



Steering Committee Meeting IPGRI, Maccarese 12 March 2003

Minutes

1. Background

The meeting was the first official meeting of the Steering Committee. It was hosted by IPGRI and organized by the Global Facilitation Unit. The list of participants is attached in Annex 1.

2. Objectives of the meeting

The objectives of the meeting were a) to brief the Steering Committee on the progress of the GFU made since the last meeting in July 2002, b) to achieve agreement on GFAR's presence on the Steering Committee, c) to achieve agreement on the hosting organization of the GFU's portal and its further development

3. Agenda

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 9:00 | Opening and welcome of participants by the Director General of IPGRI (Geoff Hawtin) |
| 9:10 | Welcome of participants and presentation of agenda by the Deputy Chairman (P. Griffée) |
| 9:20 | Pending issue from July meeting: GFAR's presence on steering committee (I. Hoeschle-Zeledon/Ola Smith) |
| 9:30 | Progress report (I. Hoeschle-Zeledon) |
| 11:15 | GFU web portal <ul style="list-style-type: none">- presentation of structure and content, feed back received (C. Bothe)- next steps and requirements to publish portal (C. Bothe)- opportunities, constraints and implications of different hosting options: IPGRI (P. Bordoni/M. Buonaiuto), FAO, ECOPORT (P. Griffée), others (P. Bordoni)- decision on hosting organization and further action |
| 12:00 | Update on international workshop (I. Hoeschle-Zeledon) |
| 12:30 | Short term outlook, ideas for long term action (I. Hoeschle-Zeledon) and discussion |
| 13:00 | Lunch |

4. Summary of the meeting and conclusions

Geoff Hawtin, the Director General of IPGRI, welcomed the participants and expressed IPGRI's pride in hosting the GFU. He pointed out the importance the current external review of IPGRI gives to underutilized species.

Peter Griffiee welcomed the participants on behalf of the chairman, Eric Kueneman, who regretted not being able to attend in person. Apologies were also received from Hans-Jochen de Haas, BMZ.

4.1 Pending issue from July meeting: GFAR's presence on the SC

Ola Smith reported that the GFAR's new Management Team considers it important that GFAR is represented on the SC of all Global Partnership Programs, since they were strongly involved in their setups. In the case of the Underutilized Species Program the GFAR Executive Secretary would be the member on the SC.

The members of the SC have agreed to include GFAR as a new member on the SC. There will be a formal invitation from the chairman to the GFAR Executive Secretary.

4.2 Progress report

Irmgard Hoeschle-Zeledon presented to the house the activities of the GFU carried out since last July based on the work plan approved by the SC (Annex 2). During the subsequent discussion the following points were raised:

- a) information dissemination: Nazmul Haq offered to provide in the ICUC newsletter a special site for the GFU. He also asked the members of the SC to help ICUC in distributing their regular newsletter to stakeholders in order to reduce costs and enlarge number of readers. Peter Griffiee said to contact the editor of the Plant Breeding News, an electronic newsletter supported by FAO, to provide a corner to GFU for contributions.
- b) selection of species for case studies: some members of the SC requested clarification on the criteria used to select the species for case studies. IHZ pointed out the purpose of these case studies: they should provide information and lessons learned in order to serve as a starting point for the development of general concepts and instruments for the sustainable promotion of any underutilized species; they are not meant to promote these particular species. The GFU was requested to produce a short document explaining the selection decision, which can help to mobilize support for the studies (Annex 3). Ola Smith then asked what species would be promoted by the GFU. Peter Griffiee reminded the house that the GFU's key task was to facilitate. Toby Hodgkin reiterated that the GFU's work was not species specific and the selection of and work on species was done by the stakeholders. Some members, however, expressed the need to establish selection criteria for species since there might be cases when specific species have to be considered (*the GFU's coordinator would like to remind the SC members that criteria for the species that will be treated as underutilized in the context of the GFU have been established and approved by the members of the last meeting in July 2002. Hence the GFU will provide support only to those organizations/*

networks working with species that fulfill at least some of those criteria; see Annex 4).

