

QUNO SDC Project – Final Review

Geoffrey Hawtin and C.S.Srinivasan

with

Susan Bragdon, Nora Meier and Chelsea Smith

September 2016

Summary

In April 2012 QUNO started a 4-year project entitled “*Food Security in Trade and Intellectual Property Regimes – Towards Equity and Sustainability*”. The project, mainly funded by SDC, aimed to help ensure that the needs and opinions of small-scale farmers in developing countries, are fully taken into account within international IP, trade and investment regimes. Following a mid-term review in 2014, a number of changes were successfully made to the project. The principal outcomes envisaged from the project after the mid-term review were the following:

Outcome 1: Small scale farmer innovation is better understood and reflected in negotiations in international IP, trade and investment fora.

Outcome 2: An effective voice is provided for small scale farmers in food security-related aspects in international IP, trade and investment negotiating fora.

Outcome 3: Food security concerns of small farmers and other vulnerable groups become an integral element of international trade negotiations.

A final review was conducted in September/October 2016 and the key findings and resulting 20 recommendations are presented in this report. The review analysed project publications, appraised the project’s Food Security-Trade policy tool, and interviewed project staff and approximately 18 other people associated with the project.

Overall the project has been very successful, especially since much of the work was conceived within a longer timeframe than subsequently proved possible. The review considered the project offered good value for money and noted that all those interviewed expressed a very positive opinion of QUNO’s work and in particular its *modus operandi*. The project has produced a stream of well-researched, high quality publications and policy briefs.

With respect to Outcome 1, there is now a better understanding of factors influencing small-scale farmers’ innovation and better awareness of these factors among negotiators. However, a greater distinction could usefully be made between factors that influence innovation by small-scale farmers and those that impact on innovations for small-scale farmers by others.

The project has done some important work on Farmers’ Rights, which in many ways lie at the heart of the issues surrounding IP and small-scale farmers’ innovation. In taking this work forward, the review recommends looking at the national level and then taking the ideas and experiences gained to the regional and international levels. In this process it

should also be possible to learn valuable lessons about how best to secure more effective participation of small-scale farmers in policy dialogues. However, the report fully recognizes that such an approach requires adequate resourcing and that it falls somewhat outside the mandate of QUNO and would require forging appropriate partnerships.

A related issue is that of access by small-scale farmers to PGRFA, requiring the strengthening of local and national genebanks and the like, as well as the linkages between them and with international genebanks. The review recommends that QUNO consider initiating a dialogue focusing on these issues, together with relevant partners. In the longer term the report sees considerable value in creating an 'innovation policy tool' analogous to the tool currently being developed in the area of trade policy.

With respect to Outcome 2, many small-scale farmers and organizations that represent them have participated effectively in the project. Recognition of the importance of such participation appears to have increased, for example WIPO-IGC is now more open to adopting mechanisms for gaining small-scale farmers input to their work. However, the report highlights the continuing problem and some possible ways ahead, for achieving a more effective representation of the full spectrum of diverse small-scale farmers' views and interests.

On Outcome 3, the project has shifted its focus from developing a new, alternative framework for international trade and investment to exploring individual policy elements in international trade agreements. The work on investment effectively ceased and work on trade has focused on developing a web-based, interactive Food Security-Trade Policy Analysis (FS-TPA) tool that explores the links between international agricultural trade rules and food security. The tool has an attractive, user-friendly interface that provides easy navigability to different levels of information. In further developing the tool, the report recommended that: an additional (deeper) level of information and analyses be added; links to more detailed analyses be expanded; a mechanism be put in place for periodically updating the tool; the further development of the tool be overseen by a body of experts to ensure the quality, credibility and relevance; information and analyses of Regional Trade Agreements be added. The maintenance and further development of the FS-TPA tool will require substantial funding and the report recommended that securing this is an important priority. Furthermore, in the longer term QUNO should consider bringing in a collaborative institutional partner such as a UN agency, University department, research institution or the like in order to ensure sustainability.

In conclusion, while there is still a way to go before international and national policy instruments take adequate account of food security issues and the needs of small-scale farmers, the project is to be commended for its impressive achievements. We believe that the project has contributed significantly to raising awareness of the issues and to generating and providing valuable new information and insights to underpin the negotiations. We very much hope that funding can be secured to continue the valuable work.

Table of Contents

Summary	i
Acknowledgements.....	1
1. Preface	1
2. Method of Review.....	2
3. Project Description.....	3
4. Performance by Outcomes and Outputs	5
4.1 Outcome 1.....	5
4.2 Outcome 2.....	6
4.3 Outcome 3.....	8
4.4 Overall Assessment.....	9
5. Partnerships	10
6. Publications and Communications.....	11
7. Recommendations	13
7.1 Recommendations – Innovation.....	13
7.2 Recommendations – Trade	16
7.3 Recommendations – General.....	17
8. Conclusions	18
9. Annexes.....	19
Annex 1. Reviewers' <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	19
Annex 2: Terms of Reference.....	20
Annex 3: Persons consulted for the Final Review – September 12-16, 2016.....	24
Annex 4: Project Publications and Reports.....	25
Annex 5: Project Logframe and Activities	27
Annex 6: Verification of Achievements.....	35
Annex 7: Participants in Project Consultations.....	39

Acknowledgements

Throughout the Review the external reviewers benefited greatly from the advice, support and hospitality of QUNO management and staff, above all from the project team. We would like to thank, in particular, Jonathan Woolley, Director of QUNO, for his very useful explanations and overall guidance, Susan Bragdon, Representative for Food and Sustainability and project manager, for her invaluable advice, explanations and suggestions, and Chelsea Smith, Research Assistant and Nora Meier, Program Assistant, for their very helpful insights and analyses. We would also like to thank Susan Sprague Parachini, Office Manager, for her highly efficient and effective administrative support.

We acknowledge with thanks the extremely useful information and advice we received from representatives of the project donor, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, in particular from Peter Bieler, Manuel Flury and Christina Blank.

Finally, we wish to express our thanks to all those who we interviewed in the course of this evaluation. We very much appreciate the time they devoted to helping us in this exercise. Their feedback and constructive comments were an essential source of information for this review.

1. Preface

In April 2012 the Quaker United Nations Office (QUNO) in Geneva initiated a project entitled “*Food Security in Trade and Intellectual Property Regimes – Towards Equity and Sustainability*”. The project, mainly funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), is set to run until the end of 2016. The project responds to a widely shared belief that the current system of rules and procedures in international agricultural trade, investment and intellectual property rights is not sufficiently supportive of the special food security and rural development needs of small-scale farmers in low-income countries.

A mid-term review of the project was carried out in October/November 2014, following which a number of substantive changes were made and a new logframe developed and approved by SDC. The changes are outlined in the main body of this report. As a result, this final review of the project concentrates mainly on the period since the mid-term review to date, September 2016.

