UNEP/ FAO GEF implemented project

"Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being"

Technical Inception Workshop and 1st International Steering Committee Meeting

22nd –26th April 2012

Rio de Janeiro, BRAZIL

Photo: Lady selling mangaba - Arquivo MMA - João Vital Souto

Minutes of the Meeting

Executive summary

Important procedural notes for countries:

- Changes in the project executing arrangements can be made at any point over the five years, but these have to first be rectified and approved during the annual ISC meetings
- The same is true for amendments in the logframe following actual project implementation
- The workplan can be revised on an annual basis if needed. Workplan revisions should be consolidated and circulated prior to the International Steering Committee (ISC), with countries presenting their rationale for the requested changes. These can then be approved during the ISC.

Recommendations and next steps

Countries

- Identify a **common approach** to be used for baseline data collection
- Identify nutrients on which to focus nutrient composition analysis
- The FAO Food Composition Databases already hold some information on neglected and underutilised species. Countries need to verify whether data on these species is already available or incomplete
- Identify national experts that have already been trained by FAO on food composition analysis
- Verify internal mechanisms for providing data to FAOSTAT and whether data provision is already embedded into the national reporting system
- Countries to make project implementation arrangements and by the end of May deliver a clear structure of the national management arrangements.

Countries and FAO

- Seek entry point for BFN in National action plans (NAP) for nutrition, for the upcoming (International Conference on Nutrition ICN +21). Dr. Burlingame to send the template and contact point at the Ministries of Agriculture
- Seek entry point for Nutrition in National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) for nutrition. Dr. Burlingame to send the template for reporting on nutrition indicators for biodiversity and contact point for national and regional INFOODS coordinators.
- FAO to inform relevant country Regional and Sub-regional offices to make them aware of the new BFN initiative

Bioversity International

- Bioversity to send an official letter to governments announcing the project launch and advising on key next steps

- Update Project Supervision plan to reflect changes in reporting (i.e. six-monthly Technical Report due in December 2012)
- TORs for the TAC need to be drafted and circulated for partners to provide feedback and then approve (in 2 weeks)
- The GPMU to send a procurement plan template in spreadsheet format out to countries as soon as possible
- Change wording in the logframe end of project targets to take into account studies between varietal differences and not just species differences.

International partners

- Dr. Remans to scope among the Columbia University students to find candidates for carrying out research work in the countries, as well as facilitating the application of interns.
- Dr. Burbano to enquire about involvement of countries in the Centre of Excellence against Hunger

Resources

- Nagoya Protocol for Access and Benefit Sharing
- Long distance training modules carried out by FAO on nutritional analysis
- Bio-cultural community protocols (BCPs)
- Useful Tree Species for Africa tool
- Purchase for Progress initiative (P4P)
- Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER)

Funding opportunities

- GEF Small Grants Programme

Links with

- UN initiative on sustainable consumption and production and the Sustainable Food Systems Programme coordinated by UNEP in collaboration with FAO
- Save and Grow Initiative
- Masters in Development Practice offered by the Global MDP Program

Forums for highlighting the Project

- Rio +20
- IUCN World Conservation Congress in Korea (6-15 September 2012) – a slot has been secured for a poster presentation

- Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP) to be held in October 2012
- Terramadre in Turin, Italy (25-29 October 2012)
- Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN +21) to be held from the 13-15 November 2013
- Annual Conference of the Global Child Nutrition Forum held in 2013 in Brazil
- Third International Symposium on Underutilised Plant Species, to be possible organized in 2014
- SAARC regional Health Ministers Summit in Sri Lanka (2014)
- World Expo in Milan Italy in which the focus will be Nutrition (2015)
- Third State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
- International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
- UNEP's Green Economy initiative
- Governing Council of UNEP
- Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the CBD
- Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)
- 10 Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production

Technical Inception Workshop and 1st International Steering Committee Meeting

22-26 April 2012, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Minutes of the Meeting

Introduction

Within the framework of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) supported project "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being" a technical inception/planning workshop was organized between 22 and 24 April 2012 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to clarify and reach consensus among relevant stakeholders of the meanings and implications of project activities and the terminology involved. The three day consultation gathered participants from the four partner countries – Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey – the co-implementing and executing agencies, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and Bioversity International, respectively, and five representatives from the international partners involved in the project: the World Vegetable Center (AVRDC), Crops for the Future (CFF), the Earth Institute Columbia, the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), and the World Food Programme (WFP). The technical workshop was followed by the First International Steering Committee meeting of the project (25-26 April) to oversee the project launch and future implementation of project activities. A full list of participants is provided in **Annex 1**.

Opening statements by representatives of Bioversity International, Brazil, FAO and UNEP

The meeting commenced with introductory remarks by the Global Project Coordinator, Dr. Danny Hunter from Bioversity International, followed by a round of self-introductions by participants and by welcoming remarks by the host country, Brazil, and the co-executing agencies.

On behalf of the Brazilian Government, Camila Neves Soares Oliveira of the Ministry of the Environment (Ministerio do Meio Ambiente - MMA) warmly welcomed participants to Brazil and to the city of Rio de Janeiro. She confirmed Brazil's strong commitment to the project and reminded all those present of the interest Dr. Braulio Dias, former Secretary of the Biodiversity and Forests Department of the MMA and now Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, continues to have in the project ever since his involvement in the negotiations for COP's Decision VIII/23 regarding the *Cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition*. Dr. Oliveira ensured that a senior representative from the Ministry of the Environment would be present at the official launch of the project during the World Nutrition 2012 Congress. Following some information on logistics, Dr. Oliveira wished participants a very successful meeting and hoped that the sharing of experiences would lead to building a better future with improved nutrition and biodiversity conservation for all.

In her opening remarks, Dr. Barbara Burlingame, Senior Scientist of the Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division of FAO, stressed the importance of the project for the Rome-based food agency, particularly in view of the appointment of José Graziano da Silva as the new Director General (DG) of FAO. The project covers two of the technical areas in which the Brazilian DG

firmly believes in - eradicating hunger and accelerating the shift towards truly sustainable food consumption and production systems. FAO is gradually sensitizing its constituents to issues of nutrition through sustainable diets and according to Dr. Burlingame this global initiative has a key role in bringing together the environment sector and the nutrition sector to work towards these goals. The FAO representative also announced that she would highlight the project during her presentation the World Nutrition Congress being held in Rio the same week.

On behalf of the UNEP, Dr. Marieta Sakalian, Senior Programme Management Officer, Biodiversity expressed her gladness at being able to take part in the project inception and launch after the many months of hard work involved in getting the project approved. She thanked country partners for attending the meeting and the host-country Brazil for the excellent arrangements. Dr. Sakalian emphasized that sustainable development cannot be achieved without mainstreaming environment into other sectors and underlined that the main objective of the project, which is being funded by GEF, is to achieve the conservation of biodiversity holding high nutrition potential. Further she stated that this proposed project is in line with UNEP's role in the GEF to catalyze the development of scientific and technical analysis and advancing environmental management in GEF-financed activities. She offered UNEP's support to project partners to help them meet global outputs that can then be used by other countries. Words of thanks were also extended to Brazil for the very generous co-financing and she wished participants a very successful and productive week.

Agenda and Objectives

Following these opening statements, Dr. Hunter introduced the agenda of the Technical Inception Workshop and described the purpose of the meeting. He pointed out that the aim of the workshop was to clarify the project structure, its goals, objectives and expected outcomes. It would also be useful to understand the kinds of approaches, methodologies, tools and capacity building the project will need to embrace in order to achieve these. Furthermore, he explained that the workshop would set the ground for a dedicated and effective partnership bringing the relevant expertise, knowledge and skill sets to support the above.

Specifically, the Global Project Coordinator pointed out that the inception workshop would engender:

- Strong sense of commitment and ownership to the project
- Effective working partnership between country and international partners
- Recognition of partners' strengths, contributions (roles and responsibilities) and opportunities
- Common understanding of the project framework, project goal, objective and outcomes
- How project components, outputs and key activities relate to the above
- Awareness of project indicators, benchmarks and deliverables
- Awareness of the planning and scheduling of activities within each output/component
- Appreciation of methodologies and approaches the project can employ to achieve outputs and outcomes
- Clarity on methodological issues, where to find support, and guidance/back-stopping
- Recognition of training needs and resource needs and how to meet these
- Assessment of project workplan, especially 1st and 2nd year activities, by component and output
- Appraisal of how partners can best network and collaborate on activities and project outputs including joint publications (publications strategy)

He then proceeded to explain how the workshop would begin by reviewing the project framework, goal and objectives, components and outputs, indicators (logframe) and activities (workplan). Day 1 and 2 of the workshop would focus on individual outputs/activities across each of the three technical components: Component 1: Knowledge base; Component 2: Policy and regulatory framework; Component 3: Increased awareness & Outscaling, with the two remaining components (4 & 5) being largely dealt with during the International Steering Committee meeting on the following days. Day 3 of the workshop would focus on how international and country partners can best assist each other, giving international partners the opportunity to:

- provide a general overview of their organization
- highlight work that is relevant to the aims and themes of the project and countries
- showcase tools and resources which are relevant for countries to know about
- describe how they foresee providing ongoing support and technical guidance to countries

Following the agenda, he then provided an overview of the project's goals, revisiting the project's conceptual and institutional framework, and its implementation arrangements at the global and national level. He also mentioned that relevant project documents and a preliminary set of resources that could aid countries in planning project activities had been collected and made available on a CD-Rom prepared by the Global Project Management Unit (GPMU) at Bioversity. He then opened the floor to questions from participants.

Dr. Michael Hermann from Crops for the Future enquired about ownership, and asked whether the project envisaged the creation of a website where project activities would be highlighted as well as links to country and international partners. Dr. Hunter replied that the creation of a website was part of foreseen activities along with a joint communication strategy.