- c) inclusion of underutilized species in development programs: Alessandro Meschinelli pointed out that the problem is to convince the regional partners to give importance to underutilized species. The appealing points about these species have to be made clearly visible. The decisions for investments are often not taken by the stakeholders concerned but by consultants with own ideas. The donors' country portfolio managers and their consultants have to be addressed. The database "who is doing what" would be very helpful for the preparation of new program proposals. Certain issues like the impact on gender are of high interest for most donors and are therefore rightfully included as issues to be looked at in the planned case studies. Fulvia Bounaiuti suggested to strengthen the GFU's PR skills and to show permanent presence at all levels, particularly at the sub-regional levels. Feed-back should be received from there and conveyed to the donors. Ola Smith said that GFAR could support the GFU in organizing specific regional meetings with stakeholders on topics related to underutilized species, which would allow to emphasize on the important role of underutilized species and to capture the needs of the various stakeholders. Toby Hodgkin recommended the GFU to reach out to more stakeholders. He mentioned that CSOs had not yet been mobilized and should be addressed during the coming months through a stronger involvement of GFAR. He also said the SC felt that the GFU should focus on policy issues.

4.3 GFU web portal

The house has agreed to accept IPGRI's offer to host the GFU website to let it take off. Details will be clarified between IPGRI and the GFU. Toby Hodgkin mentioned IPGRI's long-term commitment to underutilized species and its wish to see the GFU's work to be continued beyond the lifespan of the unit. IPGRI would be pleased to collaborate with other agencies to seek resources for the maintenance of the website using the entry points mentioned by Alessandro Meschinelli (e.g. if IFAD is giving additional grants to IPGRI for work on underutilized species part of these grants could go to support the GFU website hosted by IPGRI). The GFU will still provide part of its limited resources to improve the site and to make it as attractive as possible for both the users and possible supporters. Ola Smith said that in view of a long-term solution GFAR could be useful in finding a home for the site within its constituencies. Toby Hodgkin stressed GFAR's crucial role in this context.

4.4 Update on international workshop

IHZ reported on the current status of the organization of the international workshop to be held from 6-8 May in Leipzig, Germany. IFAD and CTA made commitments to co-sponsor the event. The number of participants will be around 55 from about 30 countries. The SC members emphasized that there should be a strong involvement of the private sector and CSOs (people not belonging to the international scene) during this workshop.

4.5 Outlook

IHZ listed the remaining activities of the work plan to be carried out at short term. The facilitation of the inclusion of underutilized species in regional, sub-regional and national research priorities and in national agricultural policies through sensitization and awareness creating events with decision and policy makers, donors and development agencies are long-term activities.

Regarding the suggestion of establishing a competitive fund amongst potential donors, the SC members felt that it would be very difficult and the example of the unsuccessful exploration of a challenge program on underutilized species was given. It was suggested to support the development of good and convincing proposals and to address donors directly. GFAR could also provide backing and support to stakeholders with regard to proposal development and presentation to funding agencies.

Annex 1

Steering Committee Meeting, IPGRI, Maccaresse 12 March 2003

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ORGANIZATION	e-mail ADDRESS
Peter Griffee	FAO-AGPC	<u>peter.griffee@fao.org</u>
Toby Hodgkin	IPGRI	<u>t.hodgkin@cgiar.org</u>
Nazmul Haq	ICUC	<u>haq@soton.ac.uk</u>
Alessandro Meschinelli	IFAD	<u>a.meschinelli@ifad.org</u>
Ola Smith	GFAR	<u>ola.smith@fao.org</u>
Fulvia Bonaiuti	GFAR	<u>fulvia.bonaiuti@fao.org</u>
Massimo Buonaiuto	IPGRI	<u>m.buonaiuto@cgiar.org</u>
Carolin Bothe	GTZ	<u>carolin.bothe@gtz.de</u>
Paul Bordoni	GFU	<u>p.bordoni@cgiar.org</u>
Irmgard Hoeschle-Zeledon	GFU	<u>i.zeledon@cgiar.org</u>

