

Hosted by



Co-organized by



ECO SECURITIES



UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION  
TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION



**Private Sector Stakeholder Consultation and Dialogue  
on  
World Food Security and the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy  
in preparation of the  
High-Level Conference on Food Security and the Challenges of Climate Change and  
Bioenergy**

**27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> March 2008, FAO Headquarters, Rome**

**PROCEEDINGS**

***Background***

Responding to the call by the UN-Secretary General in 2007 for a joint response by the UN system and its agencies to contribute to the combat against climate change and conscious that such change will drastically impact the agricultural, rural and land-use sectors, with especially severe consequences for developing countries and food security, the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions – FAO, IFAD, WFP and the Global Mechanism (GM) – are committed to step up efforts in the areas of climate change mitigation and adaptation. Food security, a central concern to all Rome-based UN agencies, is threatened by the changing climate as well as by the increasing demand for bioenergy which, at the same time, can also be seen as a chance to contribute to the improvement of local livelihoods, depending on the local context – further activities in the agricultural, rural and land-use sectors can contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation whilst promoting rural development.

The *Rome 2007 Initiative*, was recently initiated by FAO and the GM, with the participation of IFAD and WFP, with the intention to engage in global, large-scale activities to reduce emissions from the agriculture, rural and land use sectors so that these thus far underrepresented sectors can benefit from the emerging carbon markets and related investments while at the same time assisting with the development of urgently needed adaptation measures. This process is currently coordinated by FAO and the GM in collaboration with a specialized international private sector partner, EcoSecurities, under the framework of a public-private sector working group, and includes the proposal for a Centre of Competence for Climate Change and Rural Development and, more specifically, the elaboration of a facility concept to promote climate change mitigation and adaptation projects in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors.

**FAO High-Level Conference on World Food Security and the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy**

FAO will host a 'High-Level Conference on World Food Security and the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy' from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> June 2008 in Rome (for details visit <http://www.fao.org/foodclimate/conference.html>). The overall purpose of the Conference is to address food security and poverty reduction in the face of climate change and energy security.

More specifically, the objective is to assess the challenges faced by the food and agriculture sectors from climate change and bioenergy in order to identify the steps required to safeguard food security within the broader context of action being recommended to address climate change and bioenergy at the global, regional and national levels. It should thus contribute to the UN system efforts in the field of climate change.

The Conference will build upon the work initiated at a number of Expert Meetings between January and March 2008 to assemble the best available knowledge and tap relevant networks as well as to include a broad range of views and experiences in the discussion process, including civil society organizations and the private sector. The stakeholder consultation findings and the Expert meetings will inform the Conference preparation process and will provide direct input to the Conference itself. In this context, a combined *High Level Conference* and *Rome 2007 Initiative* Private Sector Stakeholder Consultation was organized to provide the private sector with a unique forum to get in touch with FAO and the UN system, raise international policy options for the High-Level Conference and ensure that the food security impacts of climate change are addressed in the context of the Post-2012 negotiations.

The purpose of the Consultation was to further collaboration and encourage new partnerships between the private sector and FAO, IFAD, WFP and the Global Mechanism in response to the food security challenges posed by climate change and bioenergy. More specifically, the consultation encouraged private sector stakeholders to:

- express their views on the links among food security, climate change and bioenergy;
- propose lead questions for the Expert Meetings and the High-Level Conference in June 2008;
- propose recommendations on actions that should be taken at national, regional and international levels taking into consideration the possible framework of a post-2012 agreement;
- identify areas of common work and proposals for cooperation and partnerships;
- identify key civil society and private sector organizations working on world food security issues in relation to climate change and bioenergy;
- propose strategic possibilities of agreements and partnerships with FAO to address and respond to the uncertainties posed by a changing climate.

#### The Rome 2007 Initiative on Sustainable Growth – Working Group on ‘Investing in Emissions Reduction and Rural Development’

The *Rome 2007 Initiative* is a Public-Private Sector Expert Dialogue on ‘Investing in Emissions Reduction and Rural Development’ launched in Rome on 14 November 2007 in conjunction with the World Energy Conference (11-15 November). Participants included representatives of the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions, members of selected private sector companies and the European Investment Bank, the EU’s financing institution. Overall, the dialogue’s objectives were to identify needed steps and activities to support and facilitate the development of GHG mitigation and adaptation measures that promote rural development, and see how an interaction and collaborations between the public sector or rather the UN agencies and institutions in Rome and private sector could facilitate this process. The participants of the expert dialogue decided to continue as a working group.

The members of the working group that were present at CoP 13 in Bali announced the launch of the working group during a joint side event on climate change and rural development by the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions. A presentation on ‘Climate Change related Investments and Rural Development’ was given at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Global Conference on Social Responsibility, 15-17 February 2008 with the main theme being ‘Growth Models to Combat Climate Change and Alleviate Poverty’, which relied largely on the approaches for the promotion of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in the agricultural, land use and rural sectors that the participants of the expert dialogue began to discuss at the expert dialogue in November.

The 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the working group was held just prior to the private sector stakeholder consultation in preparation of the 'High-Level Conference on World Food Security and the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy'. The aim of this first working group meeting was to continue the dialogue on the promotion of investments in emissions reduction and rural development and more specifically commencing the work on the elaboration of structure concept of an investment facility to promote climate change mitigation and adaptation activities in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors.

The Working Group introduced its activities to the Consultation participants.

---

## ***Proceedings***

### Organizational matters

The event was divided into three main sessions over two days (see agenda). Presentations were delivered by representatives of the private sector and by the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions. The underlying idea for this first session was to share views, experiences and potential contributions in order to find common ground and set the scene for the afternoon interactive rounds of discussions. Mr Alexander Mueller, Assistant Director General of FAO, concluded the morning session providing the audience with an overview of the key issues discussed and an analysis of the linkages between energy and food security and the role that the private sector can play in addressing the impacts of climate change and bioenergy production on food security, land tenure, water use and rural livelihoods.

In the afternoon, the participants were asked to each join one of three working groups according to their interest and area of expertise:

WG 1	Agriculture and agri-business
WG 2	Financial sectors
WG 3	Technology transfer and energy needs

Through a facilitated dialogue with open discussions and brainstorming, each group was asked to formulate a set of policy options for national, regional and international action in the context of the post-2012 negotiations, as well as to identify areas of common work and proposals for cooperation between the private sector and the UN agencies.