The Terms of Reference of the review (See Annex 2) requested that recommendations be made for future work. At the time of the mid-term review there was a clear expectation that, provided the project continued to perform effectively, resources would be provided for a second phase. Unfortunately, SDC has recently indicated that an extension of funding is now unlikely, at least in the short term. While it was made clear that this decision was made for reasons internal to SDC and in no way reflects on the importance or performance of the project, it does mean that the review to some extent was evaluating ‘work in progress’ as the outcomes and indeed many of the activities, were conceived within a longer timeframe.

This Final Review of the project was undertaken following the Terms of Reference approved by SDC, by the external reviewers Chittur Srinivasan and Geoff Hawtin (See Annex 1 for brief CVs of the reviewers), working together with the QUNO project staff, in particular Susan Bragdon, Nora Meier and Chelsea Smith.

2. Method of Review

The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the final review of the project specified two separate objectives. The first objective was to assess the project in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, sustainability and relevance to the needs of project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries. The guiding questions to be addressed for this objective were (1) the extent to which the project had contributed to the overall goal and the factors that influenced the project's capacity to have an impact; (2) the extent to which the project had achieved the expected outcomes and outputs; (3) the efficiency with which the expected outcomes/outputs were addressed; (4) the lasting impact of the project; and (5) the extent to which the project activities met the needs of stakeholders and partners.

The second objective was to provide an independent input on priority areas for future projects by QUNO and/or others. The guiding questions for this objective called for (1) identification of future developments that would best contribute to the overall goal of the project; (2) prioritisation of future activities; and (3) identification of additional partners and linkages.

The ToRs noted that assessment of impact on policy was inherently problematic on account of the long time frame involved and the difficulties in identifying cause-effect linkages, especially in the context of the "quiet diplomacy" used by QUNO. It was suggested in the ToRs that a participatory approach of interviewing and talking to project partners and other stakeholders that were involved in project activities may be helpful in providing a sense of impact. Therefore, a mostly qualitative approach was adopted for this review principally based on interactions with a cross-section of project participants, stakeholders, partners and the SDC.

For conducting this review of the project, the reviewers:

- (1) Reviewed the activities undertaken by the project in relation to each of the planned outcomes and outputs in the Project Logframe as revised following the mid-term review
- (2) Appraised all the information products generated by the project, which were made available to the reviewers through a shared Dropbox folder set up by the QUNO team. These included the bi-annual Activities Reports documenting the work undertaken by the project, the reports of activities (consultations, seminars), Policy Briefs and the literature reviews/research papers underpinning the Policy Briefs. The web-based interactive trade policy tool developed by the project, which allows users to explore the linkages between food security measures and international agricultural trade rules, was also reviewed.
- (3) Conducted face-to-face or Skype interviews with a cross-section of project partners, stakeholders and participants. All the persons interviewed had been involved in, or had contributed to, project activities in one form or another especially in the period since the mid-term review. They included academics, representatives of civil society organisations and officials of developing country permanent trade missions in Geneva, WIPO, UPOV and Swiss Federal Institutions (Swiss Institute of Intellectual Property). Discussions were held with SDC officials in Berne. In all 18 persons were interviewed (Annex 3). Interviewees were requested to share their experience and assessment of

project activities, processes, outputs and impacts. They were also requested to share their perspectives on avenues for future development.

(4) Had detailed discussions with the QUNO team over the period September 12-16, 2016 on the implementation of project processes, outputs, potential impact, lessons learnt and avenues/priorities for the future.

(5) Reviewed the project budget and expenditures thus far in relation to the activities undertaken and the human resources deployed.

The final review report was prepared with feedback from QUNO on the draft report and key recommendations.

3. Project Description

The overall goal of the project is that “*Sustainable food security in Less Developed Countries (LDCs), and in particular the needs of the rural poor, is taken explicitly on countries’ Intellectual Property (IP) and international trade agendas and adequately addressed in international IP and trade regimes*”. The project seeks to ensure that existing and new international IP, trade and investment agreements and the multilateral institutions that govern them: (1) support and/or do not undermine food security measures at multilateral, regional or national levels; (2) are sensitive to the needs and concerns of the poor, especially small-scale farmers in agricultural biodiversity rich systems; and (3) are mandated to prioritise food security concerns of the LDCs and their populations. The focus of the project has been on the WTO Agreement of Agriculture, the Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), the UPOV Convention and the ongoing WIPO negotiations on genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions which cover the key domains of IP and international agricultural trade. The project is based on four underlying premises:

- First, strict IP rules risk limiting countries’ space to adopt policies that better meet national needs for food security and rural development;
- Second, there is a lack of credible information, awareness and analysis of options for IP at the level of countries as well as in relevant international organizations;
- Third, a higher priority given to food security on the agendas of relevant international fora would lead to a greater capacity in such fora for the formulation of appropriate IP policies, especially in relation to the needs of developing countries; and
- Fourth, wider recognition of food security as an important objective of agricultural trade, combined with new global challenges, would facilitate consensus on a “new framework of agricultural trade and investment rules” which would enable countries to adopt policies that are better focused on their food security needs and objectives.

The initial project design envisaged three principal outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Exploiting IP options for supporting long-term food security needs of LDCs.
- Outcome 2: Broadening participation in IP negotiations.
- Outcome 3: Developing an alternative framework on trade and investment.

Following the mid-term review of the project undertaken in 2014, the project logframe underwent substantial revision. The major change was in relation to Outcome 3 on trade and investment where the focus shifted from developing a new, alternative framework for trade

and investment, to exploring policy elements, existing and new, in international trade agreements for supporting small-scale farmers and food security. The remit of Outcome 1 was also expanded to include examination of options to support small-scale farmer innovation and livelihoods that extended beyond IP. The revised logframe of the project identified the following outcomes.

- Outcome 1: Factors influencing small-scale farmer livelihoods and innovation, as well as IP and other innovation-promoting options, are better understood and have influenced national policies and negotiating positions in international IP, trade and investment fora.
- Outcome 2: Negotiations in food security-relevant topics in IP, trade and investment fora involve the more effective participation of small scale farmers (and/or organisations representing them).
- Outcome 3: Actual and potential elements of international trade agreements that affect food security of vulnerable groups in general, and small farmers in particular, are identified and better understood, and have influenced international trade negotiations.

The revised project logframe lists several outputs for each outcome and specific activities for each output. A key element of project implementation is determined by QUNO's *modus operandi*. This involves bringing together multiple stakeholders in the relevant subject domains in non-adversarial and informal settings where participants are not constrained by their official mandates or stated positions. QUNO aims to provide an avenue for appreciation of diverse perspectives, facilitated by a trusted, even-handed and neutral co-ordinator. Working together in partnership with other organisations and individuals is also integral to the QUNO process. The list of partner institutions (Annex 7) includes Geneva-based NGOs like ICTSD and the South Centre, the CGIAR, and UN Organizations dealing with IP and trade, in particular WIPO, WTO, UPOV, and with development, agriculture and investment like CFS, UNCTAD, FAO and IFAD. Individual experts associated with the project represent a wide range of policy makers, associations representing farmers and the food industry as well as other stakeholder groups.