Annex 2: GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

Output 1: Improved access to information available and systems in place to maintain information flow			
Activities	Indicators	Timetable	Costs (EURO)
1.1 Create online portal (gateway) for information placement and web-links to further internet info sources		Aug. 02-May 03	
1.1.1 Make suggestions for the design of a homepage	Proposal available by 9/02	Aug.-Sept. 02	
1.1.2 Contract consultant for homepage development	TORs defined and contract signed by 9/02	Aug.-Sept. 02	10,000
1.1.3 Publish homepage	Homepage published by 1/03	Jan. 03	
1.1.4 Train person to maintain homepage	GFU Assistant trained by consultant until 12/02	Nov. 02	Included in 1.2
1.1.5 Prepare proposal for design of portal	Design discussed with experts by 10/02	Aug.-Oct. 02	
1.1.6 Identify relevant web-links		Aug.-Dec. 02	
1.1.7 Find host for portal	Host organization and server identified by 5/03	Oct. 02-May 03	
1.1.8 Contract consultant to develop portal	TORs defined and contract signed by 11/02	Nov. 02	30,000
1.2 Compile information 'Who is doing what' and monitor development	Initial database available by 3/03 Expert list available	Sept. 02-March 03 Sept. 02-Aug. 03	5,000
1.3 Organize meetings with target groups to identify information gaps and needs	Several meetings held, information gaps and needs identified	Oct. 02-Aug. 03	20,000
1.4 Encourage stakeholders	Information submitted to the	Continuous	

GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

to actively contribute to information exchange	portal		
+,*1.4.1 Encourage creation of a corner for underutilized species in existing newsletters	Relevant newsletters publish regularly topics related to underutilized species	Continuous	
+,*1.4.2 Facilitate the production of info material by stakeholders	e.g. 1 monograph of IPGRI, ICUC per year; fact sheets on various underutilized species	Sept. 02- Aug. 03	10,000
1.5 Identify complementary stakeholders to collectively maintain information system	Portal and homepage updated and maintained outside the GFU by 12/04	Continuous	

GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

Output 2: Platform for discussion of concepts, strategies and instruments to promote and facilitate the sustainable use of underutilized species is created and maintained			
Activities	Indicators	Timetable	Costs (EURO)
2.1 Contribute to the documentation and analysis of case studies on underutilized plant species			
2.1.1 Identify specific cases		Aug.-Dec. 02	
2.1.2 Encourage and support stakeholders to document cases		Aug. 02-April 03	10,000
2.2 Make case studies available to stakeholders for discussion and evaluation	Several cases documented in different forms and discussed during international events	Jan.-April 03	5,000
2.3 Facilitate the identification of criteria for 'good practices'	Criteria for 'good practices' defined and approved by stakeholders by 5/03	May 03 during intern. Workshop	
2.4 Initiate chat-rooms and e-mail discussions on particular topics amongst stakeholders			
+,* 2.5 Encourage stakeholders to jointly organize workshops/seminars on topics related to underutilized plant species	Intern. Workshop held in 5/03 on 'Strategic elements for the promotion of underutilized plant species'; workshop on policy issues with policymakers in III/03	July 02-May 03	30,000
		March-Aug.03	5,000 until 8/03
2.6 Encourage and facilitate the inclusion of underutilized species in research priority	Research priorities defined for at least 3 regions by 6/03	Oct. 02-May 03	

GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

setting			
2.6.1 Enter in dialog with regional fora on underutilized species	All regional fora contacted by 12/02	Oct.-Dec. 02	
2.6.2 Attend meetings of regional fora	Meetings attended as occasion occurs	Oct. 02-May 03	5,000
2.7 Identify complementary stakeholders to collectively maintain the platform			

GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

Output 3: Access of stakeholders to financial resources is facilitated			
Activities	Indicators	Timetable	Costs (EURO)
3.1 Identify policy of traditional donors with regard to under-utilized plant species and identify new donors +,*3.1.1 Contact traditional donors and commercial sector to identify areas of interest		Nov. 02-Aug.03	
3.1.2 Elaborate database of potential donors and areas of interest	Database available by 8/03 and maintained	Jan.-Aug. 03	
3.2 Inform potential donors on importance of under-utilized species and the development potential they offer +,*3.2.1 Co-organize info-workshop	Info-workshop for donors organized in 03	Febr.-Aug. 03	10,000
3.2.2 Prepare info materials	Various info materials developed by 6/03	Nov. 02-Aug. 03	5,000
*3.2.3 Facilitate stakeholders' participation in intern. fairs/exhibitions	Stall at "Green Week" in Berlin 1/03 or at other fairs	Sept. 02-May. 03	10,000
3.3 Link research and implementation organizations with potential donors			

GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

<p>3.4 Advise stakeholders in formulation of pilot projects based on regional and national priorities</p> <p>*3.4.1 Encourage development of project proposals</p>	<p>Several proposals elaborated and submitted to donors (e.g. based on BMZ financed studies carried out in SSA)</p>		
---	---	--	--

GFU for Underutilized Species - Workplan August 2002 - August 2003

Output 4: The modalities of developing a sustainable mechanism to support underutilized species are determined			
Activities	Indicators	Timetable	Costs (EURO)
4.1 Facilitate networking amongst institutions, organizations and existing networks +,*4.1.1 Prepare an update on networks' activities +,*4.1.2 Co-organize training courses on specific topics	Update available by 12/03 Training course on marketing/add value strategies in 2003	Jan.-Aug. 03 Jan.-Aug. 03	40,000
4.2 Encourage and support stakeholders to assume leading role in maintaining the facilitation mechanism			
4.3 Agree on specific responsibilities individual stakeholders are willing to accept as part of the GFM			

* also of IPGRI's interest
 + also of ICUC's interest
 could be joint activities



Annex 3

Selection of species for case studies

Background:

Part of the GFU's task is to identify and document 'best practices' and 'success stories' with regard to the promotion and sustainable utilization of underutilized species and to draw lessons learned. This information will help to develop concepts and strategies to be applied in future development programs for these species and to avoid undesirable effects.

This information can best be collected by evaluating some cases of promotion of underutilized species, taking into account the objectives of the promotion, the approach used and looking at the entire chain from the genetic resources to the consumers of the products obtained from the species promoted.

The key issues to be looked at when evaluating these cases include the social, ecological and economic impacts the promotion of a plant species, from an underutilized situation to a more exploited status, has on the livelihood of the people in the area of origin of that species.

Social issues:

Impact on gender (income, workload, social status)

Impact on people who depend on collecting plants from the wild for their survival and cash income (who do not have own farm land)

Impact on cultural/religious traditions

Impact on diet of local people (quality, quantity)

Impact on indigenous knowledge

Impact on human rights

Ecological:

Impact on ecosystem (intra and inter specific diversity)

Economic:

Impact on household income

Impact on household food security

Impact on farming systems

Impact on local/regional/international markets

There are currently 5 case studies envisaged. In order to carry out these studies partners are sought to contribute with already available expertise and human and financial resources.

The selection of the species for these studies was based on several criteria:

1. should belong to different categories of use (food, medicinal, industrial/artisan)
2. should belong to different markets (local/regional/international)
3. within the food species there should be several types represented (fruits, vegetables, grains, etc.)
4. should be cases from various geographical regions
5. should represent examples of good and less good practices with regard to improvement of the livelihood of the local people and the sustainable utilization of the biodiversity
6. availability of interested partners to jointly conduct the study

The following species were chosen in a first selection process:

1. Quinoa: during the past 2 decades national governments, development organizations and donors supported the promotion of this Andean grain in order to improve the food security and food quality of the indigenous people of the Andens. Today Quinoa is a highly appreciated food of an increasing number of consumers in Europe and the US. This growing demand led to the cultivation of Quinoa even outside its area of origin where it was not known before, e.g. Europe and the US. Some varieties have even been temporarily patented in the US. The study should focus on the impact the demand for this species and hence its production outside the area where it was promoted had on the initial target group, e.g. on their own diet, incomes, farming systems, the existing biodiversity, etc. It should clearly elaborate the benefits the Andean people enjoy from the promotion of Quinoa as a valuable food. PROINPA, a foundation in Bolivia for the Promotion and Research on Andean Products, has expressed interest in contributing to this study. PROINPA is working with local communities and is promoting Quinoa for local consumption and export.
2. Physic Nut: *Jatropha curcas* is widely distributed all over the semi arid and arid areas. All parts of the plant are used in traditional medicine. The so-called Jatropha-System, the integrated utilization of the Jatropha plant, has been supported by various donors with the aim of producing alternative fuel energy and to improve local food production. In addition the plant offers off-season income opportunities particularly for women producing soap. The case study should provide a verification of the predicted benefits of the Jatropha-System for the rural poor people. UNIDO has supported several Jatropha projects in the past and has made a commitment to assist with this study.
3. Devils' Claw: It is a native plant of Southern Africa, especially Botswana and Namibia. Its roots have been harvested from the wild and used for centuries by the native people to prepare traditional medicine. In the recent past the values of the plant have been discovered by pharmaceutical companies mainly from Europe, which led to an intensive collection. There are currently major efforts to