On the second day (28<sup>th</sup> March), after a summary of the breakout groups' outcomes, all participants took part in an interactive discussion and negotiation exercise to extract the key messages formulated in each of the working groups and to formulate the key messages, joint recommendations and policy options to be brought forward to the High-Level Conference.

## Opening session - sharing public and private sector views on world food security and the challenges of climate change and bioenergy

Chair: Luc Dubreuil, FAO

### The public sector/The Rome-based UN agencies and institutions

The stakeholder consultation was opened by the Assistant Director General of FAO, Natural Resources Department, **Mr Alexander Mueller**, who welcomed the participants to Rome and highlighted the importance of a dialogue and collaboration between the private and public sectors to jointly tackle climate change – a great threat to the developing world and a major obstacle to poverty reduction. Of all economic sectors, agriculture is the most climate sensitive and also may suffer most severely from impacts directly or indirectly linked to climate change (e.g. water scarcity and trans-boundary pests and diseases, respectively). Mr Mueller noted that legally binding financial mechanisms to help climate change mitigation and adaptation already exist and that it is essential to carefully analyze those to understand how to best make use of them in the agricultural and land use sectors.

**Mr John Powell**, Deputy Executive Director of WFP, went on to elaborate on the roles that the private and public sectors can assume in the fight against climate change and re-iterated that collaboration between the private and public sectors is not only desirable, but also possible and a concrete reality. He illustrated this by providing examples of partnerships with the private sector in which WFP is directly involved and explained how these have for example enabled further expansion of their scientific and technical knowledge base, their social marketing capacity and expertise and have brought about improvements in their transport logistics. He elaborated on how the carbon footprints of rural communities may be reduced in a sustainable way and remarked that the private sector needs to help the UN family overcome the costs involved by providing them with suitable financial models.

**Mr Christian Mersmann**, Managing Director of the Global Mechanism to the UNCCD, highlighted the importance of the private sector in acting as a source of change in the UN system and, while acknowledging the difficulties involved in engaging the private sector, he described the same as a crucial task. He pointed out the necessity for the UN agencies to understand and capture the needs of the private sector. Mr Mersmann mentioned the partnership between his organization and EcoSecurities with regards to the development and implementation of the GM's Strategic Programme on Climate Change and Environmental Services as an example of a successful and extremely fruitful collaboration between the two sectors. The knowledge, availability of information and expertise about climate change related financial mechanisms is virtually lacking in many developing countries, and while the GM is trying to fill that gap, the private sector has a crucial role to play in empowering the local people with the knowledge and expertise they need. Finally, Mr Mersmann remarked that not only should collaborations between the private and public sectors be encouraged, but also the UN agencies should work closely together to achieve their goals more effectively.

Finally, **Philippe Remy**, Policy Officer from IFAD recalled IFAD's mandate to 'enable poor rural people to overcome poverty' and described how the new dimensions generated by climate change require innovative approaches and the establishment of new partnerships between the public and private sector in order to boost the existing and encourage new financing mechanisms for climate change mitigation and adaptation. Mr Remy expressed IFAD's interest in assessing opportunities for new types of collaborations and activities which will ultimately benefit the rural poor.

### The representatives from the private sector

**Mr Christof Walter**, Research Manager of Sustainable Agriculture at Unilever, kicked off the private sector's presentations by presenting the views, expectations and potential of food production and food security from the perspective of a food manufacturer. As the world population

grows and lifestyles change, food demand is likely to double by 2050 – an increase that may become out of control as a result of the extra strain resulting from the impacts of climate change and bioenergy. A political will to invest in agriculture is crucial: the sector both contributes to and suffers from climate change and it can play a key role in mitigation and adaptation efforts provided that appropriate policy measures, adequate for the magnitude of the change, are in place. Unilever actively contributes to climate change mitigation: between 1995 and 2006 the company cut manufacturing emissions by more than a third and it is committed to reduce them by a further 17% by 2010. Since biomass is a limited resource, the only one for food products, but one of a number of alternatives for renewable energy, bioenergy should only be considered where energy efficiency and GHG savings are considerable. Competition with food is inherent to both bioethanol and biodiesel and standards will only be able to solve production issues. The confluence of climate change and rising food demand is directly relevant to Unilever's business: for example, the increase in vegetable oil prices makes it difficult to put healthy and affordable products on the market and the shift in areas suitable to grow raw materials as a result of climate change will result in sunken investments in the supply chain and fixed assets. Food security needs to be reassessed taking into consideration the unprecedented growth in food demand, climate change and bioenergy. Investments in yield improvements in agriculture will be key and Unilever has a track record of working with farmers on better practices to that end. There is an urgent need to coordinate the development of comprehensive policies for food security with comprehensive policies for energy security and climate change at the global level.

**Ms Anne Ruth Herkes** presented on behalf of BP Biofuels, one of the largest biofuel producers worldwide, providing an overview of her organization's activities and their vision of investing on a global scale and supplying the market globally. BP Biofuels perceive themselves as a core stakeholder in the field. Acknowledging that the transport sector contributes about 20% of global GHG emissions, the contribution of biofuels in reducing emissions can be considerable. First generation biofuels, presently manufactured on a large scale, use the fruit or seed of the plant as raw material, whereas second generation biofuels are able to use the whole plant as raw material. Second generation biofuels are still being developed - cellulose technologies are not necessarily complex, but are still costly and hence not economically viable as yet. There has been some debate in terms of when these may become. Second generation biofuels will involve a more efficient process and non-food crops, such as energy grasses and biomass from agricultural waste. This will ensure considerably less or no competition at all between food and fuel. Ms Herkes recognized the need to develop an appropriate approach to sustainability, a process which should be lead by governments, the UN agencies and relevant NGOs. To develop new policies and measures, a focus on innovative technologies is crucial. BP Biofuels is interested in actively collaborating with the UN agencies to contribute in establishing standards for sustainability and becoming a leading actor in the field. They wish to understand FAO's views on land use, land use change and forestry issues and to share their knowledge base so as to be able to jointly introduce appropriate policies and measures.

