilities to achieve that vision.

IIED identifies value added possibilities for a gfp in:

1. *A partnership that empowers forest stakeholders, particularly marginalised groups* to recognise and improve their rights, powers and capabilities, to help mobilise them in making key decisions about forest and institutional futures locally, nationally and internationally; and to support their action in the forest.
2. *A partnership that makes real connections within the forest sector and across other sectors by helping* forest stakeholders to become better linked to a wide variety of knowledge, capacity-building and finance networks and institutions; and that makes forestry a collaborative, better coordinated, accountable and cross-sectoral enterprise with sound landscape, macro-economic and societal perspectives.
3. *A partnership that brings* Global Public Goods (GPGs) ‘down to earth’. Identifying and developing practical mechanisms to sustain GPGs generated by forests (including climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity protection and watershed conservation) in diverse national and local contexts, this could ensure that forest ecosystem services are integral to forest policy and practice, with equitable cost/benefit-sharing.
4. *A partnership that significantly improves the quality and quantity of forest and extra-sectoral investment* to sustain forests alongside agricultural, energy, infrastructure and other needs. In turn this could catalyse consequent public and private resource flows towards investments in forests and forest stewards, and improve investments in other sectors. For example, in some countries this might involve supporting the analysis, planning and governance improvements required for REDD, shaping the additionality to be provided by new climate funds.

The IIED team also made a rough assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of international initiatives that already cover some or all of the ground that a potential gfp might cover. It found that there is a lot of very relevant work going on, particularly in the private and NGO sectors, but relatively few initiatives are having high impact in key areas identified as those of potential added value for the gfp. We highlight a number of them in the report. Engagement with these in gfp development will reveal useful interconnections within and between initiatives.

Suggested principles for developing and running a gfp

A set of principles for how things should be done emerged strongly from the consultation. We suggest that partners commit to a set of core gfp principles on joining the partnership and should regularly assess adherence to them. The following principles could be explored and agreed in the process to develop the gfp:

1. *Inclusive* – of locally initiated activity, initiatives on global public goods, and diverse knowledge traditions – offering stakeholders equitable opportunities.
2. *Transparent* – publicly open about process and decisions – enabling stakeholders to form their own opinions about gfp’s credibility and rigour.
3. *Learning based* – structured around an action research framework: identifying what works, innovating to fill gaps, and tracking change.
4. *Additionality* – supporting existing initiatives rather than replacing them, but adding value by, for example, improving synergies between them.
5. *Citizen action* – identifying and employing effective political agency, which can drive positive change nationally and ultimately globally.
6. *Equity* – with a clear and credible approach to ‘who counts most’ in prioritising which issues to focus on, how to seek views, and what action to take.
7. *Efficient and agile* – aiming to be light, quick and effective in decision-making and management – but not so fast that some stakeholders are left behind.
8. *Continuity* – a clear, understandable ‘menu’ of activities always on offer, from which stakeholders can choose, while also encouraging improvement.
9. *Comparative advantage* – partners contributing what they are best at, and linking with others to better achieve their own missions.
10. *Ownership* – the bottom line is that a gfp would not exist until partners design it and declare it.

5. A possible process towards a gfp – phased and bottom-up

A phased and bottom-up process would include rehearsing what a partnership might look like, and would pilot different ideas for scaling up initiatives in different countries. In brief:

- a) *A ‘Development Group’ would initiate a gfp work plan.* The DG’s objective would be to shape the gfp, ensuring a bottom-up and demand-driven process rooted in local realities and influential in key national and international political and institutional processes. It would decide on the main activities of the gfp development process (including an appropriate name for the initiative). The DG would be informed by country dialogues (see below), and so continually sharpen the objectives so that the gfp adds value. Progressive and flexible donor support would be required for its work. We suggest possible criteria for DG membership in the report. Its composition would primarily be leading individuals from low- and middle-income countries (including proposed pilot countries – see below),

working part time alongside others from a few progressive intergovernmental agencies, and internationally active civil society and private sector organisations. It is expected that the DG would be superseded once a formal partnership is launched.