establish Devil's Claw plantations in South Africa. The case study should look particularly at the impact the high demand for the plant from abroad has on the sustainability of its utilization in its natural habitat. At the same time it should look at the effects of a shift from wild harvesting to production in plantations out of its original environment on the social and economic situation of the native people whose livelihood depends on the income achieved by harvesting and marketing plants collected in the wild. Currently Devil's Claw is receiving higher attention in Namibia through a multi-sector working group coordinated by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. A situation analysis has been done to gather information regarding the environmental and socio-economic impacts of wild harvesting and there are plans within the Ministry of Agriculture to develop cultivation techniques. Our envisaged case study could hook-up with the study realized in Namibia.

4. Kiwi: The World Kiwifruit Review 1998 says: "The kiwifruit industry is unique among global fruit industries in being so totally dominated by one variety, the Hayward variety. Most consumers are not even aware that other varieties exist." Kiwi is one of the very few temperate fruit crops that have been domesticated in the past century. It was once a wild plant in China, but by 1970 it had developed into a new crop in New Zealand, based on a single introduction of seed from China. The Hayward variety has been taken back to China, where it is now widely cultivated (Janick, J. in: Perspectives on new crops and new uses, 1999). Italy and the United States are other important producers today.

With this background the case study should provide information on the impact the successful global commercialization of this fruit had in its area of origin with regards to the social, environmental and economic issues mentioned before.

5. Indigenous African Vegetables: This is a readily available case study based on a DFID funded project, which was executed in Uganda, Zimbabwe and Cameroon. It will be presented during our international workshop in May by the lead scientist for the Cameroon component. It will show how the promotion of the indigenous vegetables in some areas in the country through participatory selection and improvement of varieties, market development and improved post-harvest handling led to enhanced production and consumption, its impact on the nutrition income and gender aspects.

Annex 4

Conceptual Framework Global Facilitation Unit (GFU) for Under-utilized Species*

The potential importance of a wide range of species for poverty alleviation and food security in developing countries is recognized by many researchers, development specialists and policy makers. Various activities such as publishing monographs, conducting research projects, promoting use and marketing etc. with regards to some of those species take place in various places and at varying intensities. During the first GFAR Conference in Dresden, Germany, in May 2000 a working group recommended an involvement of GFAR in under-utilized and orphan species and commodities (UOC) in order to increase the visibility and valorize the work already done and to stimulate activities at regional level and to follow-up by establishing a Global Facilitation Mechanism.

In two follow-up meetings of an informal group consisting of representatives of FAO, IPGRI, ICUC, IFAD and BMZ this idea of the Global Facilitating Mechanism on Under-Utilized and Orphan Commodities was further developed. The elaboration of a Global Framework for Action for UOC was commissioned by FAO, while IFAD provided funds to IPGRI for research activities on UOC and ICUC conducted a study on 'Global research on under-utilized crops' on behalf of IPGRI. BMZ provided a financial contribution for the establishment of the Facilitation Mechanism, and IPGRI offered to host the mechanism.

It is suggested that the office of the coordinator is called the 'Facilitation Unit. It is anticipated to have a sustainable mechanism in place as the ultimate result of the activities of the Unit after a period of 3 years. The Unit is limited in time whereas the Global Facilitation Mechanism should become a perpetual instrument.