**Mr Coen Weddepohl** represented Man Investments, a 225 year-old FTSE 100 company and global leader in alternative investments with \$76 billion in assets. He delivered the financial sector's perspectives on balancing food security, climate change and bioenergy. Climate change mitigation requires vast amounts of money; the financial sector is an efficient allocator of capital and able to mobilize capital on a large scale, a task which can prove difficult. Capital allocation is driven by a minimum return, a marginal abatement cost of GHG emissions, and government subsidies. Mr Weddepohl identified a large global financing gap over the next two decades of \$5-10 trillion, corresponding to capital required to finance and build environmental infrastructure (forestry, agriculture, clean energy production etc). Man Investment can set up an implementation fund, building environmental infrastructure, which gives the client access to Man Investment's infrastructure, distribution, brand and single A credit rating thereby enhancing the client's credibility and negotiation position. Man Investment takes charge of the structuring of the fund and the associated risk management, as well as of the distribution. The advantages of the fund structure include an efficient cash management and the avoided dilution of IRR. Furthermore, it enables access to a broader client base and makes it possible to raise capital in one go, as opposed to various placements a company would have to go through. The GHG abatement potential of

different alternative energy measures, the economics of different biofuel types and their lifecycle carbon analysis were illustrated in a series of diagrams: the only type of biofuel resulting in real GHG abatement opportunities was sugarcane biofuel, most economically viable and climate change effective if produced in Brazil - focusing on the lowest cost solution is crucial to guarantee investment. Mr Weddepohl cited an IEA study according to which to displace 10% of conventional fuel with biofuel in the US and Europe would require 43% and 38% of total cropland available respectively. He concluded that biofuels cannot constitute a long-term solution and technologies such as waste-to-energy, methane capture, cellulosic, algae and carbon capture should be considered more seriously. To optimize environmental benefits and revenue, a holistic rather than a focused approach could significantly increase overall revenues.

**Dr Philip van Lelyveld** presented the views, expectation and potential from the perspective of a manufacturer involved in the production of a series of goods ranging from food through pharmaceuticals and to biodigestors. He provided the example of the production of an antibiotic that DSM has been producing for decades and where price pressure and technological availability made the elimination of several steps possible resulting in a series of benefits including GHG and energy savings, solvent free and less polluting production as well as lower costs and a more pure end product. He used this as an analogy for the production of biofuels: if appropriate incentives are available, efficiency improvements in the production of bioenergy would make them more viable and reduce the food vs fuel debate. It is essential to combine the economic and ecological effects of new technologies. Industry is and should be seen as part of the solution. An increase in efficiency could for example be achieved through integrated bio-refineries and second-generation fuels using the whole plant as feedstock. Agricultural raw materials should be certified.

#### Outcomes of the 1<sup>st</sup> working group meeting of the 'Rome 2007 Initiative on Sustainable Growth – Investing in Emissions Reduction and Rural Development'

**Mr Robert Tippmann**, Head of Policy Advisory Services at EcoSecurities, on behalf of the *Rome 2007 Initiative* Public Private Sector Working Group, officially launched at the UNFCCC CoP13 in Bali in December 2007, discussed the key elements needed to establish a facility to endorse financial investments that would promote mitigation and adaptation measures in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors.

Carbon finance, emissions reduction and adaptation funding are of mutual interest to both the public and private sectors. Public sector institutions have mandates to contribute to climate change mitigation, adaptation and rural development. The private sector, particularly in industrialized countries, is a major contributor to, as well as partner in the fight against global warming. Private sector players need to meet specific targets under emissions trading schemes, or decide to contribute through voluntary offsetting measures or investments into adaptation where it affects its business.

To promote climate change mitigation and adaptation in the context of rural development at the necessary scale, it is essential to pull resources together from all available sources, through stakeholders from the public and private sector, including international organizations, governments, non-governmental organizations (NGO), investors, carbon buyers, technology providers, technical experts and researchers. The combination of the different, and often complementary, resources, expertise, skills and capacities needs to be tackled and coordinated while engaging the rural communities and the rural poor in the process from the beginning. There is a number of existing, fully developed as well as underdeveloped, climate change mitigation opportunities through greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction or avoidance, carbon substitution, carbon sequestration and conservation.

It will be necessary to undergo a number of activities to identify mitigation and adaptation potential, including screening existing activities within portfolios of participating organizations to identify opportunities, organize workshops to raise awareness on the topics, design pilot projects for certain not fully developed projects, develop a project pipeline and project selection and investment

criteria. To develop the projects it will then be necessary to identify suitable partners, prepare the necessary documentation, such as project design documents, adaptation proposals and monitoring plans, contract the projects appropriately so as to ensure ownership of the carbon credits, get third party validation or external evaluations, develop risk and benefit sharing strategies and get the technical support needed (e.g. a reformed, programmatic or sectoral CDM requires methodological work or limited applied research). To implement the activities, monitoring, response and verification mechanisms will need to be put in place, a risk management strategy developed, and replicability of the process insured. Benefits and profit should be shared among the stakeholders.

There is a huge, not fully captured potential for emissions reduction and carbon credit generation in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors – at the November meeting, a number of examples were brought forward from the private sector, including methane recovery, pig farm, household biodigestors and biomass projects. Some of these projects, however, hit hurdles due to both technical and financial burdens, such as lack of access to capital or lack of accepted methodologies or local expertise. Indeed, many projects never even reach the implementation stage due to these barriers. The UN agencies, and in particular FAO and IFAD, are needed to support projects at the interface of rural development and climate change mitigation (and adaptation), technically and financially, to remove such barriers and allow the private sector to invest and become project partners. The impacts and associated public relations and marketing potential of such projects are mutually attractive to public and private organizations, since they can demonstrate the fulfillment of the agencies mandates to support development, or are signs of the implementation of environmentally friendly and corporate social behavior. At the same time they offer the opportunity to address land degradation and loss of biodiversity, two other major environmental change processes linked to and also causing climate change.

The concept of such a facility is not a new one, however, no such platform exists to promote climate change mitigation and adaptation activities in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors globally. The working group is elaborating a basic concept of such a facility that would support, technically and financially, the identification, development and implementation of mitigation and adaptation projects in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors through, amongst others, collaborations and partnerships between the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions (not limited to these but with a focus on these) and private sector players.

The working group has identified some issues and open questions to be addressed as the framework for the facility is formalized, namely identifying the right roles for leveraging the particular resources, networks, competencies, and mandates of both private sector and public sector members. Another important question will be determining an ideal mechanism to make small-scale activities both feasible and viable. The working group will seek to design a framework that maintains focus on the related issues of rural development, mitigation, food security, and sustainable energy production, while creating win-win opportunities for both the public and the private sector. Risk management tools from the banking and insurance sectors will help to create such opportunities if they are applied to identification, structuring, and screening of relevant projects.

