

# SADC CROP WILD RELATIVES



UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM



## Report

## Second Steering Committee meeting

2 October 2015, Rome, Italy

## **Minutes of the Second Steering Committee on EU-ACP project on In situ conservation and use of Crop Wild Relatives in three countries of the SADC region.**

**Held on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 at Bioversity International, Maccarese, Rome, Italy**

### **Present:**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chike Mba                 | Senior Officer (Team Leader), FAO, Rome, Italy, (Chair)   |
| Anneline Morgan           | Senior advisor, Science, Technology and Innovation, Social and Human Development and Special Programmes, SADC Secretariat, Gabarone, Botswana |
| Paul Munyenembe           | Director SADC Plant Genetic Resources Centre, Lusaka, Zambia  |
| Chandrani Jhowry          | Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security, Port Louis, Mauritius  |
| Willem Botes              | Lecturer, University of Stellenbosch, Chair of South Africa Breeders Association, Stellenbosch, South Africa                                  |
| Joseph Baidu-Forson       | Regional Representative for West and Central Africa, Bioversity International, Accra, Ghana   |
| Yasmina Jaufeerally-Fakim | Faculty of Agriculture, University of Mauritius, Reduit, Mauritius  |
| Thabo Tjikana             | Genebank Curator, Directorate of Genetic Resources, Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Pretoria, South Africa                 |
| Godfray Mwila,            | Deputy Director a.i, Zambia Agriculture Research Institute, Lusaka, Zambia  |
| Shelagh Kell              | Programme Manager, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK, (representing Nigel Maxted)  |
| Ehsan Dulloo              | Component leader and Coordinator of SADC CWR project, Bioversity International, (Secretary)   |

### **In attendance as observers:**

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Imke Thormann | Research Assistant, Bioversity International, Rome, Italy |
| Allison smith | Initiative Manager, Bioversity International, Rome, Italy |

### **Apologies:**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Nigel Maxted | Senior Lecturer, University of Birmingham (represented by Shelagh Kell)          |
| Ismael Sunja | Executive Director, Southern Africa Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU) |

1. The chair welcomed members of the Steering Committee (SC). The agenda (annex 1) was adopted.

## **2. Agenda item 1. Apologies:**

2.1 The project coordinator indicated that only two of the SC members, namely Nigel Maxted from University of Birmingham and Ismael Sunga from SACAU were unable to attend the meeting and they sent their apologies. Nigel Maxted sent Shelagh Kell as his representative. It was noted with concern that SACAU was also not present in the first Steering Committee. The SC noted that it is important in having a representation of farming community in the SC, given that farmers are the ultimate beneficiaries of the project. The SC urged the project coordinator to ensure that the minutes of SC and progress reports be sent to Mr Sunga and explore opportunities with South Africa partner to visit and/or attend meetings of the Confederation and to make presentation on the project. It was also suggested that SACAU be invited to participate at the national Stakeholder workshop due to take place on 22 October in Pretoria South Africa. **(Action: Project coordinator to share notes of meeting and progress reports; DAFF to visit and invite SACAU for national stakeholder workshop; Project coordinator to explore with SACAU the possibility of making a presentation on the project at a SACAU meeting)**. The chair requested that other countries should also actively engage with the farmers' communities.

2.2 The point was made that presentation to farming communities should not be too technical and be made in a simple layman language. As much as possible photographs, local varieties name, local examples to which farming communities are familiar with should be used in transferring key message that farmers may understand.

## **3. Agenda item 2. Matters arising**

3.1 The chair requested that the minutes of meetings should indicate the actionable items and responsibility clearly assigned to actions. **(Action: Project coordinator to ensure that minutes includes an Action list)**

3.2 The chair asked whether any progress was made on obtaining a representation from environment sciences on the SC. Mr Baidu Forson reported that he contacted Neville Ash from UNEP, but he has been promoted to Deputy Director of UNEP Division on Environmental Policy and was directed to Mounkaila Goumandakoye of UNEP who in turn asked him to contact Cecilia Njenga, the UNEP Coordinator for Southern Africa, based in Pretoria. The TOR of the SC was sent to her, but no response was obtained. However the project coordinator was informed that Marieta Sakalian, Senior Programme Management /Liaison Officer (CGIAR/FAO), Biodiversity of UNEP- GEF was requested to join the SC and will follow up with her. **(Action- Project coordinator to contact Ms Sakalian to join the SC)**. Further it was also suggested that environment sector should also be engaged in the project at the national Level. **(Action: National project coordinators should include environment representatives on their national committees)**.