- b) *A 'Catalytic Group' of key institutions would support the Development Group:* It is suggested that three or four international institutions, credible with government, civil society and business, would provide an initial 'engine' to support the DG. We recommend that the World Bank ask these institutions to initiate the next steps. The World Bank should support the follow-up process financially and remain supportive of the process. We stress, however, that this Catalytic Group should not overwhelm the primarily 'Southern' DG – there is a real need to redress institutional asymmetry by encouraging bottom-up approaches. The Catalytic Group's work plan would be openly available and demonstrate just how stakeholders can engage with the process.
- c) *Pilot country 'people's diagnostics' with coherent international support.* The development of gfp should be rooted in a few representative countries where there is both demand and scope for progress. Country-based work would aim at sharpening the gfp objectives to suit (a) *the country context* – such as experience, needs, and entry points and (b) *relevant global issues* that emerge from country work – such as better GPG provision locally, as well as institutional change in international institutions. In the report we suggest possible criteria for selecting the location of these people's diagnostics: significance of forests; political dynamics and stakeholder demands; and operational issues. Once priority locations are identified the DG would engage, with the support of the Catalytic Group, with stakeholders. Representative groups of the main stewards of the forest at local level and protagonists in other sectors that affect forests would be consulted. This engagement would develop a frank assessment and joint understanding – a 'people's diagnostic' – of current and potential power and capabilities to make progress. It would provide an initial brokering of key support to identified priorities – innovative areas, proven areas warranting better support or ready for significant scale-up, or central initiatives such as NFPs in need of reinvigoration.
- d) *Global thematic work to draw on country processes and engage with areas of international policy flux.* Analytical work would emerge from country diagnostics and from DG interactions with Group members and key international players. While a bottom-up emphasis would take priority, the DG would also engage robustly with international processes – precisely because forest stakeholders are demanding the ability to influence forest, carbon and extra-sectoral policy, and investment and institutions. Analytical work may well cover, for example, REDD, biofuels, criteria and modalities of major carbon/forest funds, financial innovations to reach SMEs and community groups, governance, trade practices and standards affecting in-country groups, and the roles and activities of international institutions that influence forests.
- e) *Informing international initiatives of local/national needs. Early engagement* in selected countries would generate a 'menu' of activities transferable to many other countries. The aim would be to ensure that these are robust activities, workable and sustainable through adaptation to local context, and able to attract significant funding from international donors and investors. In addition, the gfp DG would report findings from in-country activities to relevant fora (UNFF, UNFCCC, FAO Committee on Forests – CoFo, International Tropical Timber Council – ITTC, Commission for the Legal Empowerment of the Poor, World Social Forum – WSF, World Economic Forum – WEF, IUCN, Roundtable on Sustainable

Palm Oil, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the World Business Council on Sustainable Development). A number of *milestones* would be targeted by the gfp development process, notably the UNFF8 session on finance and the UNFCCC Copenhagen CoP on forest/climate regimes.

- f) *Launch of the partnership.* The Development Group would clarify the objectives (and name) of a gfp, and its activities, main partners, funding and governance. The objectives and composition of that partnership cannot be fully anticipated yet. It could well focus around forest stakeholders, with key roles for governments, civil society organisations, NGOs, private sector associations, donors and foundations, as well as CPF and other international organisations. An equitable but efficient governance structure would need to be agreed. At this point, the Catalytic Group would be dissolved and some kind of independent review function established.
- g) *Innovative mechanisms developed and rolled out with the full launch of the gfp.* Our consultation process has identified widespread demand for a new way of working in international forestry initiatives – one that focuses on delivering priorities while exercising broader thinking within each activity area. This implies both country-focused and international priority activities. At *national* level, initial activities could focus on mechanisms to: attract better investment into forestry, especially through emerging carbon funds; improve synergies between international initiatives in-country; and enable marginalised groups to become more closely involved in forest decision-making processes and governance improvements.
- h) As an illustration only, the following kinds of *international* activity might be launched:
 - Tiered forest stakeholder fora from national to regional to global levels
 - A menu-based mechanism for technical and financial support
 - Networks for research, learning, knowledge sharing and monitoring
 - Preparing forest investment portfolios
 - Shared gfp task forces on top issues
 - Amalgamation of some existing forest partnerships
 - Roles in global forest financing mechanisms
 - A small secretariat to assist the gfp's work

Rather than becoming another organisation the gfp might evolve into a continuous facilitation process to enable forest stakeholders to work together to shape effective action.

- i) *Communications.* The gfp idea relies on ensuring forest stakeholders can contribute to big changes in the forest sector. Thus the gfp would need four types of communication activity: (1) communications to inform stakeholders of the gfp opportunity and to help them to engage; (2) communications to ensure transparency about issues explored and decisions made; (3) communications to influence the range of change processes, locally and globally, in forestry and in related sectors; and (4) communications between forest stakeholders to share knowledge and ideas resulting from the gfp. These activities would be needed both in gfp operations and in its development process.

- j) *Monitoring and evaluation – tracking progress and enabling continuous improvement.*
A clear framework would be needed for establishing credible baselines in (a) partner countries and (b) in international policy and institutions, to support the tracking of progress in the forest sector and to ensure continuous interrogation, learning and adaptation. Such an M&E system would benefit from clear and agreed gfp principles for assessment of *process*; a clear gfp development plan and plan of activities for assessment of *outputs*; and an agreed vision and value-added statement for assessment of *outcomes*.
- k) Possible schedule – three overlapping phases:
- 0-12 months – Start-up of DG and in-country processes
 - 6-30 months – In-country and global thematic analysis and influence
 - 18-36 months – Formal gfp launch and full operational menu

In conclusion, IIED's GFP consultation and assessment process has been a serious and credible attempt to solicit stakeholder opinion on forest priorities and stakeholder roles in a highly dynamic context. The key challenge now is for key institutions to come forward to support the combined delivery of global, national and local needs – in a fully participatory way. IIED hopes that this report of consultations, analyses and recommendations will serve as a resource to inform, provoke and inspire that process.

Continued feedback is welcomed – please email gfpconsultation@iied.org