The next steps and activities of the working group include:

- Presentation of the investment facility concept at the April Rome-based agencies coordination meeting;
- Presentation of the work at a SBSTA side event in June in Bonn;
- Advanced development of the investment facility concept by November 2008;
- Presentation at a related side event at COP 14 in Poland in December 2008.

[ The presentations are available at <http://www.fao.org/foodclimate/stakeholder/private-sector/presentations-ps.html> ]

Identifying key issues and establishing linkages: is it possible to ensure food security without compromising food production?

Mr Alexander Mueller, Assistant Director General of FAO, gave the last presentation of the morning session, identifying key issues and establishing linkages to provide some guidance and food-for-thought for the breakout groups in the afternoon: is it possible to ensure energy security without compromising food security? What is the role that the private sector can play in addressing the impacts of climate change and bioenergy production on food security, land tenure, water use and rural livelihoods?

The world is facing a dilemma between producing food or bioenergy. It is necessary to address both issues and give them similar weight. The discussions on food and energy should be combined. The world population is growing, and it is growing most significantly in urban areas in developing countries. This, coupled with changes in consumption patterns (increased consumption of meat), is leading to an increase in food and energy demand. Climate change will not significantly affect agricultural outputs in the Northern hemisphere, but it will have huge impacts on areas in developing countries that are already food constrained. Not only is there a problem related to a decreased production of food, but also food has become increasingly expensive as a result of speculation. To ensure food security, adaptation strategies are needed which will reduce the risks of climate change, as well as options to mitigate the emissions resulting from agriculture, i.e. there is a need to produce more food at lower climatic impact. Both food security and bioenergy are needed and both mitigation and adaptation are needed. The challenge in the coming years will be to create a carbon market that brings together all those issues and couples them with sustainable development to ensure that the money available reaches the Southern hemisphere and the world's most vulnerable people.

Appropriate platforms are needed to discuss issues such as standards setting and to bring the issues of mitigation, adaptation, food security and bioenergy together at international level. The carbon market will have an important role to play, but how it can address all of the relevant issues discussed remains to be elaborated. What is sure is that the combination of food insecurity and climate change could lead to much social instability including migration for hunger and land degradation, if it is not dealt with appropriately.

The discussion that followed saw the private and public sector representatives agreeing on the need to increase agricultural productivity and optimize the production of raw materials so as to minimize the competition between food and bioenergy production and therefore mitigate the dilemma between the need for food and energy. At the same time, the use of different raw materials, such as agricultural waste, should be encouraged for fuel production. While the willingness to invest in such projects and the technologies necessary are available, appropriate policies need to be put in place by the public sector (i.e. governments) to provide the private sector with incentives to act.

Agriculture and land use change/forestry contribute approximately 35% to global GHG emissions, yet these sectors have not been appropriately addressed in the global climate change regime as yet. It is essential that these sectors are included in the global efforts to reduce emissions and that the correct incentives, such as inclusion in the global carbon market, are provided for this to happen, while also maintaining focus on rural development and poverty reduction.

In the context of global carbon markets, it is important to note that the CDM is not directly aimed at poverty reduction, but has in many cases done so as a 'side effect'. The CDM has a sustainable development component, and projects with development and/or biodiversity co-benefits are often able to generate credits that are sold in the market at higher prices – this is particularly the case in the voluntary market rather than the CDM or compliance market. In the post-2012 regime, potential CDM reforms being discussed include mechanism to take more small-scale activities through the process. A first step has already been taken with allowing a programmatic approach under the CDM, i.e. Programme of Activities. Avoided deforestation will benefit from carbon finance, although

it still remains to be seen whether through the carbon market, a public funding model or an interim hybrid model. A carbon market solution is now also advocated by NGOs who historically have been opposed to the carbon market. The sustainable development component of the carbon finance mechanisms could be further improved though. About 85% of farmers worldwide are small-scale farmers: it will be crucial to raise their awareness about and their capacity to tap into the carbon market so as to maximize their benefitting from climate change related funding.

One concrete example where the private and public sectors could collaborate on and contribute to accomplish their missions is the bundling of small-scale activities in the rural, agriculture and land use sectors. While the private sector could provide investment and other resources for bundled activities, it would need the public sector/the UN agencies to provide or support the bundling itself.

## **Breakout groups on agriculture and agribusinesses, financial sector and technology transfer/energy needs**

The stakeholder consultation participants broke into three groups to discuss policy options and recommendations and the opportunities for public-private sector partnerships in response to the food security challenges posed by climate change and bioenergy with regards to three sectors: agriculture and agribusinesses, financial sector and technology transfer/energy needs. The groups were asked to focus on the identification of the opportunities for making use of existing and emerging climate change finance mechanisms. Each breakout group developed key messages, recommendations and policy options for the June high-level conference on the following:

- Policy options for national, regional and international action in the context of the post-2012 negotiations;
- Areas of common work, proposals for cooperation and partnerships, possibilities for further areas of collaboration between the private sector and the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions (FAO, IFAD, WFP, and the GM) and other UN system partners.

### Breakout Group 1: Agriculture and Agri-business<sup>1</sup>

This group focused on the issues of food security, bioenergy, and climate change as relating to the agriculture sector and agri-businesses. Discussion topics included the role of biofuels in future energy mixes, perceived competition between the production of food crops and bioenergy crops, the role of markets and trade, and areas for further collaboration between the public and private sectors.

Though there was disagreement among the stakeholders in the breakout group as to the role of biofuels, most group members agreed that there would be other generations of biofuels and that these would likely be more efficient than those available today. They felt that the role of governments should be to be involved in this maturation of the biofuels sector, and to assist by effectively allocating funds towards the development of new technologies and approaches to production. To exclude biofuels from government funding because it is not economically feasible today would be dangerous for the viability of the next generation of biofuels, most of the group agreed.

The group also felt that the biofuels sector should be brought into the emissions reduction equation in some way. As carbon markets were developed to reduce net global emissions, and as biofuel production represents both emissions generation and reduction, there should be an overall assessment of the carbon consequences associated with the biofuels sector.