3.3 Chair also noted that William Botes was invited to represent the breeders' community on the SC. He thanked Mr Botes for his acceptance and welcomed him to the SC.

3.4 Chair noted that the TOR of the SC has been revised as was requested and no further action is required. He also noted that progress reports of the project have been circulated to the SC members.

3.5 The project coordinator reported on the progress to organise a final International conference, as was suggested by Nigel Maxted. He has explored with DAFF and Agricultural Research Council to co-host the final conference, but the administrative procedures for its organisation has proved to be too complicated and expensive if we will have to follow DAFF procedures in procurement for the conference costs. Further he noted that there was no provision within the project to organise an international conference, but additional funds would be required. Bioversity would not have the necessary human resources to be able to organise the conference on its own. The proposal was thus dropped. Ms Morgan mentioned that SADC secretariat and SPGRC can help to raise the necessary fund for the international conference. She said that the new Regional Agriculture Policy places a strong emphasis on conservation and use of genetic resources and this can be leveraged for supporting a conference on this theme. Paul Munyenembe noted also that the RAP has been endorsed by the head of states. Ms Morgan also mentioned that Department of Science and Technology of DAFF can also co-fund such an initiative, as they can support institutions by providing co-funding for existing EU projects. There is also National Research Council funds that can be explored if the conference could be linked to its Bio-economic Strategy. Mr Botes in his capacity of South Africa Breeders Associated pledged to co-host the conference in Stellenbosch and said that his lab can take care of the venue and logistics of the conference. This was very much appreciated by the SC. It was agreed that a task force for organisation of the final conference be established and will be composed of Mr Botes, Ms Morgan, SPGRC Director Paul Munyenembe and the project coordinator Ehsan Dulloo and DAFF representative Thabo Tjikana . **(Action: Task force for organisation of the final conference to prepare a concept note for raising funds for the final Conference and undertake a feasibility study for organising final International Conference on CWR).**

3.6 Paul Muyenembe reported that the project was brought to the attention of the SPGRC Board members in October 2014. He will circulate the notes of meetings **(Action: Mr Munyenembe to send minutes of Board meeting to project management.)**

3.7 The chair followed up on the discussion regarding the opportunities for Masters and third year student to participate in the project. The chair suggested again that members affiliated to universities should look into this and would be an opportunity to train the next generation of scientists. Ms Kell indicated that this is usual practice at the University of Birmingham.

3.8 The chair referred to the opportunities that the project has to contribute to global network that FAO Commission aims to establish for in situ conservation and on farm management. Mr Mwila noted that no concrete steps and ideas have been put forward on how this can be achieved. He suggested that a regional body with a focal point that can coordinate the network is necessary. SPGRC could provide coordination among CWR expert on the region. Ms Kell suggested that partners should be invited to be members of the IUCN/SSC Crop Wild Relative Specialist Group and regional subgroup could be established. The project coordinator mentioned that regional chairs for the CWRSG could be re-established, as was the case when the Specialist Group was first created. He said that network should also engage with Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) as they have national nodes in each country and could serve for sharing of information on CWR. It was noted though that capacity in the region on CWR conservation was very limited and capacity building remains a priority, which the network could help to address. Ms Morgan said that an in situ network could serve as a platform to create capacity, knowledge exchange and information sharing. The project can be a springboard to create a network and extend to other countries in SADC region. She indicated that there is the Southern African Biosciences Network (SANBio) that could be brought in to help establish the network. Mr Munyenyembe said that SANBio will be visiting SPGRC can and he can raise this issue with them. Ms Morgan also indicated that SANBio is under her portfolio and they will come to visit Botswana next week and will also take up the matter with them. It was indicated that it would be possible to establish the network by end of this year. **(Action: Project coordinator and SPGRC to prepare a concept note about a regional network in the region for sharing with SANBIO and SPGRC; SPGRC and SADC Secretariat to raise the issue of supporting a CWR network in SADC region, with SANBio)**. The chair said that the same concept note should be shared with the CGRFA. A representation of his network could then be invited to the meeting in June next year when the networking mechanisms of the global in situ and on farm network is discussed.

3.9 Ms Morgan suggested that the minutes should be signed by the chair. The SC members asked for corrections of their names and title. It was agreed that no titles are needed in the minutes **(Action project coordinator and chair)**.