The range of activities undertaken by the project include expert/stakeholder consultations on IP, trade and small farmer innovation issues, side events and seminars in international fora such as the CFS and WTO, a series of publications (which include Policy Briefs, supported by research papers/literature reviews and reports of consultations) and the development of a web-based interactive Trade Policy Analysis tool to serve as a living information resource for stakeholders and policy makers/trade negotiators. Building linkages and networks with civil society organisations, country Trade Missions and international organisations involved with the governance of IP, trade and food security measures is a key element of project activities that can enhance QUNO's outreach and contribution to enhancing international IP and trade agendas.

The project has initiated a number of activities that were predicated on financial support being available from the SDC for a second phase of the project. However, on account of the uncertainty now surrounding future SDC funding, these initiatives may need to be reviewed or recast. In our recommendations we have attempted to identify priorities for future activities in this context.

4. Performance by Outcomes and Outputs

4.1 Outcome 1

Factors influencing small-scale farmer livelihoods and innovation, as well as IP and other innovations-promoting options, are better understood and have influenced national policies and negotiating positions in international IP, trade and investment fora.

Following the mid-term review, the project successfully widened its scope from a relatively narrow focus on intellectual property (IP), to look more broadly at small-scale farmer innovation. This was a logical and important shift based on the fact that there is relatively little evidence that formal IP regimes have had a significant impact, positive or negative, on small-scale farmers in most developing countries. This may be due, at least in part, to a lack of effective enforcement, which will always be difficult in small-scale farming communities. In any case, a large range of other factors are likely to be more important in promoting or inhibiting innovation, including seed regulations, seed production and distribution systems, access to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, (PGRFA), access to inputs and credit, security of land tenure, etc.

Since the objective of IP regimes is to promote innovation through providing appropriate incentives, it was logical for the project to take a broader look at what, among the range of other options, might encourage or discourage small-scale farmer innovation. The project is to be commended for the important papers it has produced on this topic including the report of the “*First Expert Consultation on Small-Scale Farmer Innovations Systems*”, the excellent and authoritative “*Small-Scale Farmer Innovation Systems; A Review of the Literature*”, and the resulting Policy Brief ‘*Small-Scale Farmer Innovation*’. These documents represent an important contribution to global understanding of this topic. Other useful outputs of the project have included a paper entitled, “*Access to Seeds: Lessons from the Access to Medicines Debate*” and the Policy Brief: ‘*Relationship between Intellectual Property Rights and Small-Scale Farmer Innovation*’.

The focus of the work to date has been largely on innovation by small-scale farmers themselves which, in turn is often motivated by a desire to solve the problems and challenges they and their families face on a day-to-day basis. The drivers of such innovation are likely to be significantly different from those that promote innovation for small-scale farmers by others, whether in the public or private sector. The latter is more likely to be driven by a desire for more direct financial or other gain. In this respect we endorse the decision to hold a consultation in November, 2016, to look at the role of the public sector in fostering and supporting innovation by and for small-scale farmers. This is a key yet neglected, even unfashionable, topic and we would anticipate that some important ideas will emerge at the meeting relevant to possible future work in this area. In this respect we look forward to the planned Policy Brief on “*Revitalizing the Public Sector to Achieve Food Security*”.

The project has been working with WIPO in the context of the work programme of its Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC). The WIPO staff interviewed were extremely appreciative of the project’s inputs and mentioned, in particular Susan Bragdon’s presentations at two Seminars: “*The International Legal Architecture Governing PGRFA*” and “*How Existing Instruments and the International Legal Instrument(s) being Negotiated by IGC Should Complement and Support Each Other*”. However, little progress has been made in the IGC negotiations themselves over recent years; negotiators have become bogged down

and the current negotiating draft comprises large amounts of bracketed text. During our meetings, WIPO staff indicated their strong desire for further input from QUNO to help break the current logjam – especially over the period to next June/July when the General Assembly is due to make a decision on the future of the IGC and its work programme.

Although there is a long way to go before measures to promote innovation by and for small-scale farmers have been adopted in international legal instruments, nevertheless we believe the project has indeed been successful in raising awareness among negotiators at both the national and international level. While it is difficult to gauge the extent of any such heightened awareness, Annex 6 does provide some useful indicators. For example, while the issue of innovation was raised by delegates to the CFS for the first time only in 2013, there have been 6 statements made by delegates so far in 2016. Innovation was highlighted throughout the Final Report of CFS 41. While it is difficult to assess what exact role the project has played in increasing awareness of the importance of fostering innovation, we believe that its publications and seminars mentioned earlier have probably been a significant factor. One interviewee said that he had originally doubted its importance but is now convinced that in spite of the benefits that new/modern technology can bring to small-scale farmers, traditional knowledge (TK) and local innovation remain significant in many situations and it is important not to “throw the baby out with the bathwater.”

The concept of Farmers Rights in many ways lies at the heart of the issues surrounding IP and small-scale farmers’ innovation. They are seen by many people as a *quid pro quo* for Plant Breeders Rights, but the two are very different. Rewards for innovation appropriate for professional plant breeders are very different from those that promote and reward innovation by small-scale farmers. Legal protection of locally developed varieties is, in many cases, far less important to small-scale farming communities than other factors such as access to appropriate PGRFA, access to information and technology, access to inputs and participation in decision-making on matters that directly concern them.

The project has undertaken some commendable work on Farmers’ Rights, for example the Stakeholder Consultation on the Implementation of Farmers’ Rights, held in Geneva in May 2016, and an interesting paper, due to be published soon, entitled “*Towards a Resilience Approach to Farmers’ Rights*”. However, this remains a difficult and contentious area and one that has seen relatively little progress either nationally or internationally over recent years. In spite of the International Treaty stating that Farmers’ Rights are a national concern, many countries are seeking help from the Treaty’s Secretariat and other international bodies in their efforts to introduce systems for recognizing and implementing these rights. We make some recommendations for further work in this area in Section 7 below.

In conclusion, a large body of work has been carried out by the project in pursuit of Outcome 1. The 5 Outputs given in the logframe are all highly relevant to achieving the outcome. The activities have been of high quality and the people we interviewed in the course of this review all expressed their appreciation for the relevance of the work and the calibre of the staff, consultants and others involved in it. However, there is still much to be done in this and related areas, to which we will return later.

4.2 Outcome 2

Negotiations on food security-relevant topics in IP, trade and investment fora involve the more effective participation of small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other vulnerable groups.