Another question that was raised regarded the issue of fundraising and again Dr. Hunter explained that searching for additional funds was key to project success, particularly in view of the shortfall in funding for the Kenyan partners, and that this was an activity that the GPMU would be engaging in. Dr. Hermann also raised the issue of developing standards for data to be usable. He added that in many cases, when big projects are launched, very little attention is devoted to providing partners with guidelines and standards for data collection and often the data is unusable. Dr. Hunter replied that, guidelines would be provided and that based on prior experience with the Crop Wild Relatives (CWR) Project data sharing agreements with countries and communities would be sought. He further suggested that the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) might be used as a template to handle data information and community knowledge.

Regarding the project's implementation arrangements, Marieta Sakalian wished to clarify that changes in the execution arrangements could be made at any point over the five years, but that these would have to first be rectified and approved during the annual ISC meetings. The same was true for any amendments needed in the logframe following actual project implementation. Both Brazil and Kenya welcomed this statement as changes were already foreseen at the national level regarding some of the arrangements. Dr. Sakalian also wished to reiterate the novelty of this project and its potential for including the education and health sectors in a project that was mostly Agriculture and Environment driven.

Dr. Ray-Yu Yang of the World Vegetable Center (AVRDC) complimented the presentation stating that the implementation arrangements were impressive. However, based on her past experience she expressed concerns regarding the true possibility of bringing such a diverse array of partners together. She also enquired about the definition of traditional foods, and asked whether that would encompass species that have been introduced. In answer to Dr. Yang's first statement, Dr. Hunter replied that, although recognizing that establishing effective partnerships is a difficult task, in some countries, for instance Brazil, multi-sectoral platforms are already in place to foster collaboration. This statement was further supported by Dr. Bastos, who explained that Brazil's presentation on implementation arrangements would clarify the current situation in the country, where the Agriculture, Environment, Education and Health sectors are already engaged in successful partnerships in other projects.

Dr. Wijesekara from Sri Lanka brought his experience to the table and stated that in his country it has not been such a difficult task, provided that meetings are adequately organized and coordinated. Based on past experience partners have shown a keen interest in getting together and collaborating towards a common goal.

Technical presentations

DAY 1

The second half of the morning was devoted to presentations focusing on *Component 1* of the Project logframe – Information gathering - and specifically on the methodologies and planning tools countries could use for enhancing the knowledge base on biodiversity for food and nutrition. A first presentation by Teresa Borelli, from Bioversity International, focused on a review of methodologies available to participants to gather information at the community level on agricultural management practices, as well as food preferences/choices and traditional knowledge associated with these.

Following the presentation, a debate arose regarding the definition of traditional foods to guide the selection of species targeted by the project. In this regard, Dr. Hunter explained that the project broadly embraces the definition provided by CINE in the publication 'Indigenous Peoples' Food Systems' (FAO, 2009). The definition reads: "Those foods that Indigenous Peoples have access to locally and within traditional knowledge and the natural environment from farming or wild harvesting". Certainly, endemism and local availability will be pre-requisites for the foods to be described as traditional. In the case of Brazil, the targeted species will be selected from the *Plants for the Future initiative*, coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment, which has already identified over 700 local plants species with economic value or potential. The criteria used in species selection for the initiative were: traditional use, existing markets, existing studies and multi-functionality and use.

Dr. Wijesekara from Sri Lanka further clarified that the species will vary from country to country, and that criteria for selection include that species are country-specific.

Dr. Hermann stressed the need to define common criteria for all project countries. He also pointed out that the concept of neglected and underutilised crops is a very subjective one and that underutilisation could be due to a variety of factors such as barriers on demand and supply. Furthermore, he pointed out that some species seem to flourish better outside their native range. Dr. Hermann felt that the emphasis on the species being native may not be very productive and

asked the audience whether species with potential for a greater role in agricultural and food systems, but not indigenous, would also be considered.

Marieta Sakalian intervened emphasizing that the project had been approved on the basis of agreed species selection criteria. She added that the criteria could certainly be revised, but that further discussions on the terminology would have to occur within the approved framework. Countries were welcome to use their resources to explore outside of the grey box. However, the term "traditional" mentioned in the project document referred to endemic biodiversity and local varieties in need of conservation, which would benefit from evidence of their nutritional potential provided by project activities.

Ms. Soares from Brazil mentioned that the Nagoya Protocol of the CBD recognizes the distinctive features of agricultural biodiversity and Dr. Mondovì from FAO added that the term should include species that are not imported, but that are found locally or in the wild.

Dr. Yang from the World Vegetable Centre enquired about imported seeds and Dr. Murithi from KARI wondered whether these species could be selected also on the basis of their medicinal properties.

Again, Dr. Hunter stressed that the focus of the project was species with high nutrition potential, and not species with medicinal value. This was further emphasised by Dr. Sakalian who reminded participants that one of the comments of the GEF Secretariat was to be less ambitious and to limit the focus of project activities to biodiversity for food and nutrition.

As a last comment, Dr. Hermann added that a further dimension of underuse is scientific neglect. Therefore project activities that could identify species with promising nutritional potential could surely further their conservation.

A presentation was then given by Brazil on ethnobotanical methods for assessing BFN and associated traditional knowledge. Following the presentation, Danny Hunter emphasised how national expertise was in place in each of the countries to cover the ethnobotanical aspects of the project. Dr. Remans from the Earth Institute wondered if any rapid methods were in place to link these participatory assessments to genetic variation within species. In answer to this, Dr. Bastos mentioned that for the work presented specimens were collected and taken to the lab for identification and that a project developed by the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) breeds seeds of species with high nutritional value not for commercial purposes. Barbara Burlingame from FAO enquired whether samples were also collected for nutritional analysis. Dr. Bastos replied that, although this is not normally the case, an evaluation of consumption was carried out as part of the two-year project along with documentation of agronomic practices and soil conditions at the project sites.

Further to this discussion, Danny Hunter stressed the need to identify a common approach to be used by all project countries. He wondered whether an approach similar to the one used by CINE would be acceptable. The advantage of using such an approach is that it is very detailed, and has technical guidelines and a standardised approach that all countries could follow.

Ray-Yu Yang enquired about the timelines involved in plant sample collection for laboratory analyses, to which Dr. Bastos replied that it largely depended on the number of species each country wished to focus on and the resources invested. A possibility would be to collect fewer samples, but make the samples more representative. With regards to Brazil, she continued, the

idea is to focus on species identified by the *Plants for the Future initiative* mentioned earlier and to mainstream these species into pre-existing food procurement initiatives.

Dr. Hunter wished to clarify the anomaly of Brazil's situation, given that the country will not be working in pilot sites like the remaining country partners and asked other countries whether ethnobotanical expertise was available in other countries to carry out these activities.

Dr. Miruka replied that expertise for ethnobotanical research was available in Kenya in the form of the National Museums of Kenya, who were partners in the project. However, in reply to Dr. Yang's previous question regarding timelines, plant sample collection in Kenya would be limited to one ecosystem and to a limited number of species because of economic constraints.

Dr. Yang also enquired whether national institutions would be carrying out the work, to which Dr. Sakalian replied that this was indeed the case and that this would be captured as co-financing. Dr. Yang also expressed concerns regarding the standardization of plant sample collection.

Ms. Soares from Brazil mentioned the Nagoya Protocol again with regards to regulating access to traditional knowledge. Depending on data being collected, Prior Informed Consent is generally sought from communities involved in activities, but this, she thought, would largely be up to national legislation. Turkey and Sri Lanka intervened to say that they had not signed the Nagoya protocol and that no regulations are in place in their countries with regards to intellectual property rights and traditional knowledge.

Marieta Sakalian reminded participants that many examples are available at the global level and that these could be adapted and used in countries, while Danny Hunter highlighted that it is a form of good practice to create these traditional knowledge protocols on a country-basis.

The debate was followed by a presentation by Dr. Barbara Burlingame from FAO on the International Network of Food Data Systems – INFOODS - and on assessing the nutritional composition of biodiversity for food and nutrition. FAO has already launched the INFOODS Food Composition Database for Biodiversity, which is accessible to the public and is constantly updated. One interesting item that emerged was that some of the Food Composition Databases already hold some information on neglected and underutilised species. This may be true for some of the species selected by countries. It was agreed by participants that attention needs to be paid not to duplicate efforts and to verify whether data on these species is already available, albeit incomplete.

A question was then raised by Brazil regarding FAO's role in assisting countries to develop best practices for laboratories that carry out the nutritional composition analysis. Barbara Burlingame replied that if a request is submitted to FAO from the country, the Rome-based food agency can offer some technical back-stopping. Dr. Sakalian, however, wished to stress that if such a requirement was identified by countries, alternative funding should be sought, as GEF resources could not be deployed by countries for activities on food composition methodologies. The activities, on the other hand, could be covered by co-financing.

Dr. Bastos expressed her concerns regarding this statement, since food composition tables in Brazil don't generally take into account agrobiodiversity or regional products. National food composition databases mostly deal with mainstream foods and she pointed out that this clause

might impact negatively on extension workers trying to promote nutritional information and foods in remote areas of the country.

Regarding this issue, Dr. Hunter asked the FAO representative whether long-distance training modules organised by FAO would be an option available to countries, and whether past participants from the countries could capacitate people from universities. Dr. Burlingame confirmed that 18 people were trained from Brazil via face-to-face training and that they could certainly provide their expertise to train others. This said, it was agreed that a budget line had been approved on the assessment of the nutritional value of biodiversity, and that countries wishing to do so could use resources allocated in this line item.

The discussion was followed by a presentation by Dr. Roseline Remans of the Earth Institute, Columbia University, based on results from the Millennium Villages Project on a systems approach to linking biodiversity with nutritional functions and outcomes. At the end of the presentation Dr. Remans highlighted possible synergies between the Project and the new Global Soils Monitoring System being launched by Earth Institute, to which FAO and Bioversity already contribute.

Although some issues were raised on the reliability of some of the data presented, particularly values of protein and zinc availability linked to food consumption data reported, all agreed that the analysis and models presented could be useful to the Project to better understand the gaps and potentials existing at the landscape level. When asked whether an ideal existed in the Millennium Villages, Dr. Remans replied that at the core of the model is the effective partnership between sectors and its main strength is the capacity to carry out adaptive management based on outcomes.