3.10 The minutes of the first SC meeting was proposed for adoption by Mr Mwila and was seconded by Ms Jaufferally Fakim. The SC approved the minutes as amended.

#### **4. Agenda item 3 - Project Coordinators' Status Report (Doc – First year narrative report and consolidated 6 month report 2015**

4.1 The project coordinator gave a brief summary of the progress of the 5 work packages. He said that all SC members were already fully briefed on the progress of the activities discussed during the Mid Term review meeting in two previous days and asked the SC if they have any further comments.

4.2 Mr Mwila commented that countries and governments want to feel ownerships of the projects and do not just want to satisfy donors, but rather the donors should serve and support the countries. He also said that the identifications of hotspot areas are concrete outputs for the effective conservation of CWR. However he is concerned about the quality of the data and this can affect the validity of the results. He suggested that the SC should look into how to support necessary field work also after the project to ensure the sustainability of the project. He also expressed the need to continue the work of raising awareness of the importance of CWR beyond the project among the stakeholders and reflect on how to garner support for the implementation of the work.

4.3 Mr Botes expressed concern about the work in South Africa and the timeline may not be sufficient to achieve the results in South Africa. He indicated that SANBI already has people who are well trained on in situ conservation work, but capacity should have been built in DAFF and in the genebank. It was noted though that DAFF staff was fully involved in the two training workshop and the activities are being implemented jointly between DAFF and SANBI.

4.4 Mr Baidu Forson commented that the presentation on the status report only provides a summary status of the achievement. It would be more helpful to discuss the main challenges experienced in the project delivery and flagged these which needed more attention and guidance. The project coordinator said that these details have been provided during the discussion of the MTR, but will ensure that these are captured in the report. **(Action: Project coordinator to include more details on the progress report).**

## **5. Agenda item 4- Review of key elements of the project plan, deliverables, milestones and risks assumptions**

5.1 Two supporting documentation was provided for this item Progress on the Annex 2 and progress on the action Annex 3)

5.2 Ms Kell found that the terminology related to deliverables and milestones used in the agenda and logical framework (annex 2) was confusing and requested clarifications. The logframe also did not have a time dimension and it was difficult to know what the milestones were. It was pointed out that the logframe provided is part of the approved project document and its wording cannot be changed. The chair encouraged members to focus on its content. The project coordinator said that the logframe should be viewed in conjunction with the indicative action plan where the time line is provided. It was suggested that the log frame should have dates which would help the steering committee members to understand progress and help the project to be keep on track.

5.3 Mr Baidu Forson also noted that the information provided on progress in the log frame as ongoing or initiated, partially achieved or fully achieved is insufficient. More information on the extent of achievement in terms of percentage achieved. **(Action: Project coordinator to provide more detailed information on the progress of achievement in the log frame)**

5.4 While reviewing the action plan (Annex 3), it was noted that predictive characterisation activity was reported as not started highlighted in red. It was argued that this was not quite correct as in the first year and first half of 2015, information such as occurrence data were being collected that will allow the predictive characterisation to be implemented. The steering community discussed how this activity can be supported. Ms Kell suggested that we not should wait for all occurrence data for all priority crops to start this activity. The quality of data will always be an issue, but this should not stop the activity to start. Countries were encouraged to select a crop and identify a trait for carrying out the predictive characterisation. Project coordinator said that all countries have received training on predictive characterisation and have identified the staff responsible for the activity.

5.5 The SC was overall impressed by the progress made in the progress made, but urged the project coordinator and country partners to pay particular attention to the predictive characterisation activity which is behind schedule. **(Action: Country project coordinator to take measures for implementing predictive characterisation activity as soon as possible).**

5.6 The SC urged the project coordinator to make clear the time lines of the different deliverables provided in the logframe. It was noted also it is unfair to attribute any delays to Bioversity, but country should also take their responsibility that project are on track. In fact countries have a contractual obligation to fulfil the work in time. **(Action: Project coordinator should include the time lines in the log frame for monitoring progress)**

## **6. Agenda item 5. Recommendations from steering committee members**

6.1 Ms Kell suggested that as a way to upscale the project, an exit strategy could be developed, as a concrete output of the project that can be used to inform national and regional policies. This could include recommendations for developing two products network collaboration or developing an integrated regional strategy. **(Action: SC recommended that a separate exit strategy be developed by University of Birmingham and share with SC; in addition project management in collaboration with SPGRC should prepare a concept note for a collaborative network on CWR).**