---

<sup>1</sup> Participants: Chair: Caterina Batello-Cattaneo, FAO; Anne Ruth Herkes, BP Biofuels; Christof Walter, Unilever; Yannick Herbaudière, Agroénergie Développement; Olivia Lazare, Agroénergie Développement; Laura Melo, WFP; Luc Dubreuil, FAO; Virginia Oton Garcia, FAO; Harry Van De Welp, FAO; Stephane Jost, FAO; Rapporteur: Saveis Joze Sadeghian, GM and Dimitra Stamatopoulos, IFAD

This breakout group agreed that while it seems obvious that there is a conflict between biofuel crops and edible crops as they are competing for the same available land, that greater understanding on the relationship between food production and energy production was necessary. A proposed solution was the investigation of what kinds of bioenergy crops could be grown on drier, more marginal land less suited to the production of food crops. This would help answer the question as to how much of the finite stock of available land globally could be used for biofuels production without creating conflicts with food production. While FAO has existing data that could help answer these questions, a critical component of this analysis would include potential impacts on rural farmers. The group agreed wholly that the UN agencies should not act in a top-down manner to dictate what lands should be used for what cultivation, but instead to promote responsible discussion among governments on the issue. International organizations should also seek to organize consensus on energy and land use issues globally as the UN does not possess the political power to do so.

Markets play a key role in decision-making on land use, and the group agreed that protection and subsidisation of rural farmers was warranted, but they were less certain as to the role of trade markets and actions needed. Deregulation of markets has the potential to create favorable trade conditions for rural farmers, and pressure on such trade markets from policymakers and from the private sector could lead to successful technology transfers. Regardless, the group agreed that further discussion was needed on how global markets set the price for material inputs and opportunities to set criteria. Also, other solutions included addressing poverty as a market failure and valuing common-owned natural resources within the marketplace.

Finally, though not all group members agreed upon the role of biofuels, this group did agree that both the private and public sectors should work together to share platforms of technology and experience, and that all should contribute to a common knowledge base that could then drive informed policymaking.

### Breakout Group 2: Financial Sector<sup>2</sup>

The financial sector workgroup discussed current financial barriers to the implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation activities and potential financial and operational solutions to such barriers.

This group felt strongly that there were several areas in which further research and analysis was needed, and that there was a need for an agency to act as a centre of excellence/centre of knowledge to warehouse existing data, provide analysis, support related capacity building, facilitate the development of test or showcase projects and the underlying project methodologies, and funnel intelligence into the policymaking process. FAO and other the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions were identified as potential candidates for this centre of excellence based on existing mandates and competencies.

The lack of proof-of-concept cases was identified as a barrier to further development of emission reduction projects within the agriculture sector. The group agreed that FAO and private sector stakeholders could collaborate on the development of test cases that would develop new technologies and methodologies for such projects. These test cases would also be important in the development of standards for project development within the voluntary carbon market and in the identification of bundling mechanisms for grouping small projects. Such bundling should be a priority as it will provide greater cost containment and, thus, greater access to technology and financing. Finally, such test cases would also help distinguish which carbon financing options were most appropriate in different situations.

---

<sup>2</sup> Participants: Chair: Maxim Lobovikov, FAO; Coen Weddedpohl, Man Investments; Peter De Waal, Fortis; Robert Tippmann, EcoSecurities; Siv Oystese, Global Mechanism; Rapporteur: Rebecca Smith, EcoSecurities

On the issue of increasing climate change mitigation efforts, the group was in agreement that there was a need for research into the sources of emissions within the agricultural sector by activity, on a country by country basis, and in as great a level of detail as possible. Also critical is a mapping of the marginal cost of abatement from low cost to high cost for agricultural sector mitigation opportunities. Such data would allow for more efficient reduction of emissions within the sector, including an assessment where project-based mechanisms are suitable and where these mechanisms might need to be reformed or other approaches need to be developed and deployed.

The group discussed in detail the need for categorization of emission reduction opportunities within the agricultural sector into two categories: those that are cost-positive and those that are cost-negative, along with information on key barriers and constraints to implementation (e.g. access to capital, partners, know-how, and technology; existence of technologies and/or methodologies; existing regulations; etc.). Activities that are cost positive (or have a net benefit) are essentially low-hanging fruit do not need incentivising, necessarily, but often just access to capital or the means of overcoming another barrier. An example of such an activity would be the installation of a biodigester at a livestock farm. While the cost of the biodigester is out of reach of many rural farmers, once installed, it would pay for itself over the course of some years due to the benefits associated with its use: management of a waste stream (manure), production of heat, and production of methane gas that could be used to generate electricity, either for use on-site or for sale. Despite the resultant benefits of installing a biodigester, many farmers cannot overcome the initial hurdle of financing the cost. For this reason, once activities that have a net benefit are identified, they should be paired with an inventory of financing options (e.g. grants, CDM financing, etc.) as well as policy options for promoting them within the market (e.g. carrots, like subsidies and grants, or sticks, such as taxes and penalties).

To address the issue of mitigation of food price inflation, the group agreed that research on the drivers of such inflation was needed in advance of development of a plan to address each driver individually. Some drivers, such as subsidisation of specific agricultural sectors, would be difficult to address, while others, such as the role of bioenergy production or demand, could potentially be more easily addressed by the public and private sectors.

The group also addressed the issue of climate change adaptation and all were in agreement that mapping of existing funding opportunities was essential, as was development of mechanisms for incentivising private sector investment in adaptation activities. Research into existing and emerging opportunities for combining mitigation and adaptation activities would help drive adaptation project development, as would the development of adaptation project development standards and/or a rating system. Some of the private sector stakeholders in attendance represented organizations already involved in adaptation activities, and the group suggested development of a mechanism for application of available adaptation funding to such entities if the funds could be funneled into rural community development. The private sector would be an important actor with respect to adaptation through the development of new products, services, and technologies with adaptation benefits, while the public sector could provide research on the quantification of necessary funding for certain adaptation activities, as well as facilitation of adaptation-related technology transfer. Finally, the group felt that a barrier to adaptation was the current sentiment that adaptation activities would act only as a cost centre, and that the public sector could provide information on potential profitable opportunities, highlight best practices, and facilitate greater investment and/or research and development into adaptation technologies.