In the first half of the afternoon, presentations from FAO focused on the role of biodiversity indicators for food composition and consumption to gather information on the impact of agricultural biodiversity on diversifying diets. With regards to establishing links between nutrition indicators for biodiversity and food consumption surveys, FAO invited countries and partners to be part of a working group to develop guidelines aimed at identifying, adapting and testing tools to carry out food consumption surveys for biodiversity. Furthermore, there was mention of possibilities of showcasing the project during the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN +21) to be held from the 13-15 November 2013. Barbara Burlingame however stated that no signals had yet been given from UNEP to attend the event and that Dr. Sakalian would be most suited to follow up.

Marieta Sakalian also brought to the attention of participants the UN initiative on sustainable consumption and production (SCP). Currently there is no mention of Nutrition in the 10 Year work programme on sustainable consumption and production, but this could be an excellent opportunity for the Project to seek collaboration and promote its activities in a global forum. UNEP has coordinated the SCP work over the past decade and currently is facilitating the process for development of the Sustainable Food Systems Programme for implementation jointly between FAO and UNEP. Also initial steps to engage the World Health Organization (WHO) had been taken, but problems had been encountered in identifying an entry point. Dr. Hunter further mentioned that activities were currently underway to update national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and that this might be an excellent opportunity for countries to mainstream nutrition issues into these documents.

Dr. Hermann enquired whether marketing capacity was being taken into account to engage people in promoting nutritionally-rich foods. Barbara Burlingame provided examples from the developed world where the most sophisticated consumers are those more interested in agrobiodiversity and the organoleptic properties of foods. Dr. Miruka provided the example of Kenya, where activities will be focusing on promoting markets for the minor crops. The intention is to promote traditional foods like porridge and African leafy vegetables in schools, hopefully prompting parents to start planting these crops. In Brazil several chefs will be engaged in developing recipes that use traditional crops and in changing school meals to engage pupils' appetites. The proposal to engage Slow Food once reliable data is obtained was also mentioned, as well as the importance of promoting culturally-accepted foods.

Following a presentation by Stefano Mondovì from FAO on developing and linking national databases to relevant regional and global databases, Dr. Hunter reminded participants of the baseline, mid-term and end of project target in the logframe for outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3. Dr. Sakalian, on the other hand, restated that the reason for formulating the logframe in such a way was to respond to the GEF Secretariat's comments regarding FAO's involvement in the Project.

Brazil wished to clarify whether data that had been analysed but not yet published could be considered for the assessment of nutritional value. Dr. Burlingame said this could be done. Dr. Yang enquired about whether plant samples would be collected from the field or from the markets and if countries had thought about domestication of the species if the intent was to scale-up activities to the national level. Although it was agreed that sample collection from field or markets is largely up to countries, Dr. Hermann from Crops for the Future interjected that ideally samples should be collected in the field and then be deposited in genebanks.

If genebank collections and *ex situ* conservation were outside the scope of GEF-funded projects, as Dr. Sakalian reminded participants, collaborations might be sought with FAO's Save and Grow initiative proposed Dr. Burlingame. She also added that the most important thing to remember is to avoid creating duplication, since databases already exist that could be used by the project. Most countries have information systems for food and nutritional security already in place, which could feed into existing initiatives or databases such as the joint FAO/WFP database on food consumption data at national level. She also provided names for the focal points within these organizations: Mark Smulders for FAO and Joyce Luma for WFP.

When asked how she foresaw the project interacting with these databases, Barbara Burlingame replied that for instance trends in micronutrient issues could be monitored at the beginning of the project and 5 years down the line to see whether agrobiodiversity has made a change or caused improvement in nutrient status of the target populations. If the mechanism to provide the information to FAO is FAOSTAT, Dr. Sakalian suggested that countries verify internal mechanisms for providing data to the system and establish whether data provision is already embedded into the national reporting system to avoid duplication of efforts. Regarding training, she confirmed that project funds could be used to provide training for this and Barbara Burlingame offered resources and tools from FAO.

Dr. Remans was curious about how information that was collected at the sub-national level could be used to report at the national scale? Barbara Burlingame acknowledged the comment and replied that this is something that FAO hopes to achieve in the future.

The session for Day 1 was closed and Dr. Hunter thanked participants for their contribution and participation.

DAY 2

Day 2 of the Technical workshop kicked off with a short presentation by Danny Hunter on criteria used by countries for site selection, species selection and baseline surveys.

At the end of his presentation, Dr. Hunter suggested that countries try and link the information on tools and methodologies provided in the presentations of Day 1 to activities present in the logframe and workplan. This might be especially useful when reporting activities in the Project Implementation Review (PIR). He added that countries were free to develop their own workplans, but that these should fit in with the global workplan. Workplans developed by each country will then be integrated into respective country LOAs. Although not all countries may wish to undertake all activities, he stressed that countries should be very strategic in their selection; particularly Kenya, which has a reduced scope of activity.

Although, according to Kuena Morebotsane from the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, GEF is more interested in outcomes and outputs, these will need to be reported against specific project activities. There is however a certain degree of flexibility if countries wish to change the activities and the workplan can be revised on an annual basis if needed. Furthermore, she informed participants that if the information contained in the UNEP report was similar to the FAO format there would be no need for duplication. Dr. Marieta added that all consultations regarding workplan revisions should be consolidated and circulated prior to the International Steering Committee (ISC), with countries presenting their rationale for the requested changes. These can then be approved during the ISC.

Presentations followed on enhancing policy and markets to support the mainstreaming of biodiversity for food and nutrition, relevant to Component 2 of the Project workplan. Brazil presented their experience with regards to establishing cross-sectoral policy platforms and experience relevant to outputs 2.1 and 2.2 of the logframe. Regarding future collaborations with other sectors, Brazil mentioned possible collaborations with pre-existing publications that promote regional recipes in schools and partnerships with the Ministry of Health to develop school curricula dealing with nutrition.

Dr. Hunter enquired whether any data was available showing that the application of Law 11.947, of 16 June 2009, stipulating that 30% of the food bought for schools must be locally-sourced from rural farmers, had contributed to an increase in biodiversity conservation. Ms. Soares from Brazil replied that this was something the project would need to explore. Dr. Bastos added that one of the main barriers to promoting local foods was that school nutritionists did not know how to prepare foods that aren't normally found in markets and that through the project they will be empowered to use local traditional foods. Further aims include the assessment of nutritional data of local foods and developing recipes that use these, as well as assessing the contribution of agrobiodiversity to school meals. School meal programmes have yet to break down the list of purchased products by species and this is something the project can hopefully introduce. Adding to this last comment, Dr. Hunter explained that the plan is to try to tie in agrobiodiversity with the school gardens and school meals programmes and called upon the WFP representative, Dr. Carmen Burbano of the School Feeding Programme, to provide her view on opportunities and constraints in using local biodiversity.

According to Dr. Burbano, the greatest constraint for using locally-sourced products in schools is food and safety regulations. Once school feeding programmes are de-centralised adequate food-testing becomes difficult. Buying locally is also an issue with regards to costs and economies of scale, but that could naturally be offset by transport cuts. The feasibility of initiatives of this nature also depends on the creating of links with the agricultural sector, which actively participates in the process of procuring locally-produced foods. Dr. Hunter enquired with Carmen Burbano whether in her opinion bringing together different programmes was the key element of success, to which she replied that building the supply chain was probably the most challenging feat. Dr. Hunter also asked whether WFP is already embedded in the school feeding programmes in Brazil, and Dr. Burbano informed participants that the Director of the Centre of Excellence against Hunger was the former director of WFP's School Feeding Programme. The recently-established centre will act as a global resource providing information, expertise and technical assistance on school feeding and will respond to government demands to strengthen national capacities and knowledge on sustainable school feeding, and to support national governments in the design, management and expansion of nationally-owned, nutritious, sustainable school feeding programmes, simultaneously promoting food and nutrition security as well as best practices for connecting family farmers to markets. The centre is bringing in countries from all over the world to learn about the Brazilian experience, which provides much opportunity for South-South cooperation.

With regards to the presentation from Brazil, Dr. Yang enquired about the type of foods that have to make up the 30% of school provisions according to prescriptions from the Law mentioned earlier. Ms. Soares replied that the Food Procurement Programme (PAA) has no limitations regarding what it can buy; on the contrary, the School Meals Programme (PNAE) has more restrictions. In Brazil each school has its own nutritionist who decides the children's menu for the entire year. The Project has foreseen working with the Nutritionists' Association to ensure that more indigenous foods are taken into consideration when preparing school meals.

Dr. Hermann, on the other hand, enquired whether farmers are given purchase guarantees as part of the deal and whether this is by product or value. Ms. Soares replied that the PAA establishes a minimum price for purchased products based on market research. Dr. Burbano complemented this explanation by clarifying that, in the Brazilian set up, farmers are registered in family farming programmes. The 30% that schools have to purchase locally does not go through the tendering process, and schools can carry out direct contracting with individual farmers or cooperatives. What they normally buy from family farms are fruit, vegetables, milk and dairy products, with school nutritionists establishing how much quantity each child needs.

Dr. Yang also enquired about the obstacles experienced in developing these policies. Ms. Soares replied that the former Brazilian President, Lula da Silva, significantly strengthened family farming. Yet farmers still have many complaints relating to bureaucracy, logistics, food safety and procurement. However, since this is a relatively new programme there is flexibility for improvement. On this issue, Dr. Silva from Sri Lanka enquired about monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the programme. It was explained that this is largely carried out through a social control mechanism, one of the strengths of the programme being the close involvement of the community. To monitor school progress a committee is set up constituted by 2 representatives from the school, 2 representatives from civil society, and 1 representative from the government on a purely voluntary basis. The committee audits the books and checks and monitors staff.