## 7. Agenda item 6 - Communication and awareness activities

7.1 The SC acknowledged that the visibility actions undertaken so far by the project has been very effective. It recommends that the environmental and nature conservation actors should be brought in. The project coordinator mentioned that the project has been presented at various international fora such side event at FAO commission on genetic resources for food and agriculture in January 2015. It was also presented at the IUCN/SSC Science leaders meeting in Abu Dhabi in September 2015 and aside event at International Treaty on PGRFA is being organised. In addition a joint notification by the secretariats of CBD, ITPGRFA CGRFA and Bioversity International have been made and sent to all the national focal points for these organisations for a call for action to strengthen in situ conservation of PGRFA including CWR in protected areas networks.

7.2 It was suggested that the project be presented at United Nations Climate Change Conference, COP21 in Paris. It was considered that it may be too late for this and also that the UNCCC COP may be too high profile political event for CWR.

7.3 It was also mentioned that in 2016, there will be the World Conservation Congress organised by IUCN in Hawaii 1-10 September and this would be a relevant forum for a workshop on CWR. Project coordinator informed SC that he and Nigel Maxted as the co-chairs of the IUCN/SSC CWR Specialist Group, have discussed this possibility and we could pursue it. The deadline for submission of a proposal is 15<sup>th</sup> October. **(Action: project coordinator to work with Nigel Maxted for submitted a proposal to IUCN World Conservation congress)**

The SC urged all partners to include a link of the project website to their institutional website and requested project management to make available the login information to access the project intranet. The link is as follows: <http://www.cropwildrelatives.org/sadc-cwr-project/>

**(Action: Project partners to include link to their website and the project management will also share the login information)**

With regard to the suggested International conference, the SC took note of the offer of University of Stellenbosch to host the conference. The SC established a taskforce composed of project coordinator, William Botes, Anneline Morgan and Paul Munyenyembe to put together a concept note for the organisation of the final international conference and study feasibility of organising Final International Conference. **(Action: See action under section 3.5)**

## 8. Agenda Item 7. Any other business

8.1 There was no other business reported.



## **9. Agenda item 8 next meeting**

9.1 Project coordinator indicated that the next face to face meeting of the SC will be organised in conjunction with the final dissemination meeting. However SC members will be kept informed of progress of the project by email and the two task force created during this meeting will meet virtually to complete their assignments.

### **SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS**

Action 1: Project coordinator to share notes of meeting and progress reports; DAFF to visit and invite SACAU for national stakeholder workshop; Project coordinator to explore with SACAU the possibility of making a presentation on the project at a SACAU meeting

Action 2: Project coordinator to ensure that minutes includes an Action list

Action 3: Project coordinator to contact Ms Sakalian to join the SC

Action 4: National project coordinators should include environment representatives on their national committees

Action 5: Task force for organisation of the final conference to prepare a concept note for raising funds for the final Conference and undertake a feasibility study for organising final International Conference on CWR

Action 6 : Mr Munyenembe to send minutes of Board meeting to project management.

Action 7: Project coordinator and SPGRC to prepare a concept note about a regional network in the region for sharing with SANBIO and SPGRC; SPGRC and SADC Secretariat to raise the issue of supporting a CWR network in SADC region, with SANBio

Action 8: Minutes should be signed by the chair

Action 9: Project coordinator to include more details on the progress report

Action 10: Project coordinator to provide more detailed information on the progress of achievement in the log frame

Action 11: Country project coordinator to take measures for implementing predictive characterisation activity as soon as possible

Action 12: project coordinator should include the time lines in the log frame for monitoring progress

Action 13: SC recommended that a separate exit strategy be developed by University of Birmingham and share with SC; in addition project management in collaboration with SPGRC should prepare a concept note for a collaborative network on CWR`

Action 14: project coordinator to work with Nigel Maxted for submitted a proposal to IUCN World Conservation congress

Action 15: Project partners to include link to their website and the project management will also share the login information

Signature and Name  
CHAIR OF STEERING COMMITTEE

DATE:

# Annex 1

## Agenda

1. **Apologies**
2. **Minutes of previous meeting** – matters arising (Doc – Minutes of the First steering committee) and adoption
3. **Project Coordinators' Status Report** (Doc – First year narrative report and consolidated 6 month report 2015)
4. **Review of key elements of the project plan, deliverables, milestones and risks assumptions** (Doc – project's log frame)
5. **Recommendations from steering committee members** – SC members provides guidance implementation of the project and comments on the overall progress of the project.
6. **Communication and awareness activities** (Doc – Project's Communication and Visibility Plan) SC members provides suggestions on how visibility of the project can be improved and how project results can be upscaled.
7. **Any other business**
8. **Next meeting**
9. **Report back to main Mid-term Review Meeting**