Outcome 2 is highly relevant to achieving the overall goal of the project, i.e. *that sustainable food security and the needs of small-scale farmers in the Least Developed Countries are adequately addressed in national and international policy agendas and legal regimes.*

While greater participation of small-scale farmers in decision-making processes is a laudable objective, to achieve it in an equitable and comprehensive manner is far from straightforward. Social, cultural and economic circumstances vary widely from household to household; most countries are highly heterogeneous ecologically; the availability of inputs, distance from markets, access to information and technology, etc. all vary widely from one location to another. These factors combine to make small-scale farmers, indeed farmers in general, a highly diverse group.

The situation is exacerbated in that not only are the farmers themselves highly diverse but so are the groups that seek to serve and represent their interests. These include such organizations as farmers' unions, associations and cooperatives organized on a village, province or national level, or along commodity lines. Developmental or other civil society organizations, many having a strong political agenda, may also seek to represent small-scale farmer interests. And all are subject, to greater or lesser degree, to government sanction or control.

Given this situation, it is important that the full spectrum of interests has an adequate and effective voice in negotiating processes and that representation is not 'hijacked' by one or a few special interest groups. This begs the question as to how this might be achieved. While it might be comparatively easy at the national level to involve a range of different individuals and organizations in a national dialogue, it is obviously more difficult at the regional level, and more difficult again at the international level, where numbers of participants in any meeting or negotiating forum are of necessity limited. Section 7 below presents few ideas on how QUNO might gain some further useful insights and practical experience of how to organize effective and representative input by small-scale farmers to policy-making.

In spite of the inherent difficulties, the project has made some useful inroads into securing a greater voice for small-scale farmers. The issue has been repeatedly raised by QUNO staff and others in the intergovernmental fora with which the project interacts. It is also a recurring theme in many publications and will be directly addressed in a planned Policy Brief entitled "*Are Small-Scale Farmer at the Table? A Reflection on Small-Scale Farmers' Participation within International Fora*" as well as in a paper on "*The Foundation of Food Security: the need for predictable and Consistent Support for Small-Scale Farmers*".

Annex 7 lists participants who have been involved in project consultations. While only a handful of actual small-scale farmers have been directly involved in the project, many participants have come from organizations that work with and represent small-scale farmers. Most of these, however, are civil society organizations. QUNO did have active involvement of a representative from a farmers' union (Zimbabwe); from representatives of the Asociacion Nacional de Empresas Comercializadoras de Productores del Campo, a 200,000-member farmer organization, and representatives of the Asian Farmers Association; a regional alliance of 17 national federations and organizations of small scale women and men farmers and producers from 13 countries in Asia. In future work in this area it might be useful to seek the involvement of a broader spread of organizations in order to be sure that the full range of small-scale farmer views and perspectives are adequately represented.

We were encouraged to learn that WIPO-IGC appears to be open to adopting mechanisms for gaining the input of small-scale farmers to their work, recognizing that to date most of the local-level LDC input has come from indigenous people's groups. On the other hand, we note that QUNO's own efforts to gain recognition by UPOV as an official observer have so far been denied, through no fault of their own. UPOV has claimed that they have insufficient information upon which to base a decision regarding QUNO's competence in relation to matters relevant to the UPOV convention. While this rejection does not appear to unduly affect the project's ability to provide a valuable input to the negotiations, e.g. through contacts with country delegations, the decision does exemplify the difficulties faced in gaining access to this negotiating forum. If QUNO's competence in this area is questioned, how much more so the small-scale farmer groups that QUNO and other seek to support and whose interests they seek to protect.

4.3 Outcome 3

Actual and potential elements of international trade agreements that affect the food security of vulnerable groups in general and small-scale farmers in particular, are identified and better understood, and have influenced international trade negotiations.

Following endorsement by the mid-term review, the project shifted its focus in the work on international trade – from developing a new, alternative framework for international trade and investment in agriculture to exploring individual policy elements, current and new, in international trade agreements that are important for supporting small scale farmers and for food security. In the post mid-term review period, the project's work on trade has focused on the development of a web-based interactive Food Security-Trade Policy Analysis (FS-TPA) tool which systematically explores the linkages between international agricultural trade rules and food security for small farmers and vulnerable groups in LDCs. The FS-TPA tool also delineates the policy space available to LDCs for food security measures within the framework of existing international trade agreements.

The development of the FS-TPA tool has been underpinned by a pioneering research effort to identify and analyse how international agricultural trade rules derived from the WTO Agreement on Agriculture could potentially affect a whole range of food security measures available to LDCs. The report by Kim Burnett on "*The Relationship between Key Food Security Measures and Trade Rules*" for an expert consultation on a new framework for trade and investment in agriculture is a key output from this project. Jennifer Clapp's paper on "*Trade Liberalisation and Food Security: Examining the Linkages*" also makes an important contribution to raising awareness and understanding of trade liberalisation – food security linkages. The QUNO studies can be seen as having made a contribution to the mainstreaming food security concerns in the context of international trade negotiations and breaking down the silos within which discussions in international fora take place. One of the interviewees remarked that QUNO's work had contributed to dispelling the notion that "food security is not a trade issue". QUNO has made a notable contribution in raising the relevance of trade issues in CFS deliberations.

The QUNO studies on food security-trade linkages have culminated in a very informative, concise and clear Policy Brief explaining the nature of WTO trade rules for agriculture and their linkages to and implications for food security policy measures. The Policy Brief clearly demarcates the policy space that is available for food security policy measures that are compatible with WTO trade rules. It also highlights the nature of interventions that may not be compatible with adherence to WTO trade rules. It provides an excellent starting point for more detailed examination of specific food security policy measures and

is well referenced with links to more detailed sources of information and relevant literature.

The web-based FS-TPA tool has an attractive and user-friendly interface which provides easy navigability to different levels of information. The first level categorises food security measures into a number of macro-categories which presently are: (1) Infrastructure; (2) Rural Development; (3) Knowledge and Innovation; (4) Natural Resource Access and Stewardship; (5) Safeguards; (6) Farmer Participation; (7) Food and Nutrition; and (8) Accessible Markets. The second level lists specific policy or programme measures related to each of the above categories. The third level provides information on specific policies and programmes – which includes the description/definition of the policy/programme, its relationship to food security, the context in which it is used, how it may be affected by international trade rules and relationship to other policies. The key section on “Relationship to Trade Rules” provides links to more detailed analysis of the issue from the WTO, FAO or other authentic sources.

The FS-TPA tool is a very valuable output from the project that provides an easily accessible resource for increasing the awareness of food security-international trade linkages for all stakeholders and as a reference for officials and trade negotiators. These benefits can be sustained over time only if the FS-TPA tool is maintained, updated and its functionality enhanced. Suggestions for maintenance and further development of the FS-TPA tool are discussed in section 7.