Taking into account the discussions of the informal group and further consultations with the key stakeholders, the following is proposed as a Conceptual Framework for the Global Facilitation Unit:

The **Global Facilitation Mechanism**, initiated and established by the **Facilitation Unit** is expected to contribute to the following **Overall Goal**:

Under-utilized species contribute increasingly to food security and poverty alleviation of the rural and urban poor

* In this document the terms "under-utilized species", "under-utilized and orphan species and commodities" and "under-utilized and orphan commodities" are still used, because it refers to the previous discussions and the decision made during the meeting on 19.07.02

In this context under-utilized species are therefore species with an under-utilized potential with regard to food security and poverty alleviation. They are neglected by:

- Research
- Extension
- Donors
- Farmers themselves
- Policy and decision makers
- Seed industry
- Technology providers
- Social and cultural attitudes and practices
- Consumers
- Etc.

As a consequence farmers tend to under-utilize these species and to grow crops and raise animals, which receive high attention by at least some of the above mentioned actors. Those species usually have been studied by researchers of various disciplines to improve the genetic material, to develop production and processing technologies, extension services have sufficient knowledge to advise farmers adequately and last not least they have their established markets at different levels as compared to under-utilized species.

Species that will be treated as under-utilized in this context of the Global Facilitation Mechanism should fulfill some of the following criteria:

- Low external inputs for production required
- Suitable for organic production
- Suitable for cultivation on marginal land (low soil fertility, etc.)
- Suitable to stabilize fragile ecosystems
- Fit into smallholders' farming systems
- Possess traditional, local and/or regional importance
- Easy to store and process by resource poor communities
- Market opportunities available
- Possess high nutritional and/or medicinal value
- Offer multipurpose uses

The **Facilitation Unit** contributes to the following **Development Goal**:

An increasing number of donors, research institutions, extension services, policy and decision makers include under-utilized species in their development programs

Objective of the Global Facilitation Unit:

Organizations and their networks, which work on topics related to under-utilized species are strengthened and new organizations are engaged

How can they be strengthened:

- Providing access to relevant information
- Providing a platform for discussion of concepts, strategies and instruments applied to develop under-utilized species
- Supporting their access to financial resources
- Improving networking amongst them

Indicators to measure the **achievement of the objective of the Facilitation Unit** could be:

- Intensity of the use of the information provided (number of visitors of homepage, number of requests for information, etc.)
- Number of new projects in place
- Number of new partnerships
- Number of new publications
- The benefits of the GFU are described by the participating institutions
- Number of new organizations
-
-

Therefore the **expected outputs** of the **Global Facilitation Unit** should be:

1. Improved access to information on under-utilized species is available and systems are in place to maintain it

Relevant activities:

- Create an online portal (gateway) for information placement and web-links to further info sources
- Design and publish homepage for GFU
- Compile information on ‘who is doing what’ and monitor development and progress
- Organize regional meetings with target groups to identify information gaps and needs
- Encourage stakeholders to actively contribute to information exchange
- Identify complementary stakeholders to collectively maintain the information system and to assume the clearing house function
-
-

2. A platform for discussion of concepts, strategies and instruments to promote and to facilitate the sustainable use of under-utilized species is created and maintained

Relevant activities:

- Contribute to the documentation and analysis of case studies on under-utilized species
- Make case studies available to stakeholders for discussion and evaluation
- Facilitate the identification of criteria for ‘good practices’
- Initiate chat rooms and e-mail discussions on particular topics amongst stakeholders
- Encourage stakeholders to jointly organize workshops/seminars on topics related to under-utilized species
- Encourage and facilitate the inclusion of under-utilized species in research priority setting
- Identify complementary stakeholders to collectively maintain the platform
-
-

3. Access of stakeholders to financial resources is facilitated

Relevant activities:

- Identify policy of traditional donors with regard to under-utilized species and identify possible new donors
- Inform possible donors on importance of under-utilized species and the development opportunities they offer
- Link research and implementation organizations with possible donors
- Advise stakeholders in the formulation of pilot projects based on regional and national priorities
-
-

4. The modalities of developing a sustainable Global Facilitation Mechanism to support under-utilized species are determined

Relevant activities:

- Facilitate networking amongst organizations and existing networks
- Encourage and support stakeholders to assume an active leading role in establishing and maintaining the facilitation mechanism
- Agree on specific responsibilities individual stakeholders are willing to accept as part of the GFM
-
-