**Annex 2:**

**LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT**

|                             | <b>Intervention logic</b>   | <b>Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement</b>   | <b>Sources and means of verification</b>   | <b>Progress as at 29 September 2015</b>  | <b>Assumptions</b>  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Overall objective</b>    | To enhance the link between conservation and use of crop wild relatives (CWR) in three ACP countries of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) region as a means of underpinning regional food security and mitigating the predicted adverse impact of climate change | <p>National policies addressing conservation and use of CWR established;</p> <p>At least one <i>in situ</i> Genetic Reserve for CWR established by each partner country;</p> <p>Evidence of the use of CWR in improvement of crops in each partner country.</p> | <p>National policies;</p> <p>List of protected areas;</p> <p>Registry of new climate resilient varieties at country level</p>  |  |   |
| <b>Specific Objective 1</b> | To enhance the scientific capacities in three ACP countries of the SADC region to conserve CWR and identify useful potential traits for use to adapt to climate change.   | <p>Two subregional training workshops on conservation and use of CWR undertaken;</p> <p>At least 30 national staff across SADC region trained on <i>in situ</i> conservation of CWR, genetic diversity assessment and predictive characterisation</p>           | <p>Project Reports;</p> <p>Training activity reports;</p> <p>Needs assessment report;</p> <p>Travel reports of project coordinator</p> <p>These reports will be made available by the end of the</p> | <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b></p> <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED (target exceeded; 50 national staff trained)</b></p> | <p>Capacities within countries are lacking;</p> <p>CWR of importance to the SADC region are available</p> |