The impact of this project on the agenda/priorities of international trade negotiations may not be visible in the near term given the slow pace of progress in these negotiations. However, all the stakeholders that we interviewed including representatives of LDC Permanent Trade Missions and international organisations, recognised the value of the QUNO platform that brought together divergent perspectives in a non-adversarial setting to find a way forward from deadlocked positions, generate new ideas and find consensus. The development of information products like the FS-TPA tool underpinned by careful research and facilitation of stakeholder dialogue, address the overall objective of the project by contributing to a change in the “narrative of trade negotiations” and by providing a far more nuanced assessments of the welfare impacts of trade liberalisation.

4.4 Overall Assessment

Following the Mid-term Review, it was decided that the project would no longer work on investment policy beyond maintaining a watching brief. Reference to investment policy was thus dropped from the Overall Goal statement in the revised logframe. However, reference to investment policy was retained in the wording of Outcomes 1 and 2 although little or no work has actually been devoted to this over the last two years. Given the profile and experience of project staff and the demanding workload in the areas of IP, innovation and trade policies, we fully agree with the decision to downplay the work on investment.

There was a very widespread appreciation from all who we interviewed for the style of QUNO's work: low key, off the record, consensus seeking, technically driven and evidence based, yet with strong concerns for equity and fairness. It is in large measure due to this method of working that the project has been able to make significant progress in such a complex and politically charged arena. We consider this approach to be a major reason behind the repeated requests that we heard from partners for QUNO to continue to support LDC efforts to raise food security issues and the concerns of small-scale

farmers in the various negotiating fora. We also believe that the high level of expertise and motivation of the QUNO staff associated with the project has been a major factor in this.

Several interviewees cited the value of the side events organized by QUNO at negotiating sessions and other meetings. These were seen as an effective way of reaching a larger audience with timely and relevant information, as well as for soliciting feedback on work in progress. The side event at CFS in which the policy tool was presented was mentioned as a good example of this.

A major focus of the project has been on raising awareness and promoting a greater understanding of the issues and potential solutions among negotiators from small developing country delegations. This group often has multiple responsibilities across many sectors and clearly cannot be expert in all the areas in which they are expected to engage. All too often developing country negotiators are at a great disadvantage when facing the far greater negotiating power of the developed countries. We commend the project for focussing attention on this group.

We also commend the project for initiating efforts to promote better coordination and cooperation among the secretariats of the various treaties concerned with IP, innovation and trade policy, in particular the International Treaty on PGRFA, UPOV, the WIPO IGC and TRIPS. All four have responded positively to QUNO's initiative and we very much hope funding can be secured soon to enable the four secretariats to meet. Such strengthened cooperation is greatly needed as all too often the "left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing."

We believe that the project offers good value for money. The overall funding devoted to the effort has amounted to approximately CHF 1.887 million (CHF 1.591 million from SDC and CHF 280 thousand from QUNO and CHF 16 thousand from other sources) since the outset in 2012. Since the new project outcomes were adopted at the end of 2014, approximately equal amounts of funding have been allocated to each of the three outcomes. We consider this appropriate given the importance of all three outcomes. Of the total project funding, approximately 73% has been spent on personnel costs, to which QUNO has made a significant contribution. We regard this as a good indication of the project's overall efficiency and it compares favourably with many similar initiatives with which we are familiar.

In conclusion, while there is still a long way to go before international and national policy instruments take adequate account of food security issues and the needs of small-scale farmers, the project is to be commended for its impressive progress in a relatively short period of time. We believe that the project has contributed significantly to raising awareness of the issues and to generating and providing valuable new information and insights to underpin the negotiations. We very much hope that funding can be secured to continue the valuable work.

5. Partnerships

Partnerships are the essence of the project, reflecting QUNO's customary, and widely appreciated, style of working. The project's immediate beneficiaries, (LDC delegations and negotiators), and ultimate beneficiaries (small-scale farmers and the organizations that represent them) are, overall, reasonably well represented in the work (but see below). In addition, a wide range of experts from institutions around the world, in both

developing and developed countries, play a key partnership role contributing ideas, advice, and technical support.

The consultation on innovation in May 2015, for example, included 18 participants, of which seven were from NGOs that work with and/or represent small-scale farmers, three were from developed country universities, two were from UN or other international organizations, three were QUNO staff members, two were from national institutions that provide policy advice to their governments, and one was a farmer-innovator from Kenya. Of the 18, 50% were based in developing countries and the rest in developed.

Overall the project lists a total of almost 150 individuals with whom it has worked over the life of the project (see Annex 8). These again represent a very wide range of interests and expertise as well as a broad geographical and institutional spread and, as far as we were able to ascertain, a good gender balance.

There are perhaps two groups that might be considered to be somewhat under-represented among those listed in Annex 7. One is small-scale farmers themselves. While we recognize that direct representation is always going to be highly problematic, there is also a fairly narrow spread of institutions listed that claim to represent their interests – most being NGOs. There is, for example, a relative lack of ‘official’ farmer organizations, e.g. local or national farmers’ unions, producer federations or grower cooperatives. While recognizing that many of these may not adequately represent the interests of small-scale farmers, many do so. And in any case it is important to hear the views of the entire farming sector when trying to influence government negotiating positions on issues of national food and nutritional security. We recognize, however, that getting an accurate representation of the extremely diverse perspectives of farmers in general, and small-scale farmers in particular, is extremely difficult. We thus make some suggestions in section 7 below on how this issue might be addressed.

The other group that we might have expected to feature more prominently, given the nature and target of the project, is LDC negotiators themselves. Representatives from less than 10 LDC missions to the UN organizations are listed in Annex 8.

In spite of these observations we feel the project is to be congratulated on the number, relevance and diversity of the partners with which it works. We heard universal appreciation and support for QUNO and the project from all the partners we interviewed.

6. Publications and Communications

The reviewers are pleased to note that the project has produced a stream of well-researched, high quality publications closely aligned with the anticipated outputs in the subject domains of small-farmer innovation, IP and international trade. The list of current and planned publications of the project is given in Annex 4. These publications include reports of consultations, briefing papers, Policy Briefs and more detailed literature reviews/research reports. The publications are targeted at both generalist and specialist audiences with the briefing papers/Policy Briefs aimed at a generalist audience and the literature reviews and research reports being more suited for a technical/specialist audience. The Policy Briefs provide an accessible but thorough introduction to issues related to small-farmer innovation, IP and trade for multiple stakeholders. An important aspect of project publications that we wish to highlight is that the Policy Briefs are supported by a body of systematic literature reviews and rigorous academic scholarship. Some specific observations on the key Policy Briefs produced by the project are given in

Box 1. The FS-TPA tool which is also an important “information product” developed by the project has already been discussed in section 4.3. While the project’s publications have attempted to synthesise different perspectives, they have not hesitated to challenge prevailing paradigms on IP and trade issues.