### Breakout Group 3: Technology Transfer/Energy Needs<sup>3</sup>

The working group focused on the issues of technology transfer and the growing energy needs and ways of conciliating the latter with the need for food security in a climate constrained world. The group started off the discussions by agreeing that to address the shortage of agricultural materials,

---

<sup>3</sup> Participants:

Chair: Olivier Dubois, FAO - Philip Van Lelyveld, DSM NV; Walter Meyer, Progis; Elisabeth Barsq-Runquist, Global Mechanism; Alejandro Kilpatrick, Global Mechanism; A. Agostini, FAO; Rapporteur: Marianna Doria, EcoSecurities

more efficient production was key. While the political push for biofuel production has been considerable, there are no overarching incentives and/or standards to make sure that new, innovative technologies are used rather than food crops replaced. To bring about the change needed, incentives are crucial, and to make sure that the change is positive, standards need to be developed. Any setting of international standards or premium should go through multiple stakeholder consultations in which the private sector should be involved. There is a risk that a lot of work is going on for international standards, while standards at national level are being neglected. Incentives for national standard are urgently needed. A strategy of standards and premiums should also apply at national level: even if a product is for the national market, it should respect the standards used for export products. The group however recognized the different priorities of OECD and non-OECD countries and understood the problems in applying standards at national level resulting from a poor governance structure in many developing countries. Financial incentives should be linked to the application of standards. Overall, the UN agencies could be the facilitators for the global dialogue on principles about standards to be applied in order to tailor them to local circumstances.

The group agreed that biofuels are and should be just one part of a solution towards energy security and that their development and production should go hand in hand with other alternative energy measures such as reducing consumption and technology improvements. It was agreed that the efficiency of biofuels should be promoted bearing in mind that they are at the beginning of a cycle of improvements. The time that this cycle of improvements may take should not be underestimated.

There are significant opportunities for developing countries to leapfrog the development process by having technology transfer from developed countries, which in turn highlights the importance of the technology transfer. Pilot projects and precedents should be used to set clear examples. While technology transfer should be encouraged, the capacity to adopt it is just as important. The private sector can strongly contribute to technology transfer, one of the four pillars of the Bali roadmap. The private sector should also be actively involved in the negotiations for the post-2012 climate regime.

Collaboration between the private and public sectors is needed since neither of the two will be able to solve the existing problems on their own. Both sectors are intrinsic parts of the solution.

The group agreed that the private sector should engage with the UN agencies even beyond the partnerships that are already in place because of the agencies' unique convening and brokering role, which enables them to get many different stakeholders together. The UN agencies could be a knowledge center for different crops and through this engage the private sector. It would be extremely useful if the UN agencies could engage with the local governments and make an inventory of potential feedstock for biofuel production, so as to take pressure off the limited number of crops that are currently being used for fuel production. Given that the UN agencies have local presence and contacts within governments, they can be the contact link between local governments and the private sector. Furthermore, the UN agencies could play a key role in identifying and promoting investment opportunities. The UN bodies could 'advertise' these opportunities to the private sector.

Finally, it was agreed that the UN agencies should promote territorial planning and clarity on ownership rights as a basis for investments. Support to capacity strengthening to that effect would be needed. Overall, the UN agencies are to facilitate the dialogue process with other stakeholder groups and civil society.

## **Outcomes of the breakout groups, options, recommendations and key messages**

After plenary presentation of the groups' outcomes, the Consultation participants negotiated on the overall outputs, conclusions, messages to the High Level Conference and next steps and agreed on the following policy options, areas of common work, and opportunities for further collaboration:

## Policy options and recommendations for national, regional and international action in the context of the post 2012 negotiations

The private sector stakeholders are part of the solution to the issues of food security, bioenergy, and climate change, and thus both the private sector and the UN agencies need to be proactively involved in the post-2012 negotiations. However, it is important to note that the private sector represents a diverse group of stakeholders with divergent interests.

Technology transfer is one of the pillars of the Bali roadmap and private-public sector collaboration can contribute to make technology transfer more efficient. Technology transfer is critical to sustainable yield improvements, and all stakeholders, especially smallholders, should have access to such technologies. While technology for integrated land management is available today, the behaviour of existing organizations within countries that do not feel comfortable with quick changes has proved problematic. This experience reflects the need for increased political awareness, and for setting up pilot projects where people can see, learn and believe how technology works and is able to help them. Parallel training, know-how transfer and the setup of structures to support large- and small-hold farmers with access to technologies via service centres providing capacity building is needed. For technology to make a real difference, first of all, the 'trainers' will need to be trained', and then that education should be downsizing to the farmers. Technology will enable developing countries to plan better, document and control agriculture and forestry in a manner that carbon credits for financing due to optimized processes would be possible. This could be a strategy against hunger but also against deforestation and for an optimized agriculture

A knowledge base in support of informed policy development at the national and international level reflecting the need to integrate food security, energy, and environmental policy against the background of climate change should be established. The Rome-based UN agencies and institutions, in collaboration with other relevant inter-governmental agencies, are uniquely positioned to act as this knowledge centre/centre of excellence by providing data warehousing, capacity building services, field presence and support for development of relevant methodologies. The centralization of data in one place will facilitate analysis of (annual) assessments of food, and water potential/needs and rural energy needs over the next 20 years from sources in both the public and private sector, thus addressing current information gaps. These analyses should take into account new technologies, efficiency improvements, and emerging policy. Research, data analysis, and best practices information should be fed back into ongoing policy processes, especially with respect to post-2012 negotiations.

Important areas of research and analysis to be addressed by this centre of excellence include:

- The underlying drivers of food price inflation, followed by development of feasibility plans for addressing each driver individually;
- Existing carbon finance opportunities in the agriculture sector as well as underdeveloped opportunities should be categorized with a view to identifying where existing mechanisms (e.g. the Clean Development Mechanism) can be applied, where reform of mechanisms is needed, or where new approaches should be formulated;
- A full carbon assessment of the generation and reduction of emissions associated with the agriculture sector should be undertaken, including the production and combustion of biofuels.

Adaptation project development standards and a rating system for best practices need to be developed.

The private sector representatives endorse FAO's call for an international instrument or standard to be developed in consultation with public, private, and civil society stakeholders to guide sustainable bioenergy production, with a view to minimizing conflicts between food and fuel production. The group invites FAO to take the lead in a UN process to develop such an instrument

or standard. It was also stressed that there might be a need for national standards or rather ways need to be found to take the national context more into account. Furthermore, the application of standards should be linked to financial incentives. An innovative land management strategy that reflects the multi-purpose use of that land, including considerations related to sustainability and the conservation of biodiversity should be developed. The potential and carrying capacity of that land should be estimated based on reliable and measurable quantitative criteria. Thoughts will need to be devoted towards ways of integrating old-styled government-driven, vertical-oriented land management, where processes are generally slow, with the need for fast decisions. A more holistic approach to understand locally the linkages and coherences between agriculture, forestry and the environment will be crucial.