*'In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                             |   |  |   |                       |   |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------|---|
|                             |   |  | project by the lead organization  |                       |   |
| <b>Specific Objective 2</b> | To develop exemplar national Strategic Action Plans for the conservation and use of CWR in the face of climate change in three ACP countries of the SADC region | Three national workshops for preparing National Strategic Action Plans for conservation and use of CWR undertaken  | National Strategic Action Plan documents;<br><br>The National Strategic Action plan will be provided with the end of project report | <b>INITIATED</b>      | Willingness of countries to provide information on CWR;<br><br>Full support from policymakers is provided;<br><br>Different stakeholders especially agriculture, forestry and environment are willing to work collaboratively |
| <b>Expected results</b>     |   |  |   |                       |   |
| <b>1 Expected Result</b>    | National capacities in the three ACP countries on conservation and use of CWR of SADC region are improved   | Baseline report is prepared analyzing the capacity of SADC member states in <i>in situ</i> conservation and capacity to use CWR in breeding programmes;<br><br>Capacity of at least 30 people from SADC Member States in <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of CWR has improved by the end of project | Training documentation and reports  | <b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b> | Capacities for conservation and use of CWR in SADC member states are lacking;<br><br>SADC member states have sufficient national staff working on conservation of plant genetic resources                                     |
| <b>2 Expected Result</b>    | Science, technology and innovation tools,   | A tested toolkit for conservation and use of CWR is available in partner   | Toolkit document  | <b>ON-GOING</b>       | Capacities for conservation and use   |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                          |   |   |  |                  |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|------------------|---|
|                          | including CWR registry information systems, for <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of CWR are deployed and tested in three ACP countries in the SADC region  | countries;<br><br>Toolkit published and distributed to relevant stakeholders in SADC region   |  |                  | of CWR in partner countries are lacking;<br><br>There is a need for state-of-the-art methodologies for conservation and use of CWR to be deployed to partner countries  |
| <b>3 Expected Result</b> | Exemplar National Strategic Action Plans (SAP) on cost-effective <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of priority CWR developed, with the participation of national agriculture and environment agencies in three ACP countries in the SADC region | Three Exemplar CWR SAPs developed and published   | National CWR Strategic Action Plans  | <b>INITIATED</b> | CWR Strategic Action Plans do not yet exist within the partner countries;<br><br>Different stakeholders, especially from agriculture, forest and environment sectors, are willing to collaborate in this action |
| <b>4 Expected Result</b> | National policymakers from agriculture, forestry and environment sectors are informed about the value of CWR, and the CWR strategic action plans promoted among them.   | National policies (e.g. National Biodiversity Action Plans, country reports etc.) include considerations of conservation and use of CWR;<br><br>Participation in policy meetings at national level;<br><br>Individual meetings with | National policies;<br><br>CBD National Biodiversity Action Plans;<br><br>Country reports to FAO Commission on Genetic resources for Food and | <b>ON GOING</b>  | Different stakeholders, especially from agriculture, forest and environment sectors, are willing to collaborate in this action  |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                     |  |  |  |  |   |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
|                     |  | <p>polycymakers</p>  | <p>Agriculture;</p> <p>Notes of meetings;</p> <p>Travel reports</p>  |  |   |
|                     |  |  |  |  |   |
| <b>1.1 Activity</b> | <p>Conduct a needs assessment of the capacity of stakeholders in the conservation and use of CWR</p>   | <p>An inception workshop undertaken to compile information on capacity building needs on <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of CWR;</p> <p>A survey among partner countries undertaken to assess capacity building needs;</p> <p>Baseline report prepared analyzing the capacity of partner countries in <i>in situ</i> conservation and capacity to use CWR in breeding programmes</p> | <p>Inception workshop report;</p> <p>Survey questionnaire;</p> <p>Report on capacity building assessment;</p>              | <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b></p> <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b></p> <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b></p> | <p>Capacities on conservation and use of CWR within partner countries are lacking;</p> <p>Countries collaborate in providing information necessary for the activity</p> |
| <b>1.2 Activity</b> | <p>Conduct two thematic regional training workshops on <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of CWR, based on identified capacity building needs</p> | <p>A regional training workshop on <i>in situ</i> conservation of CWR including diversity assessment techniques held in Mauritius and at least 20 agricultural and environment scientists trained;</p> <p>A regional training workshop on predictive characterization of CWR and pre-breeding held in South</p>  | <p>Workshop reports;</p> <p>Trainers' lecture notes;</p> <p>PowerPoint presentations;</p> <p>Other training materials;</p> | <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b></p> <p><b>FULLY ACHIEVED</b></p>                              | <p>There is a need for capacity building on <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of CWR;</p> <p>Countries have sufficient national staff working on</p>                  |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                     |   |  |   |   |   |
|---------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
|                     |   | Africa and at least 20 genetic resource scientists and breeders trained  |   |   | conservation of plant genetic resources   |
| <b>1.3 Activity</b> | Support on-the-job training in the three ACP countries                                  | <i>In situ</i> conservation sites identified in three partner countries through use of GIS;<br><br>Potential <i>ex situ</i> accessions and/or populations with adapted traits from targeted CWR identified using FIGS approach | Reports on the training activities;<br><br>List of priority sites identified in each country;<br><br>List of target CWR <i>ex situ</i> accessions / populations with potential adapted traits | <b>ON GOING</b><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><b>NOT STARTED</b> | Effective collaboration among agriculture, environment and/or forestry section exists;<br><br><br><br>Crop varietal diversity for adapted traits exists within CWR populations;                           |
|                     |   |  |   |   |   |
| <b>2.1 Activity</b> | Develop science, technology and innovation toolkits for the conservation and use of CWR | Draft toolkit is available for testing in country with staff nominated to prepare Strategic Action Plan (SAP) on <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of priority CWR   | Draft toolkit document  | <b>ON GOING</b>   | Capacities on conservation and use of CWR in partner countries are lacking;<br><br>There is a need for state-of-the-art methodologies for conservation and use of CWR to be deployed to partner countries |
| <b>2.2 Activity</b> | Pilot test the draft  | Draft toolkit used in a training   | Workshop report   | <b>PARTIALLY</b>  | Capacities on   |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.