The dissemination of project publications to stakeholders is achieved mainly through the QUNO website (distribution of hard copies to participants in project events can at best provide only limited dissemination). However, the reviewers observed that the full range of project publications is not as easily accessible through the QUNO website as it could be and it is somewhat cumbersome to navigate to some of the documents. We understand that QUNO is already addressing this issue with a restructuring of the F&S portion of the website.

The dissemination of publications intended for a general audience has received priority. However, we feel that the underlying body of literature reviews and research reports should also be widely disseminated as they are likely to be highly relevant for trade negotiators, government officials and policy makers – and all who might be interested in the evidence and analysis supporting the Policy Briefs. Dissemination of research outputs through papers in peer reviewed academic journals also needs to be explored as this would provide exposure for QUNO’s work to a wider academic audience. No statistics are presently available on the downloads of project publications from QUNO’s website. Monitoring of downloads (including the locations from which publications are being accessed) can provide a very good indicator of QUNO’s outreach. Many of the documents have been translated into French and Spanish and some into Chinese. Translation of documents is expensive, but avenues for translation into languages relevant for LDC stakeholders need to be kept under review, as it is important for stakeholder outreach. The possibility of involving partner organisations or collaborators for translation activities needs to be further explored.

Box 1: Comments on Policy Briefs

1. Policy Brief on Small Scale Farmer Innovation

- a) Develops a useful conceptual framework to explore different dimensions of small scale farmer innovation and its drivers. Identifies a complex range of small scale farmer innovations that go beyond the conservation and enhancement of agro-biodiversity.
- b) The role of innovation intermediaries and the public sector in supporting small-farmer innovation has been highlighted.
- c) However, in identifying support for small farmer innovation, a greater distinction could be usefully made between:
 - Innovation by small farmers and innovation for small farmers.
 - Small farmer innovation processes (innovations emerge as farmers engage in the production process for subsistence/livelihoods) and formal sector innovation processes.
 - Measures for supporting innovation by small farmers and measures for adoption, dissemination or commercial exploitation of the innovations.
- d) It may also be useful to address the issue of institutional capacity available in LDCs while examining options for supporting small-farmer innovation.

2. Policy Brief on Relationship between IPR and Small Scale Farmer Innovation

- a) Clearly identifies the nature of potential impacts of IPR systems (patents, PVP, trademarks, GI) on small-scale farmer innovation.

- b) The discussion on IPRs and their relationship with small scale innovation would have had greater clarity if the distinction between innovation *by* farmers and innovation *for* farmers had been made by the outset.
- c) The pathways to impact from IPR measures to impacts on small-scale farmer innovation need to be clearly delineated (e.g., how might PVP systems disrupt informal seed systems or small farmer innovations? What is the relationship between farmers using a “breadth of varieties” on their fields and IPR measures?). The complex nature of these linkages justifies more detailed exposition.
- d) A large body of farmer innovation has been identified in the paper which appears to be unrelated to, or unaffected by, IPR regimes (e.g., institutional innovations, agricultural practice innovation). The lack of relevance or impact of IPR regimes for a large body of small-farmer innovation may need to be highlighted in the policy brief. The issue of whether small farmer innovation can be brought within the purview of formal IPR systems (or whether small farmers would have the incentive to take advantage of these systems) is probably not a central concern in supporting small farmer innovation.

3. Relationship between Food Security Policy Measures and WTO Trade Rules

- a) A very informative, concise and clear policy brief explaining the nature of WTO trade rules for agriculture and their linkages to and implications for food security policy measures.
- b) Clearly demarcates the policy space that is available for food security policy measures that are compatible with WTO trade rules. It also highlights the nature of interventions that may not be compatible with adherence to WTO trade rules. Provides an excellent starting point for more detailed examination of specific food security policy measures.
- c) Well referenced with links to more detailed sources of information and relevant literature

7. Recommendations

The main project donor, SDC, has indicated that, for internal reasons, it is unlikely to be able to continue to fund the project, at least in the near future. Nevertheless, the Terms of Reference call on the reviewers to “*provide an independent input on priority areas for future projects by QUNO and/or others.*” This section of the report thus presents our thoughts and recommendations regarding possible future directions and activities relating to the overall project goal.

7.1 Recommendations – Innovation

1. Drivers of small-scale farmer innovation, both positive and negative, are still rather poorly understood and further work is still needed. It would be helpful if a greater distinction were made in the project between drivers of innovation by small-scale farmers themselves, and drivers of innovation by others that is aimed at small-scale farmers, whether exclusively or inclusively. The role of the public sector in supporting innovation justifies considerably more attention and the meeting due to take place in November is likely to provide some important leads for future work in this area.

2. We believe it will be important for QUNO to continue assisting the secretariat of the WIPO-IGC over the next few months, at least to mid-2017, to help advance the discussions on the text of the proposed international legal instrument(s) that aim to ensure appropriate and effective protection of genetic resources and traditional knowledge. A failure to make progress could put the whole future of the negotiation on this important topic in jeopardy.
3. We recommend that QUNO continue to follow-up with the Geneva-based trade missions and the TRIPS Council Secretariat with the aim of getting a resolution adopted by the TRIPS Council to look at small-scale farmer innovation and IP.
4. The concept of Farmers' Rights has much to do with the right to farmers to innovate and the right of farmers to have access to relevant innovations made by others. Thus the realization of Farmers' Rights, in many circumstances, can be promoted through measures that support and reward innovation by and for small-scale farmers. While other factors are also important, such as the right to participate in decision-making, a good entry point for any further work by QUNO on innovation could be through the on-going discussions about Farmers' Rights.
5. In order to help define the full range of possible elements, and the circumstances in which they might be effective in contributing to the realizations of Farmers' Rights, QUNO could consider convening and supporting an international expert working group. Such elements might include, but not be restricted to:
 - Extending some form of IP protection to farmers' innovation (although it is our view that this is likely to be the least beneficial/important element of farmers' rights in LDCs).
 - Security of land tenure
 - Ready and equitable access to inputs (including credit).
 - Support for *in-situ* conservation and on-farm management/improvement of germplasm, including through participatory plant breeding
 - Market based elements: Geographical Indications (GIs) and Trademarks for SSF innovations.
 - Access to genetic diversity, e.g., through linkages with community genebanks and the national genebank
 - Using GIS and mapping technologies together with social media platforms to build databases of agro-biodiversity and farmer innovations – which are pre-requisites for any applicable and appropriate, recognition, protection or compensation measures or payment for eco-system services (including climate change mitigation).
 - Examining the options for co-evolution and co-existence of formal and informal seed systems in LDCs. i.e. articulating and clarifying the role of the public sector and National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) in supporting small-scale farmer innovation
6. Based on a set of identified elements such as these, QUNO could consider convening a national dialogue in one or more receptive LDCs along with other partners such as the International Treaty Secretariat, the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and Bioversity International, in an attempt to see how the concept of Farmers' Rights could be operationalised in specific contexts. The national dialogues should aim to identify which elements are appropriate and in what circumstances, and how their introduction (individually or as a package) could be supported by governments and civil society organisations. The national dialogues

could also assess institutional capacity for implementing Farmers' Rights and the investments requires in capacity building.¹