Following this discussion, Dr. Hermann from Crops for the Future delivered a presentation on the successes, barriers and pitfalls of linking biodiversity to markets, providing some interesting examples from neglected and underutilised species. The take home messages of his presentation were:

- Increasing consumer demand typically drives renewed interest in a minor crop
- Difficult to predict whether the species will succeed or not
- Discovery of commercial attributes often occurs outside of the countries of origin for particular species

Participants agreed that the involvement of famous chefs and the development of cookbooks could help the cause for these species. The example of Gastón Acurio was provided, a chef who has rediscovered Peruvian cuisine and offers typical Peruvian meals in a modern and attractive way.

Another barrier identified by Dr. Bastos is the problem of economic scale. However, when consumers recognize that the product has a higher price due to an associated environmental benefit they are willing to pay more. Dr. Bastos' main concern is bringing higher demand for products at a family agricultural scale. If the products that are promoted have to meet the demand, fertilizers and increased agricultural land will be needed. Furthermore, there is always a risk that agriculture will lose its sociological function. Dr. Bastos made the example of açai, which, due to high demands, is on the point of becoming a monoculture.

Dr. Hermann pointed out that this would be unavoidable if the product generated commercial interest and that dynamics of interest are difficult to control. In his opinion monocultures are not necessarily bad. The real issue is to make these monocultures more sustainable, perhaps by providing incentives to farmers to manage their land sustainably or compensate them for the conservation practices and ecosystem services they provide. Also, he insisted, producing for the market will require some intensification and uniformization of product quality that may result in the reduction of biodiversity. Dr. Hermann further added that the development of these crops from mere subsistence to production levels was to be largely attributed to modern findings and transformation technologies (into convenience products, for example) rather than to traditional knowledge, whose importance, in his opinion, is highly over-estimated.

Regarding the issue of increasing inputs on farms to boost production, Dr. Remans again put forward the example of the African soil information system, which uses diagnostic tools to compare more organic-based systems with other systems. One of the strategies in the Millennium Villages Project is to initially bring in external inputs and then switch to more organic inputs. She also informed participants that the Earth Institute is looking into incentive schemes for more organic inputs in the form of subsidies to farmers.

Regarding the promotion of agrobiodiversity products among younger constituents, it was agreed that countries would have to tackle the severe disconnect shown by youths towards the food they eat.

Following the debate, Dr. Hunter reminded participants that regarding output 3.2 of the Project document that focuses on enhancing capacity of producers, processors and users to deploy BFN each country will have to identify national capacity to undertake these activities. A budget line item exists in the budget to facilitate South–South cooperation. A number of indicators will be

linked to this in terms of numbers of people trained. Targets are only global at this stage, so national targets will depend on activities identified as essential in each country.

Regarding Output 3.3, Dr. Hunter stated that the generic activities listed in the Project document are only there to provide guidance. They are not prescriptive and will be country-specific. Regarding indicators for this output, the mid and long-term targets (i.e. % increase in awareness of consumers, policy makers and other actors) are to be considered both at the pilot site level and beyond. As an example of a successful national information campaign to raise awareness on the importance of conserving local agrobiodiversity, Danny Hunter mentioned the Let's GO LOCAL campaign carried out in the Federated States of Micronesia by the Island Food Community.

Next on the agenda were two presentations relating to Component 3 of the Project, focusing on tools, knowledge and best practices for promoting and outscaling biodiversity for food and nutrition. The first, by Barbara Burlingame, dealt specifically with output 3.5 (i.e. tools and methods for mainstreaming biodiversity into food and nutrition strategies). The speaker pointed out that countries are starting to prepare their national action plans (NAP) for nutrition for the upcoming ICN +21. This is a great opportunity for countries to undertake specific actions at the policy level to ensure that BFN is mentioned and becomes part of these NAPs. Dr. Burlingame offered to send the template and contact point at the Ministries of agriculture. She also suggested that extracts of the project document could be included in the ICN +21 country statements that could become legal statements.

Links to other ongoing initiatives that could help mainstream BFN into policies and programmes were mentioned, such as the *Third State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* - which Dr. Hunter pointed out as being an indicator in the logframe – as well as links to the *International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* and the possibility to access funding for ABS activities.

When asked what the most valuable project outcomes were, Dr. Burlingame replied that the most important result is that recommendations get adopted at the policy level and countries can do this by ensuring that the work of the project is reflected in ministerial statements. The example of the Mediterranean diet was made which is now considered an Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, and for this reason attracts funds. Another example was related to quality issues dealing with geographic origin and denomination of products.

Further links to existing initiatives were presented by Dr. Marieta Sakalian, who illustrated that the Project could seek links with the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP), with UNEP's Green Economy initiative (e.g. their banner of sustainable consumption) and Rio +20. Further she suggested that the Governing Council of UNEP could be used for mainstreaming project results into the environment policy agenda of member countries. High level requests for involvement in these initiatives have to come from countries and it was suggested that the Ministries of Agriculture become advocates for the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). The Convention requires countries to prepare a national biodiversity strategy (or equivalent instrument) and to ensure that this strategy is mainstreamed into the planning and activities of all those sectors whose activities can have an impact (positive and negative) on biodiversity.

The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) could also provide a link, but contacts should mostly be sought with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), whose four main functions are:

- To identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers and to catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge;
- To perform regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages;
- To support policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies;
- To prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface, and to provide and call for financial and other support for the highest-priority needs related directly to its activities.

Regarding the use of culturally-sensitive protocols for engaging communities, UNEP developed a set of bio-cultural community protocols (BCPs) to enable the culturally appropriate interaction between a variety of stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities.

Other points of entry include the Sustainable Food Systems Programme mentioned above, as well as other initiatives for mainstreaming described in pp. 47-52 of the Project Document.

Dealing mostly with Activity 2.3 of the workplan, i.e. new marketing options for BFN and promoting nutritionally-rich foods from local biodiversity at a more local scale, Dr. Hermann gave a presentation on value adding and the use of recipes to increase awareness of this biodiversity among stakeholders. Dr. Hermann also provided examples of a range of media tools, such as Wikimedia commons and Google books to gain recognition for project work and for attracting potential donors. He suggested that donors and project managers use the deposition of pictures, documents and other products as a means of verification for the achievement of project outputs. When asked if there were any success stories relative to the registration of GI of neglected and underutilized species, Dr. Hermann replied that most successes have been registered for commodity crops, and that Sarawak pepper is a good example of a success story. Product labelling is also important and if organization or NGOs can unite producers, one of the conditions for GI registration and quality management can be met for the State to intervene to fully develop geographic indication (GI) for products. Most countries should have regulatory frameworks that carry this out. Government authorities dealing with international property rights can then become active and develop a community trademark to use a certain name. Dr. Wijesekara made the example of Sri Lanka in which areas are well known for producing honey, treacle or curd, but which don't possess GI.

With regards to Neglected and Underutilized species (NUS) and marketing options for these, Dr. Hunter highlighted the opportunity of the Project taking part in the Third International Symposium on Underutilised Plant Species, to be possible organized in 2014.

DAY 3

Day 3 of the technical workshop was devoted to international partners, who presented an overview of their organizations and possible ways of supporting country partners during the implementation of project activities.

The first presentation by Dr. Ray Yu Yang of the World Vegetable Center (AVRDC) focused on work carried out by the Centre to improve nutrient density through breeding or selection of germplasm. For countries to access AVRDC genebank and plant material, material transfer agreements need to be signed with countries, with different costs for developing or developed nations. Dr. Yang clarified that plant material is brought into Taiwan from around the world following the signing of agreements with the country of origin. The Centre does not deal with GMOs and only conventional breeding is used, with genebanks linked to national agricultural institutes. The improved lines developed by the World Vegetable Centre are generally transferred to national agricultural institutions and private seed companies in the developing countries for breeders to develop local varieties and releases. Information on vegetable germplasm, breeding lines, production guides of the Centre's principal crops, and nutrient values of more than 100 Asian and African indigenous vegetables is accessible on the centre's website (www.avrdc.org). However, additional funding needs to be secured to carry out the nutritional evaluation of more vegetable species. She further specified that the Centre undertakes agricultural interventions with nutritional objectives, such as home garden programs for direct access to diverse and nutritious food, breeding for nutritional traits to increase nutrient supplies in markets, farmer field days and training for capacity building and promotion of nutritional awareness. Seed quality and availability for gardeners and commercial farmers are critical factors for the sustainability of these programs. AVRDC is helping establish seed delivery system through seed companies and NGOs in various countries.

A presentation followed by the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) in which Dr. Stepha McMullin illustrated the work being carried out by her organization largely in Sub-Saharan Africa on promoting fruit tree species for nutrition and vegetative tree propagation of agroforestry species. She proceeded to illustrate the Useful Tree Species for Africa tool, which uses Google Earth to help users select the best tree species for a given geographical area, based on climatic and edaphic conditions. Currently, however, this is only available for Africa. She further mentioned that seed systems are managed by communities, in which farmers are trained to run nurseries. Like the Earth Institute, ICRAF is also looking into mapping functional diversity of landscapes, with a view to integrating trees in landscapes to improve nutritional potential. With regards to the ICRAF's role in the Project, Brazil expressed a keen interest in using the Centre's expertise to sustainably manage trees that are being used for extractivism, and which are losing productivity due to increased exploitation.

The presentation by the Earth Institute highlighted possible linkages to the project through a number of education programs at undergraduate and post-graduate level. Among them the Masters in Development Practice offered by the Global MDP Program, a network of universities promoting South-South cooperation and collaboration with UN Reach. Among other interesting tools being developed by the Earth Institute she also mentioned a mobile application developed for agricultural extension workers that might be useful for the project.

With reference to Dr. Remans presentation, Dr. Sakalian, reminded participants of successful experience in past projects with regards to facilitating students to carry out research work in the framework of their Master or PhD programs. Although GEF funds cannot be used to support students with their university fees, they can be used to cover costs associated with research work, such as data collection in the field.