Bioenergy is one part of the solution towards energy security and climate change mitigation and it should go hand in hand with other alternative energy measures, such as reducing consumption and increasing efficiency.

Time and a 'supportive policy framework' should be given to the bioenergy sector to develop greater economic efficiency, improved technology, and arrive at a general sector maturation. The term 'supportive policy framework' could however not unilaterally be agreed upon since some of the private sector stakeholders present raised concerns about it being construed as 'subsidization'.

To minimize conflicts between the use of land for growing food and biofuel crops, the (range of) lands more suitable for growing biofuel crops should be identified. Also, guidance should be provided to farmers regarding the range of crop options on their particular type of land while avoiding a top-down approach of dictating what farmers may grow.

Public funding should be made available for the identification of the most efficient energy security policies and/or technologies and climate change mitigation opportunities with respect to agriculture. These should then be compared with the best opportunities for mitigation across sectors. Best overall opportunities for mitigation should be analyzed through a more holistic approach.

The role of global trade and markets needs to be considered with respect to climate change mitigation and adaptation, particularly with a view towards growing national and international carbon markets. Deregulation of trade and protection of small farmers must be taken into account as an important method of reducing poverty. The difference between the oil and agriculture markets should not be underestimated: while oil and gas exploration are a global business and are done by a relatively small number of well-characterized companies and governments - in essence, the world has one oil price, and markets and distribution are relatively transparent - the basis for all bio-based processes stems from at least 7-8 staple crops such as corn, rice and soy. These are grown by millions of farmers in hugely different cultures and climate systems, with varying amounts of water and money to buy seed, fertilizer, crop protection products and farming equipment resulting in large variations in productivity. Many hundreds of local, national and regional governments have agricultural and food policies in place, ranging from planting advice and soil use to local, national, regional and world trade rules. In addition to all these differences there are the different outputs that the two industries yield: the oil and gas industry yield energy and chemicals, whereas agriculture gives rise to energy, chemicals and food and feed. In the global trade, agricultural produce is treated in a different way to industrial products. Ultimately, agricultural raw materials are fundamentally different from fossils from a technological, social, political and economic perspective, and this should be taken into account when discussing the same.

Discussion should be instigated on the possibility of market formation for ecosystem services, especially water and biodiversity

Increasing agricultural productivity must be a key political objective in a world where fast growing demand for biomass (for food, energy and other uses) meets limited resources of land, water and innovation potential. This increase in productivity must be achieved in a sustainable manner. The private sector calls on political leadership in defining sustainability criteria for the production of biofuels and other non-food-use of biomass.

In times of multiple demands for biomass, land and water, industry calls on political leaders to define global sustainability criteria for food production as well as the use of agricultural raw material for non-food use such as biofuels. The role of the political system should be limited to providing a global sustainability framework for all applications of biomass, including food production from agriculture. Both good biofuels and food security could be satisfactorily addressed in such a framework. Political entities should have a central role to play in raising awareness that the twin issues of food security and energy security under climate change conditions need addressing and in developing a framework of appropriate values. Political entities should however not necessarily have to decide on allocation of resources, while they might offer expertise and positive endorsement for good market-based solutions.

Food security, climate change and bioenergy are linked global issues and require linked and integrated policies at the national and the international level. Policies aiming at only one of these areas can have unwanted consequences in the other areas if they fail to recognize and take into consideration their interlinked nature.

Areas of common work, proposals for cooperation and partnerships, possibilities for further areas of collaboration between the private sector and the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions (FAO, IFAD, WFP, and the GM) and other UN system partners.

The UN can offer the following to the private sector:

- Neutral broker acting in interest of member states
- Is/could increasingly become a centralized knowledge centre
- Local presence and contacts with governments
- Bringing stakeholders together
- Assistance or collaboration with the identification and promotion of investment opportunities
- Global facilitator for dialogue on standards
- Promotion of territorial planning and clarity and ownership rights as a basis for investments

The private sector can offer the following to the public sector:

- Implementer role for specific agricultural practices (It is important to remember that farmers, small- medium- or large-scale, are also part of the private sector).
- Investment capital
- Risk management
- Interface at which shifts in business behaviors happen
- Research and development
- Technical development
- Data

A public-private sector investment facility should be developed to pull resources together from all available stakeholders from the public and private sector, including international organizations, governments, non-governmental organizations (NGO), investors, carbon buyers, technology providers, technical experts and researchers. This combination of the different, and often complementary, resources, expertise, skills and capacities needs to be tackled and coordinated while engaging the rural communities and the rural poor in the process from the beginning.

A provision of bundling services for several dispersed and small projects beyond the opportunities offered by Programmatic Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) opportunities should be developed.

An inventory of cost-positive project activities within the agricultural sector should be developed: there should be investigation into the viability of all agriculture activities in the context of climate change mitigation and categorisation of them according to those that are cost-positive (or have a financial benefit) and those that are cost-negative, or represent a net financial loss. Activities that

are cost-positive are essentially low-hanging fruit and often the only or major barrier to implementation is access to capital. An example of a cost-positive activity is the installation of anaerobic digestion technology to handle a waste stream (manure), where the activity has value from management of a waste stream, as well as from the generation of electricity, heat, etc. available for sale or for use. For activities that have a net benefit, the removal of barriers should be facilitated by development of a list that pairs them with different financing options as access to capital is often the only or the main barrier.

To enlarge the scale of activities, IFAD should look into its loan programmes with an eye towards identifying how they can contribute to mitigation/adaptation projects in the agricultural sector, as well as how they can develop new funding window for climate change, also taking into consideration co-fund opportunities with the private sector.

There should be further facilitation of public-private sector collaborations and partnerships that contribute to development and implementation of adaptation activities (e.g. development of adaptation-like products, such as drought-resistant seeds; insurance/risk mitigation products; land management approaches, etc.). Awareness of these potential opportunities is needed, as is education on best practices and facilitation of greater R&D.

There should be development of an inventory of available grants and donor opportunities for adaptation activities - the Global Mechanism has to some extent already initiated this activity. This should develop in concert with efforts to quantify necessary funding/investment needs for specific adaptation activities, in as much detail as possible. There should be investigation of the potential to funnel adaptation funding back to rural communities in those cases where activities by private sector entities generate adaptation benefits. Research opportunities to combine mitigation and adaptation activities should be pursued with the aim to identify opportunities for collaboration between the public and private sectors in the implementation of such activities.