7. The dialogues should include strong participation by the full range of farmers (including small, medium and large and from different parts of the country) – as well as organizations that purport to represent them - with the ancillary aim of learning valuable lessons on how to secure the input of highly diverse farmer groups in decision-making at the National level. Farmers' organizations, producer cooperatives, grower associations and the like often have very different perspectives and agendas from rural based NGOs.
8. After gaining experience and feedback at the national level, we believe it would be helpful to convene regional meetings to look at issues across neighbouring countries. This could include not only looking at common issues related to Farmers; Rights, but also exploring how best to get effective representation of the full range of farmer perspectives in regional fora. Ultimately a global consultation could be convened that could include not only government officials and experts, but also farmer representation, determined based on earlier experience gained at the national and regional levels.
9. Another priority area in promoting innovation, and one that is closely related to the realization of Farmers Rights, is the issue of access by small-scale farmers to PGRFA. Although access by farmers to PGRFA held in international genebanks under the Multilateral System is enshrined in the International Treaty, in practice access can be effectively provided only by community genebanks working closely with and through national genebanks. This requires the strengthening these institutions as well as the linkages and flows of plant genetic resources between them and with the international genebanks. A clear demarcation of the roles and responsibilities of community genebanks (and other local germplasm conservation and management systems), national genebanks and international genebanks is required, creating a model for a truly global genebank system. The international system as currently defined relates almost entirely to the maintenance and distribution of germplasm held in international collections. A truly global system, however, can perhaps best be developed from the starting point of providing guaranteed access by farmers – and especially small-scale farmers – to PGRFA held globally. The role of national genebanks is critical in a) linking to international collections (e.g., as a conduit for germplasm flows) and b) for fostering and supporting conservation and management/improvement efforts at the local level. We recommend that QUNO consider initiating a dialogue focussing on these issues, together with partners such as Bioversity International, the Global Crop Diversity Trust, IT secretariat and others including representatives of national and community genebanks. It might be particularly apposite for an initial dialogue on the topic to be held in conjunction with a significant developing country national genebank.
10. In the longer term we can see very considerable value in QUNO working towards the creation of an 'innovation policy tool' analogous to the tool currently being developed in the area of trade policy. Such a tool would underpin and promote a better

¹ We recognize that recommendations 6, 7 and to some extent 8 fall outside QUNO's mandate and normal scope of work. Nevertheless, we feel this is an extremely important area and one to which QUNO could make a very valuable contribution. We feel that ultimately work at the national and regional levels is necessary for progress to be made at the international level, both on the issue Farmers' Rights and on establishing mechanisms for strengthening small-scale farmer representation. However, we also recognize that in order to make a useful contribution, additional resources will be required and that it is probably more appropriate for QUNO to take a back-seat role rather than one of up-front leadership.

understanding of the relationship between innovation by and for small-scale farmers and areas such as access to genetic diversity, access to seed; the ready availability of inputs – including credit; access to information; participation in decision-making at the local, national and international levels; education and training; market opportunities; land tenure rights etc. Such a tool could lay out these and other elements involved in innovation and look at the interactions between them and the relationship with international policy tools.

7.2 Recommendations – Trade

1. We recommend that QUNO's future work on trade continue to focus on mainstreaming food security concerns in international trade negotiations and providing a voice for small farmers and vulnerable groups in LDCs in these negotiations.
2. As discussed earlier in the report, the FS-TPA tool developed by the project can serve as a valuable resource for all stakeholders in international trade negotiations including policy makers and trade negotiators. To sustain the benefits from this tool over time, it is important to maintain and update it and increase its coverage and functionality. Our recommendations for the further development of the FS-TPA tool include;
 - a. It would be useful to add an additional (deeper) level of information and analyses that could address questions likely to be of immediate relevance to policy makers and trade negotiators (e.g., how specific forms of input subsidies, concessional credit, price support mechanisms or public stockholding and distribution systems in particular contexts would relate to the provisions of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture).
 - b. Links to analyses of specific issues from authentic sources such as the WTO and FAO are already provided in the FS-TPA tool. The links to more detailed analyses may need to be expanded. It would be very useful for trade negotiators to have links to case law (from cases dealt with by the dispute settlement mechanism of the WTO) and to case studies of how LDCs have creatively utilised the policy space for food security within the framework of existing international trade rules.
 - c. It is also extremely important to institute a mechanism for periodic updating of the tool and the information that it provides. The FS-TPA tool should have the capability to reflect the introduction of new elements and changes in international trade agreements in the ongoing/future rounds of negotiations. The usefulness of the tool as a resource for stakeholders relies principally on being up to date.
 - d. While the information and analyses provided by the tool is underpinned by a body of rigorous research, we would recommend that the roll out and development of the tool is overseen by a consultative body of academic and legal experts and trade specialists to ensure the quality, credibility and relevance of the analyses and interpretations provided.
 - e. The incorporation of information on Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) and their impacts on food security measures is an important priority for further development of the tool. The focus of this work should be on the impact of RTAs on the policy space for food security measures and supporting small

farmers in LDCs and how they may differ from the impacts of the WTO trade rules.

3. The maintenance and development of the FS-TPA tool requires substantial funding support. We would recommend that financial support for development of the FS-TPA tool should be an important priority for the SDC or other donors for the achievement of the overall objectives of the project. The development of the tool may require QUNO bringing in a collaborative institutional partner (e.g., such as a UN agency, reputed University or research institution or the like) that can manage the tool and support its development over the longer term.