With reference to the soil data map introduced during her presentation, Dr. Remans explained that soil data maps exist for other countries, but that the one of Africa is the only one that is systematically funded by the GATES Foundation. She further described that the targeted users of the Soil map are local extension workers and governments. For instance, with reference to fertilizer guidelines, users can zoom down to the plot level and make more specific guidelines for fertilizer application based on edaphic conditions. There is however fear from governments that this tool could be used to the detriment of communities, attracting money from foreign investors to buy the more fertile lands. She added that mobile phone applications are also being used to gain information on soil quality, allowing extension workers to take GPS coordinates and link the information to the Africa soil map.

When asked whether the Earth Institute was also considering using the information for climate change resilience and adaptation strategies, Dr. Remans replied that there us a special unit within the Earth Institute looking at issues of climate change and that they are closely linked with the CGIAR CRP dealing with climate change and food security.

Dr. Hunter highlighted the Earth Institute example as a way of making partnerships with countries much more concrete, particularly via the Masters in Development Practice course at Columbia University. He added that the UNDP was already present in Brazil and in Sri Lanka, and that Dr. Wijesekara had already approached Dr. Remans to explore ways to facilitate the linkages with the University of Peradeniya in Sri Lanka. It was suggested that Dr. Remans scope among the Students at Columbia University to find candidates for carrying out research work in the countries, as well as facilitating the application of interns. He also expressed surprise at knowing that Kenya was not among the network members, seeing as there are global centres in Nairobi.

The last presentation was delivered by Dr. Carmen Burbano of WFP. She described a number of initiatives being carried out by WFP to connect smallholder farmers to markets such as the Purchase for Progress initiative (P4P), which encourages and supports farmers to produce food surpluses and sell them at a fair price, and the Cash and vouchers Initiative. She mentioned that NGOs are WFP's main implementing partners for much of the work on the ground and that 270 million children are assisted by WFP in 78 countries through snacks, meals and/or take home rations (i.e. additional incentives). Dr. Burbano encouraged countries to pursue their aim of connecting production of traditional foods to existing school-feeding programs, which, according to the expert, is a win-win situation for all. She also added that 70% of World Bank resources are currently channelled towards school feeding programs. Provided the *Demand – Procurement – Supply* link is secured, Dr. Burbano was confident that the programs could generate an important supply of income generation. She then proceeded to explain that average costs per school meals were between $US 0.30-0.70 per child per day. Therefore, the choice of products to include in the food baskets would be largely dependent on costs. For instance quinoa, although nutritious, was too expensive to include in school meals in some South American countries.

With regards to the logistics of school meals distribution, she encouraged countries to find out who is coordinating the distribution from the ministry of education, which is often the coordinating entity. She also highlighted the Annual Conference of the Global Child Nutrition Forum which will be held in 2013 in Brazil, as a possible arena in which to highlight project results. Finally, Dr. Burbano highlighted the *Systems Approach for Better Education Results*

(SABER), a World Bank initiative that helps countries examine and strengthen the performance of their education systems and policies to achieve learning for all.

When asked what the constraints were to including fruits and vegetables in school meals, Dr. Burbano replied that one of the main limitations was availability (for instance in dry areas) or food supply (e.g. not enough food). Other constraints were linked to shelf life, especially for perishables that have to travel long distances.

With regards to controlling funding, Dr. Burbano lamented the lack of control over expenditures and the need to develop different tools to control the programs. In her opinion the use of civil society committees at the local level, such as those put in place in schools in Brazil, would be a very effective solution.

Regarding documenting the impacts of school feeding, Dr. Burbano acknowledged that teasing out the different components is quite difficult. The easiest component to monitor is educational impact, whereas the least easily monitored is nutritional impact. School feeding is unfortunately seen as coming in too late to tackle chronic malnutrition. However, she informed participants that impact evaluation of school feeding is currently being carried out in Mali.

Dr. Miruka thanked international partners for their presentations and expressed a keen interest in working with all partners to broaden Kenya's program of work. She expressed particular interest in collaborating with AVRDC for the selection of improved varieties of sorghum and *Vitex* fruits which would be promoted in school diets in the project site. Furthermore, she acknowledged the need to involve non traditional partners in the project, such as the Ministry of education and NGOs.

Dr. Hunter wondered whether there was any scope for South-South cooperation with the Centre of Excellence in Brazil, seeing as school meals is one of the activities that are common to all the countries involved in the project.

Dr. Burbano explained that the Centre of Excellence works on a demand basis, but that WFP can certainly facilitate the process for the project. Dr. Burbano offered to get in touch with colleagues in Brasilia and find out how countries could have access to support.

Dr. Yang was confident of the opportunities AVRDC could offer in term of supplying improved varieties and dealing with the seasonality of production.

Further to demands by Brazil on whether international partners could help with nutritional analysis, Marieta Sakalian clarified that it was up to countries to decide in which activities to invest their funds and that international partners would provide support based on their technical expertise. She added that co-financing from international partners has already been committed, but that this shouldn't stop partners looking for additional funds.

Dr. Barbara Burlingame added that FAO has a technical cooperation programme that could provide funds for carrying out nutritional analysis and that the request for funding has to come from countries through their FAO representative.

Dr. Sakalian added that the response provided to GEFSEC gives countries some flexibility on how to administer their funds and that the GEF Small Grants Programme could also be explored for additional resources.

To further add to these statements, Dr. Hunter summarised that countries have three options:

1) Use their own funds
2) Seek additional co-financing from international partners
3) Scope for additional funds

Barbara Burlingame ended the session by reminding partners of the enormous capacity that already exists at the national level and that countries could try to bring these partners on board to provide their expertise to or additional funds for project.

Day 3 ended with a visit to the Botanical Gardens of Rio de Janeiro.

First International Steering Committee

25-26 April 2012, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Minutes of the Meeting

DAY 1

Opening statements by representatives of Bioversity International, Brazil, FAO and UNEP

Welcoming remarks by the Global Project Coordinator, Dr. Danny Hunter, were followed by greetings from the executing and implementing agencies.

On behalf of UNEP Dr. Marieta Sakalian, Senior Programme Management Officer, Biodiversity , formally opened the First International Steering Committee (ISC) Meeting, welcoming formal country representatives and all other participants. Dr. Sakalian recognised the commitment and support shown by partner countries, reminding members that countries involved in the project were all behind COP 8 Decision VIII/23 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) that formally established the *Cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition* in Brazil in 2008. She highlighted that Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey contain unique agricultural biological diversity that is crucial to the world's food supply and that this project provides an exceptional platform for bringing key international partners together with the agriculture, environment, health and education sectors at national level to work towards conserving and promoting biodiversity for food and nutrition. She also reminded participants of their role in the project, which is to formally validate the decisions taken during the meeting and wished everyone a successful consultation.
Dr. Barbara Burlingame from FAO echoed Dr. Sakalian's words. She reiterated the Director General's commitment to issues of nutrition and emphasized how the project could contribute enormously to eradicating hunger and micronutrient malnutrition. Dr. Burlingame underlined the belief shared by the Nutrition Division in FAO that environmental health and human health are tightly linked, and the hope that, by creating linkages between the agriculture, environment and health sectors, the project would attract additional resources, as well as being fundamental to the furthering of the global agenda.

Dr. Marleni Ramirez, Regional Director of the Americas Office of Bioversity International welcomed her colleagues' words and added that she was present in Curitiba, Brazil, when the *Cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition* was approved and supported by the Brazilian Government. She complemented statements by the GEF and FAO, adding that Nutrition has become a fundamental topic of Bioversity's research and development agenda, and that a number of scientists present in the Americas office would be able to outscale this project to other countries in the region.

Bioversity's comments were followed by expressions of support from the Brazilian government. Mauricio Azeredo, Chief of Cabinet of the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment, welcomed participants to Brazil and emphasized the importance of biodiversity for improving food and nutrition security, and the need of providing evidence for its use to promote its conservation. He also informed participants that the new Secretary of the Biodiversity and Forests Secretariat, Dr. Roberto Brandão Cavalcanti, would be representing Brazil at the official project launch.

Introductions, Agenda and Objectives

Danny Hunter thanked officials from the three international agencies for their opening statements and invited a round of introductions from remaining participants.

After agreeing on chairing and recording arrangements for the ISC meeting sessions, the agenda was reviewed, accepted and adopted by participants.

Dr. Hunter reminded ISC members that one of their duties is to validate decisions stemming from the meeting and that the purpose of the ISC meetings is to reflect on a range of project management and evaluation issues falling within the last two project components (Component 4 - Project Management; and Component 5 - Monitoring and Evaluation). He explained to newcomers to the GEF system that, as the project progresses and there is more to report on, ISC meetings would become progressively longer. He then proceeded to review the objectives and desired outcomes of the meeting, which included:

- Briefly review status of project in countries
- Reflect on project management issues
- Review, discuss and confirm roles at the country and global level
- Clarify the role of the ISC
- Consider the role of international partners/technical advisory committee
- Discuss project monitoring and evaluation requirements including UNEP and FAO requirements, risk analysis, tracking tools, environmental and social safeguards
- Review project workplan and budget
- Examine national reporting requirements to Bioversity and global reporting requirements to UNEP and FAO
- Discuss equipment procurement plans
- Discuss and reflect on project public awareness and promotion, communication strategy
- Key next steps after the Rio launch
- Discuss and confirm location of 2nd ISC
- Discuss plans for the official Launch during WNRio 2012

Regarding the last bullet points, Dr. Hunter emphasized how the key next steps following the launch would focus on the preparation of Letters of Agreement (LOAs) with countries, national plans to relay the information received over the back-to-back meetings in Rio to national partners, and discussions on objectives for the launch. It was suggested that as large numbers of Brazilian partners would be present during the event, they could make a collective statement. Dr. Hunter also informed participants that Dr. Harriet Kuhnlein of the Centre for Indigenous Peoples' Nutrition and Environment would be present.

Regarding the launch, awareness-raising activities for the event were briefly discussed, such as distributing a flyer at the congress and highlighting the launch during parallel presentations delivered by Barbara Burlingame, Tim Johns, Harriet Kuhnlein and Teresa Borelli.