## KEY MESSAGES FOR THE HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE

- **The private sector**, being a diverse group of stakeholders, **is part of the solution to the issues of food security, bioenergy, and climate change** and therefore should be proactively involved in the post-2012 negotiations on a new climate change agreement, alongside the UN agencies and other stakeholders.
- **An investment facility for the promotion of climate change mitigation and adaptation projects in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors should be developed**, initiated by the Rome-based UN agencies and institutions but involving private sector partners, aiming at a public-private sector partnership. Such a facility should provide technical and financial assistance in a structured and organized manner to combine different, complementary resources, skills and capacities from all stakeholders in a coordinated way while engaging rural communities and the rural poor in the process from the beginning.
- **The potential for the implementation of adaptation activities and the funding base for adaptation to climate change should be broadened** through the facilitation of public-private sector collaborations and partnerships and the use of technology developments and R&D results. A detailed quantification of the funding or investment needs for specific adaptation activities should go alongside investigations into funneling adaptation funding, particularly as by-product of private sector initiatives, to rural communities. Adaptation project development standards and best-practice ratings should facilitate these processes.
- Public funding<sup>4</sup> should be made available for the identification of the most efficient energy security policies and/or technologies and climate change mitigation options with respect to agriculture and rural energy supply.
- **An inventory of cost-positive project activities within the agricultural sector should be developed as well as a list of complementary financing options** as access to capital is often the main barrier.
- **There is a need for the development of standards**, international and national, **to guide sustainable bioenergy production with a view to minimize food and fuel competition**. Public, private and civil society stakeholders should be consulted at various development stages and financial incentives should be linked to the application of standards.
- **The (range of) lands more suitable for growing biofuel stocks should be identified** to minimize conflicts between the use of land for growing food and biofuel crops. Guidance should be provided to farmers, regarding the range of crop options.
- **Technology transfer is one of the pillars of the Bali roadmap to a post-2012 climate regime as well as public-private sector collaboration**. Technology transfer is critical to sustainable yield improvements while at the same time important in the context of climate change mitigation and adaptation and therefore **all stakeholders, especially smallholders, should have access to such technologies**.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note: there are various sources of public funding and it had not been specified during the consultation what kinds of public funding are referred to here (e.g. ODA sources or national budgets)

# **Annex I**

## **Programme**

### Day I: Thursday, 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008

- 8.30-9.00 Arrival and registration  
9.00-9.15 Welcome and opening message  
**A. Mueller, Assistant Director General, FAO**  
**J. Powell, Deputy Executive Director, WFP**  
**C. Mersmann, Managing Director, Global Mechanism**
- 9.15-10.00 Key Note Sessions: Food security, climate change and bioenergy – establishing a common knowledge base
- Food production and food security – Views, expectations and potential from the perspective of an agribusiness.  
**Christof Walter, Unilever**
  - Bioenergy – Views, expectations and potential from the perspective of a biofuel producer.  
**Anne Ruth Herkes, BP Biofuels**
  - How can the finance sector contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation whilst serving its clients?  
**Coen Weddepohl, MAN Investments**
  - Manufacturing – Views, expectations and potential from the perspective of a company that manufactures everything from food preservatives to biodigesters.  
**Philip Van Lelyveld, DSM NV**
- 10.00-10.45 Information by the public private sector working group of the *Rome 2007 Initiative on Sustainable Growth- Investing in Emissions Reduction and Rural Development* – : How to establish a facilitation platform to endorse financial investments that would promote mitigation and adaptation measures in the agricultural, rural and land use sectors
- **Robert Tippmann, Head of Policy Advisory Services, EcoSecurities**
  - Q&A
- 10.45-11.15 *Coffee Break*
- 11.15-13.00 Identifying key issues and establishing linkages: Can we ensure food production? Can we ensure energy security without compromising food security? What is the role that the private sector can play in addressing the impacts of climate change and bioenergy production on food security, land tenure, water use and rural livelihoods?
- Overview of key issues and identification of linkages  
**A. Mueller, Assistant Director General, FAO**
  - Panel, Q&A and open dialogue
- 13.00-14.00 *Lunch*
- 14.00-14.30 Introduction of the breakout groups
- WG 1: Agriculture/Agri-business
  - WG 2: Financial sectors
  - WG 3: Technology Transfer/Energy needs
- 14.30-17.30 Break-out into 3 working groups; facilitated dialogue with open discussions and brainstorming

### Day II: Friday, 28<sup>th</sup> March 2008

- 9.00-10.30 Presentations on the outcomes of the breakout groups
- One representative / the chair of each breakout group to provide the summary of the outcomes from that specific group
- 10.30-11.00 *Coffee Break*

11.00-12.30

Formulation of key messages and policy options for the High-Level Conference

- policy options for national, regional and international action in the context of the post-2012 negotiations
- areas of common work and proposals for cooperation and partnerships identified among key private sector partners
- possibilities for further areas of collaboration with FAO, IFAD, WFP, the Global Mechanism and other UN system partners

12.30-13.00

Summary of conclusions

## **Annex II**

### **List of Participants**

Organization/Company	
Unilever	Christof Walter
Man Investments	Coen Weddepohl
DSM NV	Philip Van Lelyveld
Fortis	Peter De Waal
Agroenergie Developpement	Yannisk Herbaudiere
Agroenergie Developpement	Olivia Lazare
Progis	Walter Mayer
BP Biofuels	Anne Ruth Herkes
BASF	Martjn Gipmans
Ecosecurities	Robert Tippmann
Ecosecurities	Marianna Doria
Ecosecurities	Rebecca Smith
Global Mechanism of the UNCCD	Christian Mersmann
Global Mechanism of the UNCCD	Elisabeth Barsk-Rundquist
Global Mechanism of the UNCCD	Alejandro Kilpatrick
Global Mechanism of the UNCCD	Siv Oystese
Global Mechanism of the UNCCD	Saveis Joze Sadeghian
IFAD	Philippe Remy
IFAD	Atiqur Rahman
IFAD	Dimitra Stamatopoulos
WFP	John M. Powell
WFP	Laura Melo
FAO	Alexander Muller
FAO	Luc Dubreuil
FAO	Stephane Jost
FAO	Nadia Scialabba
FAO	Harry Van Der Wulp
FAO	Rosalud De La Rosa
FAO	Olivier Dubois
FAO	Caterina Batello-Cattaneo
FAO	Maxim Lobovikov
FAO	Wendy Mann
FAO	Alessandro Flammini
FAO	Virginia Oton Garcia