|                     |   |   |   |  |   |
|---------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
|                     | toolkits in each participating partner country  | workshop on <i>in situ</i> conservation of CWR in Mauritius (linked to training events in 1.2) as well as in the development of national SAP (linked to Activity 3.4);  |   | <b>ACHIEVED (toolkit presented in the <i>in situ</i> conservation training workshop)</b> | conservation and use of CWR in partner countries are lacking;<br><br>Countries are willing to test the draft toolkit;<br><br>There is a need for state-of-the-art methodologies for conservation and use of CWR to be deployed to partner countries |
| <b>2.3 Activity</b> | Publish and distribute widely the CWR toolkits  | Final toolkit is published, distributed and made available to key stakeholders in partner countries and abroad;<br><br>Helpdesk on <i>in situ</i> conservation is made available to three countries and other countries in the region | Websites<br><br>Toolkit document                                | <b>INITIATED (work on web-enabled toolkit initiated)</b>                                 | Capacities on conservation and use of CWR in partner countries are lacking;<br><br>There is a need for state-of-the-art methodologies for conservation and use of CWR to be deployed to partner countries   |
|                     |   |   |   |  |   |
| <b>3.1 Activity</b> | Compile baseline information on distribution, diversity, conservation status and threat of targeted CWR | CWR registry package developed and deployed to the pilot country;   | CWR registry package and documentation;<br><br>Checklist of CWR | <b>PARTIALLY ACHIEVED</b>  | No appropriate data management system exists in the countries;<br><br>Countries are willing to  |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                     |  |  |   |                    |  |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|--|
|                     | in the three partner countries into web-accessible national registries, with linkages to the global Crop Wild Relatives web portal   | Baseline information hosted in national and global web-accessible databases on CWR of at least two priority crops per subregion compiled and documented in national registries | Baseline data compiled into national registries, Peer reviewed articles,<br><br>Reports | <b>ON GOING</b>    | adopt new tool for CWR data management;<br><br>Information on distribution of CWR are available;<br><br>Countries are willing to share information and data on CWR   |
| <b>3.2 Activity</b> | Identify regional and national <i>in situ</i> CWR hotspots and priority sites for <i>in situ</i> conservation and <i>ex situ</i> collection validated through expert interviews and field visits using innovative GIS technology | Validated geographically indexed mapped inventory of national hotspots for <i>in situ</i> conservation and <i>ex situ</i> collections  | Report about discussions, interviews and field visits;<br><br>Peer reviewed articles    | <b>INITIATED</b>   | Effective collaboration among agriculture, environment and/or forestry section exists;<br><br>Environmental parameters of location sites are available;<br><br>Countries are willing to share information;<br><br>Location sites are accessible for field visits;<br><br>Permissions are granted for field visits by appropriate authorities |
| <b>3.3 Activity</b> | Predict which CWR <i>in situ</i> populations and   | Germplasm with potential adaptive traits to extreme climate conditions   | Report,   | <b>NOT STARTED</b> | Information on distribution of CWR   |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                     |  |   |   |   |  |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
|                     | materials from <i>ex situ</i> collections have traits adapted to extreme climate conditions (e.g. heat, drought) using Focused Identification of Germplasm Strategy (FIGS) or other GIS approaches | identified;<br><br>Consultations with breeders and farmers to identify traits of interest   | Meeting reports with breeders<br><br>Peer reviewed articles   |   | are available;<br><br>Environmental parameters of location sites are available;<br><br>There is interest for breeders in partner countries to use CWRs in breeding programme             |
| <b>3.4 Activity</b> | Develop exemplar Strategic Action Plans (SAP) on <i>in situ</i> conservation and use of priority CWR in three participating countries  | Three national workshops held;<br><br>three national SAPs developed;  | National SAPs   | <b>INITIATED (2 National Stakeholder workshops - Mauritius and Zambia undertaken)</b> | Willingness of all stakeholder to collaborate;<br><br>Policy support for the action;<br><br>Collaboration between Ministries of agriculture and environment and/or forest is forthcoming |
|                     |  |   |   |   |  |
| <b>4.1 Activity</b> | Facilitate the mainstreaming of CWR SAP into national and regional policies  | Stakeholder consultations between different sectors undertaken within each country;<br><br>National policies (e.g. National Biodiversity Action Plans, country reports etc,) include considerations | National policies;<br><br>National Biodiversity Action plans; | <b>PARTIALLY ACHIEVED</b><br><br><b>INITIATED</b>                                     | Different stakeholders especially agriculture, forestry and environment are willing to work collaboratively;<br><br>There is willingness of policymakers to                              |

'*In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|                     |   |  |   |                                  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|
|                     |   | of conservation and use of CWR;<br><br>Participation in policy meetings at national level;<br><br>Individual meetings with policymakers held | Country reports to FAO Commission on Genetic resources for Food and Agriculture;<br><br>Notes of meetings;<br><br>Travel reports. | ON GOING<br><br><br><br>ON GOING | mainstream conservation and use of CWR within national policies  |
| <b>4.2 Activity</b> | Develop a range of communication and public awareness materials to promote the conservation and use of CWR among target groups of stakeholders including the general public | Public awareness materials developed<br><br>PA materials published and distributed to target groups  | Websites at Bioversity<br><br>Video<br><br>Posters<br><br>Flyers<br><br>Newspaper articles<br><br>TV and Radio programmes         | ON GOING<br><br><br><br>ON GOING | There is not enough awareness of the potential value that CWR have for crop improvement to increase food security and adaptation to climate change;<br><br>Stakeholders, in particular protected area managers, lack information about CWRs;<br><br>General public including farmers do not value CWR and are not aware of their importance. |
|                     |   |  |   |                                  |  |