Dr. Hunter then proceeded to give participants an overview of the project and its objectives. Following the presentation, he highlighted that co-financing is very much embedded in the GEF process and that co-financing from partners had been adequately secured. He also emphasized the project's uniqueness by having two co-implementing agencies that bring an incredible range of skill sets to the table, and offer great potential for the project to make an impact.

A suggestion was put forward by Dr. Michael Hermann from Crops for Future to broaden the definition of species with "nutritional value" to "high food value", since there are foods that are not particularly nutritious, but may be valuable foods, i.e. high in water content. The question was put forward to countries, who decided to maintain the definition since most of the species they would be dealing with are plants with high nutrition potential.

The discussion was followed by the presentation from Brazil providing updates on project development, key activities, targeted agrobiodiversity products and implementation arrangements.

Regarding key activities, Dr. Bastos informed the audience that activities in Brazil would focus mainly on Components 1 and 3 of the project workplan, since it was felt that the Policy and Regulatory Framework Component is already a well-established process. Regarding the engagement of national partners, she explained that this was achieved in a very participatory fashion, approaching potential partners and asking how they could assist and also benefit from involvement in project activities. Furthermore, key activities were identified by participatory assessment of national needs. It was also stressed how nutritional characterization was perceived by all national partners as an added value that could provide the evidence to foster additional policies for the conservation and sustainable use of BFN. Dr. Bastos explained that the project would engage five different institutions in the five different regions of Brazil and focus on a list of 70 species with high nutrition potential.

When asked if any nutrient data had been generated to date, Dr. Bastos clarified that some data existed, but that it was mostly incomplete and that bringing the existing data together would be part of the baseline exercise. However, she explained, most of the data would be generated through the project, after agreeing on list of nutrients for nutrient composition following FAO guidelines. She further mentioned that decisions were still being made regarding the location of the operational offices and that two projects had been identified - Agendha (Nutre Nordeste) and the BioFORT project of EMBRAPA – for possible involvement in project implementation.

The speaker also mentioned the need to identify species that are being purchased by national food procurement programs in order to identify entry points for promoting agrobiodiversity. With regards to ensuring sustainability beyond project lifetime, Dr. Bastos stated Brazil's intention of building a Network on School nutrition to foster collaboration with pre-existing institutions and programs, such as linking to complementary feeding projects such as *Fome Zero*.

A discussion ensued with regards to individual outputs specified in the project logframe. Following the presentation from Dr. Bastos, it was clear that the target for Output 2.1 had already been achieved in Brazil, since institutional mechanisms for linking different sectors are already in place. Regarding this issue, the Global Project Coordinator, clarified that not all countries are required to undertake each and every activity or achieve each and every output. Only where this is categorically stated is that necessary. Otherwise countries should be guided by the requirements of the Output indicator. It was suggested that the tracking tools might help clarify this statement.

It was also highlighted that it was still unclear what nutrients each country would be focusing on, and that indicative costs were needed for nutrient composition analysis.

Dr. Burlingame pointed out that FAO guidelines on food composition analysis could help countries prioritise and decide on the most useful nutrients to analyse per food group, depending on whether interest was more on epidemiology or marketing. Regarding costs, she explained that the quantity of nutrients analysed would depend largely on availability of equipment and analytical capabilities at the country level. This said, she confirmed that food composition specialists were present in all the countries and suggested inviting them to be part of the national steering committees early on in the project. That way, nutritional composition analysis could be institutionalized and be reported as co-financing.

The discussion was followed by a presentation on pre-project planning and execution arrangements in Kenya.

The presentation generated immense interest by international partners AVRDC, ICRAF and the Earth Institute who were keen to establish linkages with future project activities in Kenya. AVRDC proposed to send information material to promote the better use of indigenous vegetables, and Dr. McMullin suggested that Kenya make use of the platforms provided by ICRAF to help link the project to markets. Dr. Remans from the Earth Institute suggested that links be sought with the Millennium Development Villages project sites.

Dr. Sakalian encouraged Kenya to explore cross-collaboration with these initiatives, particularly in view of the limited budget for implementing project activities in the country. The UNEP representative added that links to these organizations might also help secure additional funding for the project.

Dr. Miruka clarified that the limited budget had forced them to select a single site for the implementation of project activities and that the linkages with these initiatives would indeed be considered. She further added that past collaboration with the German development organization GTZ had helped considerably in stretching an otherwise restricted budget. This suggestion was backed by the senior representative from Kenya, Dr. Festus Murithi, who reiterated that the most cost-effective strategy was to build on existing resources and activities.

The next presentation from Sri Lanka described national plans to establish/ strengthen 2.5 million home gardens (including forest home gardens) throughout the country. This raised a number of questions regarding the need to promote homegardens, to which Dr. Wijesekara replied that changes in lifestyle are causing people to abandon homegardens and the associated benefits they provide in terms of social cohesion. Furthermore, dietary diversity has narrowed down substantially and dietary habits have changed, with starch becoming a major component of Sri Lankan diets and improved varieties being used to the detriment of local ones. One of the aims of the project in Sri Lanka, he explained, is to raise awareness on these local varieties using homegardens as "nutrition supplements" to provide some of the essential nutrients needed at the household level.

The senior representative from Sri Lanka, Dr. Ajith Silva, added that as a result of increasing tourism in the country, greater attention was being afforded to traditional varieties (e.g. rice) and to local products. He added that in Sri Lanka the project would also focus on promoting different recipes using these varieties. Links to ongoing initiatives were identified such as an ICRAF project in Sri Lanka on improving forest homegardens in different agro-ecological zones (e.g. the Kandyan homegardens) and links to another GEF project focusing on indigenous animals and livestock and their potential for improving nutrition.

It was explained that unlike Brazil, where the focus will be more on species, in Sri Lanka the project will be studying differences at varietal level in fewer species. In this regard, the Global Project Coordinator asked the GEF agencies whether changes in the wording could be made in the end of project targets in the logframe to reflect these differences. Currently "X number of species promoted" is specified. The answer from GEF was positive.

The last presentation described country updates on site selection and project implementation in Turkey. The emphasis in Turkey will be to promote value chains of traditional foods, as well as linking these chains to school feeding programmes.

Next on the agenda was the discussion of Appendix 11 to the project document, relating to the Terms of Reference (TORs) and to the roles and project management structure at the global and national level. The rationale for discussing this topic during the 1st ISC is so that all partners are clear about what is required.

It was asked if qualifications specified in the TORs for each have to be adhered to strictly, to which the UNEP representative replied that TORs followed a standard format, but that they could be revisited and changed based on country needs at any time. The correct procedure was for changes to be reported to Bioversity who would then forward to the project implementing agencies (UNEP and FAO) for approval. Once countries have agreed upon and established their National Project Management Units (NPMU), the international steering committee should approve the changes.

Regarding the level of engagement expected of a National Project Coordinator, Dr. Sakalian recommended that this should be considered as a full time position, due to the level of reporting and responsibility involved. However, allowances could be made and the position could be flexible based on country needs.

It was recommended that countries take one month from the ISC meeting to make project execution arrangements at the country level and that by the end of May they deliver a clear structure of the national management arrangements. Dr. Sakalian also conceded that if changes were needed at a later date, these could be accommodated, provided that the rationale for these amendments was provided.

Regarding roles and responsibilities at the global level, it was clarified that FAO's role is clearly defined as the implementing agency. If cases arise where there is need for additional support from FAO outside its implementing role (i.e. training on food composition data), this will be discussed on a case by case basis. Regarding this last point, it was suggested that FAO discuss this further internally.

It was also explained that Bioversity will be responsible for overall project management and that the rationale for the current budget structure for the Global Project Management Unit (GPMU) was that management costs should not exceed 10% of the budget. For this reason the Global Coordinator and Programme Specialist time are charged against the technical component.

Regarding the International Steering Committee (ISC), Dr. Sakalian explained that based on past practices, ISC members are high level officials appointed by the countries. These officials are in turn supported by national project coordinators with a more technical background. The participation of both at the ISC allows for full exchange of information. Dr. Sakalian further clarified that the role of the ISC is to validate outcomes stemming from the project, although

implementing agencies have a final say regarding budget revisions and expenditures, which are discussed informally and can then be validated and processed. In summary, the ISC has an oversight and decision-making function, but with certain limitations. As a further note, she added that if needed and/or desired a certain degree of flexibility was present to modify the terms of references of the ISC.

Regarding the need for a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), it was mentioned that, due to interdisciplinary nature of project, the presence of a strong TAC to provide project advice, enrichment and evaluation could prove very useful. It was explained that the TAC does not have a decision-making role, but that its function is to provide technical advice to the ISC and to countries. The TAC usually prepares comments on project reports and outcomes and provides advice if the project is not moving in the right direction. It also evaluates how the project adds/ interacts/ links to the larger international research agenda and approaches. To this end, the TAC prepares recommendations to the ISC, which can be accepted, validated or rejected. Furthermore, its participation in ISC meetings is not funded by the project, but is considered part of the co-financing commitment from the organizations that form it.

Sri Lanka spoke in favour of constituting a TAC, bringing forward the example of the benefits it provided to the Crop Wild Relatives project, in terms of an independent, objective assessment of project activities and providing overall technical guidance to countries. Dr. Wijesekara also commented that the TAC had been approached independently when specific technical advice was needed.

In support of the TAC, Dr. Sakalian mentioned the potential role the TAC could offer in terms of helping upscale the project at the global level, and Dr. Hunter added that the evaluation report the TAC produces as part of the ISC is a monitoring tool in itself that can be used for the annual evaluation of the project.

Furthermore, it was explained that if countries identify some kind of training that the international partners can provide this can be accommodated within the framework of ISC meetings. However, it was clarified that training falls outside TAC's advisory role and that international partners could ask for payment for this service. Project funds could be used to cover training costs only if a corresponding budget line exists; if not additional funds would need to be mobilized.

With regards to ISC meetings, it was underlined that continuity in terms of who is sent to the meetings from countries and international partners would be preferred. It was then decided that if countries agreed to have a TAC, TORs for it need to be defined and approved. These will then be drafted and circulated for partners to provide feedback and comments (in 2 weeks).

With regards to project monitoring and evaluation, it was mentioned that, where possible, reporting requirements for UNEP and FAO would be consolidated and a single reporting format used to reduce the reporting burden on Bioversity and countries. For instance, UNEP and FAO could prepare a joint supervision plan using a format that meets both UNEP and FAO requirements. Reporting requirements will be reviewed each year and changes or updates carried out if necessary. It was highlighted that only financial reporting will certainly be different, and that Bioversity will have to report to UNEP and FAO using different financial reporting formats. The reporting to UNEP and FAO will be carried out by Bioversity, not by countries, who will report directly to Bioversity.

Other M&E documents mentioned were:

Checklist for Environmental and Social Safeguards - measuring the project's environmental and social impact. This is a new UNEP document and it was suggested to fill this in on a yearly basis, to be prepared for the mid-term evaluation.

Project Implementation Review – monitoring the delivery of project objectives and very detailed in the section on risks. It is highly recommend that countries be very detailed in providing inputs to the report to Bioversity. UNEP, as leading project implementing agency, will finalize and submit the report to the GEF Secretariat (prepared annually from June to July).

Technical report (Project Progress Report): is being revised to incorporate FAO requirements into UNEP reporting format. The report is normally prepared on a six monthly basis, but this year's is due in December 2012.

Tracking tools: developed by GEFSEC to evaluate achievement of objectives at the focal area portfolio level. It has to be filled in at the beginning, at the mid-term and at the end of the project.

If for instance there is a change from anticipated results, this provides a tool to apply adaptive management. It was suggested that countries familiarize themselves with these tools.

Regarding the mid-term review and final evaluation it was mentioned that the former is an internal process and that the latter is an external process.

The main message to partners regarding the M&E tools was that they will become clearer as time progresses.

The first day of the meeting was closed with Danny Hunter thanking country representatives for their presentation and senior level officials for their support, particularly Mauricio Azeredo from the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment for his participation and kind words of welcome.

DAY 2

Dr. Danny Hunter began the meeting by revising the agenda and starting with issues relating to **Public Awareness, Communication and Mainstreaming Strategy**.

Dr. Hunter emphasized the need to agree on communication tools, such as the banner, website and abbreviation of the project title (i.e. if it was acceptable to keep using *Biodiversity for Food and Nutrition project* in lieu of the complete title). The Global Project Coordinator pointed out that the project would generate a substantial amount of research outputs that could be promoted in publications and events at the national and international level. Thus, he urged the project to liaise with international partners who could provide opportunities to promote results stemming from project activities. He mentioned, for instance, that a side event was being organised during the meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) in Montreal, Canada, between 30 April - 5 May 2012. In the framework of this meeting, the project had been invited to a side event focusing on biodiversity, traditional knowledge and community health with an emphasis on using local resources and capacities to achieve broader development and conservation goals.

Preliminary feedback received from the side event reports that it was well attended and that it provoked an exciting discussion on human nutrition as an ecosystem service and on linkages between biodiversity, traditional knowledge and community health. The event spurred a discussion on the preparation of much larger event at COP 11 on the above-mentioned themes.

It was clarified that the GEF is the funding mechanism for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which was very keen to use the BFN project to reinvigorate the debate on biodiversity for food and nutrition and on the *Cross-cutting initiative*. Dr. Barbara Burlingame also mentioned the ministerial level meeting ICN +21 to be held in Rome in autumn 2013, which could provide an excellent opportunity to flagship the project, as well as the Agricultural Ministers conference on sustainable diets for Mediterranean countries, to be held in Malta on 24-25 September 2012, which could be relevant to Turkey to promote its activities.

The opportunity to develop Technical Cooperation Programmes (TCPs) with FAO to complement nutritional analysis work was also highlighted.

When asked by AVRDC how partners would share the credits of outputs, since so many partners are involved, Dr. Hunter replied that to have a communication strategy and clear guidelines would ensure that credit is given where credit is due. To this Dr. Sakalian added that all publications and outreach material stemming from the project would need to undergo clearance by the project implementing agencies, which are committed to ensuring that all logos from project partners are present and that the project is properly credited. Kuena Morebotsane also offered to send recently revised GEF guidelines to ensure that the project is properly quoted. In the case of Masters or PhD work resulting from the project, the project would need to be mentioned in the acknowledgements, but the publication would not have to be cleared by GEFSEC.

Logframe and workplan

Clarifications were then provided on the main tools for project implementation: the **logframe and workplan**. Dr. Sakalian explained that, if needed, the workplan could be revised, but that this would be premature at this early stage. Further, time constraints would not permit going through each activity. It was suggested that the ISC approve the two documents, which could later be revised if needed.

Brazil raised their concern regarding Component 2, and particularly output 2.1 for which baseline indicators had already been developed. It was suggested that it be recorded that Brazil had already achieved targets for this output and to export the Brazilian experience in establishing multi-sectoral approaches to other partner countries.

With regards to output 2.2 on national and international policy guidelines it was clarified that at the international level this would target forums like the CBD, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources on Food and Agriculture, the World Health Assembly and FAO's Committee on Agriculture and Committee on World Food Security.

At the national level, Kenya pointed out that the Agricultural Policy and Services Division of the Ministry of Agriculture and ASCO could provide a platform for this component.

It was understood that the ISC approved the workplan and logframe on the understanding that flexibility would be there to accommodate changes if needed.

Budgets

Regarding **budgets**, it was clarified by Dr. Sakalian that budget revisions of the technical components can be considered for the budget managed by UNEP, although there is limited flexibility for revision of the Project Management component, as according to GEFSEC requirements the budget of this component should not exceed 10% of the total GEF budget.

For UNEP, budget revision will be needed for any changes on the budget line exceeding 10%. Justification for these changes should be sent from countries to the GPMU who will forward the request to the GEF. Changes up to 10% of the total budget can be carried out without official advance approval. Any changes beyond 10% need to be approved in advance. If changes are reasonable, they will be approved.

Detecting confusion among partners regarding budget arrangements, Dr. Sakalian explained that the project has a consolidated budget but that different portions are managed by the two project implementing agencies. Funds for this budget are being transferred from the implementing agencies to Bioversity, who will subsequently forward funds to countries once LOAs are signed. She further explained that, because there are two implementing agencies, the budget is split into two sub-components, one for each implementing agencies. Through UNEP, Bioversity will receive money for Components 1: Output 1.1., Component 2: Output 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, and for all of Components 4 and 5. Funds for the execution of remaining project components and outputs will be received by Bioversity from FAO. Countries will have to report to Bioversity by outputs and by budget lines.

Dr. Sakalian pointed out that to date only UNEP has signed the agreement with Bioversity for project execution and disbursed funds to Bioversity, while FAO was in the process of finalizing its agreement with Bioversity. It was highlighted that this might delay the implementation of activities, leaving two options open to the Project: either wait until money is transferred from FAO, or authorize Bioversity to sign LOAs with countries and transfer enough money allowing countries to implement activities until the end of the year for components under the budget implemented by UNEP. Following the disbursement of funds by both implementing agencies, new letters of agreement can be signed in 2013.

It was also explained that the same sub-division is maintained in the co-finance report. Co-finance reports have to be prepared once a year, and submitted along with technical reports. Dr. Sakalian advised countries to keep track of expenditures and revise the documents on a semi-annual basis. She also mentioned that co-financing commitments are not audited. Finally, she mentioned, these reports can be shared with international partners to revise the budget lines where the co-financing commitment was allocated.

On the issue of the division of responsibilities, Kuena Morebotsane wished to clarify that the division of project tasks between UNEP and FAO was requested by GEFSEC and would not have been otherwise approved When asked how long it would take for the money to be transferred from FAO once the Execution Agreement between FAO and Bioversity had been signed, Kuena Morebotsane replied that this depended largely on Bioversity and the countries and on how soon they could agree on the LOAs between them and Bioversity.

To avoid delays in project implementation, the Global Project Coordinator, suggested that LOAs be developed with countries until the end of the year, using money so far provided by UNEP. To this end, countries would need to develop budgets and workplans until the end of the year.

It was requested from Turkey that UNEP circulate the final UNEP and FAO budgets in Excel format approved by the GEFSEC among partners.

With reference to procurement, Dr. Sakalian explained that procurement plans are requested by countries at the beginning and at the end of the project. It was recommended that countries prepare a procurement plan as soon as possible, since all project equipment, with some agreed exceptions, needs to be purchased in the first half of the project. Countries need to keep track of equipment throughout the project and at the end of the project provide details of where the equipment purchased with project funds will be housed. Although there will be a single format for all countries, the budget needs to be prepared separately for UNEP and FAO. The GPMU will send a template in spreadsheet format out to countries as soon as possible.

In relation to budget revision, Dr. Sakalian was asked to clarify whether the flexibility for moving funds around was greater in those budget lines dealing with technical components. She replied that the justification for transferring funds from the M&E component to the technical component might be more feasible following the mid-term review. However, if countries could provide robust justification for this, it might be approved. Dr. Sakalian explained that the accountability was very high, and that countries should be careful when making budget changes.

The remainder of the session was taken up by programme and logistical arrangements at the WN Rio 2012 conference. Ways to make use of the presence of national partners at the meeting were discussed, along with ideas on how to engage the audience and open the floor to more interactive discussions.

Barbara Burlingame from FAO emphasised the need to sensitize the audience - who would be largely made up of nutritionists - to issues surrounding the importance of biodiversity and food as ecosystem services. She argued that this would allow the mainstreaming of nutrition into the environment sector and vice versa.