*'In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.

|              |   |   |  |  |   |
|--------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5.1 Activity | Coordinate and manage all aspects of project implementation | <p>Inception meeting and first Steering Committee meeting organised in Zambia in year 1;</p> <p>Midterm review and second Steering Committee meeting held in year 2 in Rome;</p> <p>Final dissemination meeting and third Steering Committee meeting held in South Africa at end of action;</p> <p>Progress reports submitted to contracting authority;</p> | <p>Inception workshop report and first Steering Committee report</p> <p>Midterm meeting report and second Steering Committee report</p> <p>Final report and third Steering Committee report</p> <p>Project technical and financial reports</p> | <p>FULLY ACHIEVED</p> <p>ON GOING</p> <p>NOT STARTED</p> <p>ON GOING</p> | <p>Partner countries produce their progress reports in a timely manner;</p> <p>There is economic and political stability of the partner countries and in the region</p> |
|--------------|---|---|--|--|---|

## Annex 3

### Progress on the Action Plan as at 30 June 2015

#### Duration and indicative action plan for implementing the action (max 4 pages)

The duration of the action will be 36 months .GREEN - achieved ; ORANGE - partially achieved; RED - Not started; Grey – according to original action plan

| Year 1  | Semester 1 |       |       |       |       |       | Semester 2 |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
|---|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| Activity  | 1          | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7          | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | Implementing body     |
| Preparation Activity 1.1 preparation of the Needs assessment              | GREEN      | GREEN |       |       |       |       |            |       |       |       |       |       | Bioversity            |
| Execution Activity 1.1 implementation Needs assessment                    |            | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN |       |       |            |       |       |       |       |       | Bioversity, Countries |
| Preparation Activity 1.2 preparation of the regional training course      |            |       |       |       | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN      | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | Bioversity, UoB       |
| Execution Activity 2.1: To develop toolkit on conservation and use of CWR |            |       |       | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN      | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | GREEN | UoB                   |

*'In situ* conservation and use of crop wild relatives in three ACP countries of the SADC region' (short name - SADC Crop Wild Relatives) is a three-year project (2014-2016) co-funded by the European Union and implemented through the ACP-EU Co-operation Programme in Science and Technology (S&T II) by the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. Grant agreement no. FED/2013/330-210.



| Following years  | Year2          |   | Year 3 |   | Implementing body     |
|--|----------------|---|--------|---|-----------------------|
|  | 3              | 4 | 5      | 6 |                       |
| Activity 1.2: Thematic regional training workshops on in situ conservation                 | Done in year 1 |   |        |   | Mauritius             |
| Activity 1.2: Thematic regional training workshops on predictive characterization          |                |   |        |   | South Africa          |
| Activity 1.3: To support on the job training in the SADC region                            |                |   |        |   | Countries             |
| Activity 2.2: To pilot test the draft toolkit in each participating country in SADC region |                |   |        |   | UoB                   |
| Activity 2.3: Publication and dissemination of toolkit                                     |                |   |        |   | UoB                   |
| Activity 3.1 Deployment of CWR database  |                |   |        |   | Bioversity            |
| Activity 3.2 : Identification of CWR hotspots and priority sites for in situ conservation  |                |   |        |   | Bioversity            |
| Activity 3.3: Implementation of Predictive characterization activities                     |                |   |        |   | Bioversity            |
| Activity 3.4: Development of exemplar National Strategic Action Plan (SAP)                 |                |   |        |   | Countries             |
| Activity 4.1: Mainstreaming the CWR SAP into national and regional policies,               |                |   |        |   | Countries             |
| Activity 4.2: Communication and public awareness materials                                 |                |   |        |   | Bioversity; Countries |
| Activity 5.1: Midterm review and Steering Committee meeting                                |                |   |        |   | Bioversity, Rome      |
| Activity 5.1: Final Dissemination workshop and Steering Committee                          |                |   |        |   | South Africa          |