It was also suggested that during the launch Dr. Sakalian first provide an overview of the context in which the partnership had developed, sensitizing the audience to the concept of the GEF as the funding mechanism. For this to be more effectively achieved, it was proposed that the framework context be separate from the technical component in which country partners could emphasize the importance of the project for their countries. Senior country representatives were advised to meet with their respective NPCs to discuss what they might say at the meeting. The use of Powerpoint presentations was accepted, and it was decided that Dr. Hunter be the moderator for the event.

To be ready for questions from the audience, Dr. Remans from the Earth Institute suggested that common definitions be set, and that a business as usual scenario be presented, so as to clarify the benefits that a project of this nature would bring.

Regarding the signing of the agreement between FAO and Bioversity, Kuena Morebotsane clarified that she was confident that the agreement would be signed within the next few months.

She also explained that the Nutrition Division, acting as the focal point for FAO for the project, would be coordinating the entire agency's support to the project.

When asked by Sri Lanka whether FAO representatives in project countries should be invited to national steering committee meetings, it was replied that it is good practice to invite them, but that they rarely attend. However, it would be advisable to invite FAO representatives at the national project launch. Countries thus requested that FAO's Nutrition Division send a formal letter to their offices in the countries to make them aware of the new BFN initiative.

In order to start preparing workplans and budgets for the drafting of LOAs to cover the remaining portion of 2012, it was requested that Bioversity send an official letter to governments announcing the project launch and advising on key next steps.

Suggestions were then welcomed for the location of the 2nd ISC in 2013, possibly in conjunction with a relevant national or international event within project countries. The reason for hosting the ISC in the countries, it was explained, was also to bring attention to some of the project activities that are taking place in the countries. Tentative offers were put forward by Kenya and Sri Lanka.

Other opportunities for showcasing the project and project results were identified, such as:

- IUCN World Conservation Congress in Korea (6-15 September 2015) – a slot has been secured for a poster presentation
- Terramadre in Turin, Italy (25-29 October 2012)
- SAARC regional Health Ministers Summit in Sri Lanka (2014)
- World Expo in Milan Italy in which the focus will be Nutrition (2015) – it is expected that Bioversity will have a pavilion for this

It was suggested that countries keep flagging forums and opportunities as they arise and that relevant information is exchanged through emails or using the dedicated Biodiversity for Food and Nutrition Listserve set up by the GPMU. Also, countries should seek to optimize costs by piggybacking on other initiatives and business-related travel.

With regards to fundraising opportunities, entry points linking to on-going activities and cross-country collaborations were identified such as:

- Complementary feeding practices for biodiversity
- Cross-country cookbooks
- Home-grown school feeding (HGSF)
- Functional diversity analysis
- Develop education curricula, course material
- Crowd sourcing – using individuals to provide data (validation of what has been identified at the satellite level). Also called citizens' science

This session ended the ISC meeting. Thus, the Global Project Coordinator called on the representatives of the implementing agencies and the executing agency to close the assembly.

Dr. Burlingame from FAO reiterated her gladness for being involved in the project. She thanked the GPMU for the excellent organization of the meeting, and expressed her gratitude to national partners and international colleagues old and new.

Dr. Sakalian echoed the words of the FAO representative and thanked all national partners for taking part in the meeting, with a special mention to the Government of Brazil for facilitating the get-together. Words of appreciation were expressed to the international partners for providing excellent inputs during the meeting, and to the co-implementing agency for their support. Lastly, she thanked the GPMU for their excellent support.

Dr. Ramirez from Bioversity International conveyed her gratitude to participants for being invited and for demonstrating that a common aspiration is shared by all. She felt that the launch had been the first big show of the project's effective partnership. She anticipates many difficulties during project implementation but hopes these can be solved together.

On behalf of Brazil and the MMA, Ms. Soares thanked participants for coming to Brazil and for establishing such an effective partnership. Her words were endorsed by Mauricio Azeredo who added that it had been a pleasure to meet all participants. The Chief of Cabinet also expressed his sincerest thanks to Ms. Soares for representing the Ministry of the Environment so efficiently and welcomed all participants back to Brazil in the near future.

The meeting was officially closed by the Global Project Coordinator.

Annex 1

Technical Inception Workshop
1st International Steering Committee Meeting
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil – 22nd to 26th April 2012

Participants List

BRAZIL

Deborah MARKOWICZ BASTOS
Associate Professor of Food Science
Nutrition Department
School of Public Health - São Paulo University
Av. Dr. Arnaldo 715 - São Paulo - SP
Tel: +55 11 30617855
Email: dmbastos@usp.br

Dr. Mauricio AZEREDO
Chief of Cabinet
Biodiversity and Forests Secretariat
Ministry of the Environment
Av. W2 Norte, SEPN Quadra 505, Bloco B,
Edifício Marie Prendi Cruz
Brasilia, DF, 70.730-542
Mobile: +55 61 92761945/20282192
Email: mauricio.azeredo@mma.gov.br

Camila NEVES SOARES OLIVEIRA
Analista Ambiental
Genetic Resources Management
Biodiversity Conservation Dept.
Biodiversity and Forests Secretariat
Ministry of the Environment
Av. W2 Norte, SEPN Quadra 505, Bloco B,
Edifício Marie Prendi Cruz, sala 414
Brasilia, DF, 70.730-542
Email: camila.oliveira@mma.gov.br
Tel: +55 61 2028-2288
Mobile: +55 61 81706400

Marcia Ortiz MARQUES
Senior Scientist
Instituto Agronômico
Av. Barão de Itapura, 1
481 Caixa Postal 28
Campinas
Sao Paulo CEP 13012-970
Email: mortiz@iac.sp.gov.br
Tel: +55 19 32021770

KENYA

Maureen KEMUNTO MIRUKA
National Project Coordinator
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute,
P.O. Box 57811-00200, City Square,
Nairobi, Kenya.
Tel: +254 20 4183301-20 Extn 2340
Mobile: +254 0722 576 069 and +254 0733 433 368
Email: mkmiruka@kari.org
Email 2: maureenmiruka@gmail.com

Festus MURITHI
Assistant Director
Socio-Economics and Applied Statistics Division
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute,
P.O. Box 57811-00200, City Square,
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 4183301-20 Extn 2340
Email: fmmurithi@kari.org
Email 2: fmmeme@yahoo.com

SRI LANKA

Anura WIJESEKARA
National Project Coordinator
Horticulture Crops Development & Research Institute (HORDI)
P.O. Box 11. Peredeniya, Sri Lanka
Tel: +94 81 238 9749
Mobile: +94 71 448 4143
E-mail: awijesekara@yahoo.com

Ajith SILVA
Director of the Biodiversity Secretariat
Ministry of the Environment
82, Sampath Paya
Rajamalwatte Road
Battaramulla, Sri Lanka
Mobile: + 94 71 442 1506
E-mail: koralage2001@yahoo.com

TURKEY

Vehbi ESER
National Project Coordinator
Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policy
PO Box 51 Yenimahalle 06171
Ankara, Turkey
Tel: +90 312 3435675
Email: veser@tagem.gov.tr

Arzu ÜNAL
Coordinator
Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policy
PO Box 51 Yenimahalle 06171
Ankara, Turkey
Tel: + 90 312 3434612
E-mail: aunal@tagem.gov.tr

Birgül GÜNER
Coordinator
Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policy
PO Box 51 Yenimahalle 06171
Ankara, Turkey
Tel: +90 312 3434612
E-mail: bguner@tagem.gov.tr

UNEP/DGEF

Marieta SAKALIAN
Senior Programme Management/Liaison Officer (CGIAR/FAO), Biodiversity
UNEP/DGEF Regional Programme Coordinator Eastern Europe and Central Asia
c/o FAO Headquarters
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 5705 5969
E-mail1: Marieta.Sakalian@unep.org
E-mail2 Marieta.Sakalian@fao.org

BIOVERSITY INTERNATIONAL

Danny HUNTER
Global Coordinator
49 Olympic Drive
Orange, NSW 2800
Australia
Tel: (+61) 0448 697 256
Email: d.hunter@cgiar.org

Teresa BORELLI
Programme Specialist
UNEP/GEF Nutrition Project
Via dei Tre Denari 472/a
00057 Maccarese (Rome), Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118 228
Email: t.borelli@cgiar.org

FAO

Kuena MOREBOTSANE
FAO-GEF Unit
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06570 55358
Email: kuena.morebotsane@fao.org

Barbara BURLINGAME
Senior Scientist
Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division (AGND)
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06570 53728
Fax: +39 06 570 54593
Email: barbara.burlingame@fao.org

Stefano MONDOVÍ
Consultant, Biodiversity for Food and Nutrition
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06570 52491
Email: stefano.mondovi@fao.org

AVRDC – The World Vegetable Center

Ray-Yu YANG
Nutritionist
AVRDC -The World Vegetable Center
P.O. Box 42, Shanhua
Tainan 74199,
Taiwan
Tel: +886 6 583 7801, ext 430
Email: ray-yu.yang@worldveg.org

CROPS FOR THE FUTURE

Michael HERMANN
Global Coordinator
c/o Bioversity International
Stesen Kuarantin, Jabatan Pertanian
Bangunan JKR (P) 1746
P.O. Box 236, UPM Post Office
43400 Serdang, Selangor
Malaysia
Email: M.Hermann@cgiar.org

EARTH INSTITUTE COLUMBIA

Roseline REMANS
Associate Research Scientist
Tropical Agriculture Program
61 Route 9W
Lamont Hall, Room 2G
Palisades NY 10964
USA
Tel: +1 845 365 8557
Fax: +1 845 620 4870
E-mail1: rr2547@columbia.edu
E-mail2: rremans@ei.columbia.edu

World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)

Stepha McMULLIN
Post-Doc Fellow
GRPi
Agriculture Nutrition and Health
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
PO Box 30677
Nairobi, 00100, Kenya
Telephone: +254 20 7224234
Fax: +254 78 72650
E-mail: s.mcmullin@cgiar.org

WFP

Carmen BURBANO
Policy Officer
School Feeding Specialist
Via C.G. Viola 68
Parco dei Medici
00148 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 6513 2102
Fax: + 39 06
E-mail: carmen.burbano@wfp.org