7.3 Recommendations – General

In addition to the recommendations in sections 7.1 and 7.2 above, we would like to make the following general recommendations:

1. The project – and indeed much of QUNO’s work, ultimately aims to help improve food security in LDCs, focussing particularly on the role of small-scale farmers. Given the increasing recognition that adequate quantities of food *per se* do not guarantee freedom from malnutrition, it might be useful in future work to incorporate more overtly the concept of nutritional security, i.e. access by all to sufficient food of adequate nutritional quality.
2. Annex 4 lists a number of publications that are under preparation. We have seen drafts of several and, convinced of their usefulness, we would urge QUNO to complete and publish them even if this proves not to be possible within the project time-frame.
3. We suggest QUNO consider introducing a system for monitoring downloads of documents from the web. Simple monitoring systems are not expensive and allow for monitoring both the number of downloads and the countries from which they are requested. Such monitoring, at a minimum, would enable QUNO to track how popular a particular document is and where in the world there is most interest in particular topics.
4. In order to facilitate searches for project documents on the website, we suggest a greater use of tags, particularly given the fact that inter-relationships among different factors are not always intuitive.
5. Several interviewees suggested that QUNO might usefully consider focussing more of its work at the regional and national level, for example, through looking in more detail at regional trade agreements and the national implementation of Farmers’ Rights. We concur. While recognizing that QUNO’s charter obliges it to focus on international issues under discussion within UN and related agencies, building up expertise and experience from the bottom up, i.e. from the national and regional level, makes a lot of sense and would, in many cases, complement and help to reinforce the ‘global’ approach. For QUNO to make a significant contribution, however, adequate funding should be assured and appropriate partner institutions engaged.
6. In addition to looking at the details of specific innovation and trade policies and how they impact on food security and the livelihoods of small-scale farmers, it might be interesting and useful for QUNO to promote work to look more closely at the ways in which countries determine such policies at the national level and how they establish their international negotiating positions. What consultation processes are involved and how inclusive are they of the full range of viewpoints within a country? How broad

is the internal consultation process within and across ministries? Are other stakeholders included in the process – if so which and how? What is the role of the media? (e.g. to what extent does it have a direct influence on policymakers vs. an indirect influence on political constituencies?). Which facets of the media (e.g. traditional vs. social) are most influential? What depth of expertise is there on any given topic and to what extent are national positions essentially determined by just a small handful of individuals? How important is ‘peer pressure’ from neighbouring countries in determining national negotiating positions? etc. The answers to questions such as these could be important when considering how to most effectively influence policymaking in the interests of certain disadvantaged groups. While, we fully recognize that addressing such issues is outside QUNO’s mandate and institutional capacity, nevertheless we feel the potential impact that such a heightened understanding could have on QUNO’s work at the international level justifies the spending of some effort to promote such studies by others.

7. The meeting due to be held in November, 2016 on the role of the public sector in support of small-scale farmer innovation, is expected to give rise to some important ideas and suggestions for follow-up. We see this as a very significant area and one that is of particular concern in an era when governments around the world are cutting costs and reducing the services they provide. Well targeted public support for certain key activities could have a major positive impact on small-scale farmers and on national nutritional security. We feel it will be important for QUNO to assess the extent, nature and priority given to any further involvement in this area following the November meeting.

8. Conclusions

In conclusion we consider the project has made very commendable progress towards achieving its ambitious outcomes. There appears to be a more widespread appreciation of the issues concerned among LDC negotiators, not least because of the various consultations and side events conducted by the project, coupled with some excellent policy briefs. The work and publications underpinning these briefs is solid and widely appreciated among the professional community.

The project, as originally conceived, was to have run for a second phase. Unfortunately, the resources needed for this now appear unlikely to be forthcoming. As a result, it will not now be possible to build further on the progress to date unless additional resources can be secured. The work on innovation, e.g. through developing a tool that is analogous to the policy tool – especially in the context of Farmer’ Rights; the design of better ways by which small-scale farmers can be represented in international fora; the design of a truly global genebank system that serves the needs of small-scale farmers; and the continued development of the policy tool, all justify further support. The potential for a significant impact in all three areas is very considerable.

Finally, we would like to thank QUNO for inviting us to review this extremely worthwhile project and we take this opportunity to wish QUNO success in finding the resources to take this important work forward.

9. Annexes

Annex 1. Reviewers' *Curriculum Vitae*

Dr. Geoffrey Hawtin is an Advisor and until August 2005 was the Executive Secretary, of the Global Crop Diversity Trust, an international foundation that he helped create to finance the conservation of the biodiversity of crops worldwide. He is also a Technical Advisor for the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) in Colombia, and a member of the Darwin Initiative Expert Committee, UK. From January 2008 to April 2009 he was Director General of CIAT. From 1991 until 2003 he was Director General of the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI, now Bioversity International), a research centre of the CGIAR headquartered in Rome, Italy. He has also worked for the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) based in Syria and the Canadian Government's International Development Research Centre in Vancouver and Ottawa. He has served on the Board of Trustees of the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew and chaired the Board of Directors of the Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE) in Costa Rica. Dr Hawtin obtained both his first degree and Ph.D. from Cambridge University, U.K., carrying out his doctoral thesis research at Makerere University, Uganda. He has published more than 100 scientific and technical publications, has been awarded the Frank N Meyer Medal by the Crop Science Society of America and has been elected Correspondent Étranger of the Académie d'Agriculture de France. He has Canadian and British nationality and currently resides in UK.

Dr C.S.Srinivasan is Associate Professor of Agricultural and Development Economics in the School of Agriculture, Policy and Development at the University of Reading in the UK. He has an MSc from the London School of Economics and a PhD in Agricultural Economics from the University of Reading. His main research interests are in the economic impacts of intellectual property rights in agriculture in the context of developing countries, the economics of agricultural biotechnology innovations, genetic resource policies and food and nutrition transitions in developed and developing countries. Dr Srinivasan's PhD thesis examined the potential impacts of plant variety protection in India. He has published over 50 publications in his areas of research interest. Prior to joining academia, Dr Srinivasan was a senior civil servant in India with extensive experience in the implementation of agricultural and rural development programmes and agricultural policy formulation at the state and national levels. He has contributed to a number of studies undertaken by the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture for enhancing benefit-sharing flows under the Multilateral System. He has also undertaken programme evaluation for the Genetic Resource Policy Initiative of Bioversity International. He resides in UK.

Annex 2: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for Final Review of SDC Project

Objectives:

- 1) To assess the project in terms of effectiveness, sustainability and relevance to the needs and interests of project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries;
- 2) To provide an independent input on priority areas for in future projects by QUNO and/or others.

Evaluation guiding questions:

Objective 1:

Project effectiveness shall be assessed in relation to the project's outcomes and expected outputs, measured by the indicators proposed in the log-frame:

- To what extent has the project contributed to the overall goal? What factors have influenced the project's capacity to have an impact, in line with this overall goal?
- To what extent has the project achieved the expected outcomes and expected outputs? What are the underlying internal and external factors for that contributed to the achievement of the expected outcomes and outputs?

Project sustainability shall be assessed in terms of the likelihood that results achieved will have a lasting effect after the completion of the project:

- Under what conditions will the project activities have long-term effect?

Project relevance shall be assessed by comparing project activities with the needs and interests of project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries:

- To what extent do project outcomes and outputs reflect the needs and interests of project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries?
- To what extent do project activities complement and support the efforts of partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries?

Objective 2:

- What are the possibilities and limitations of the overall goal and expected outcomes?
- What future developments would best contribute to the overall goal of the project, if the overall goal is adequate?
- Where is development potential, and where is further development meaningful?
- Which project areas should be given priority?
- Which internal and external factors, risks and opportunities need to be considered carefully?
- Are there additional partners that could make a substantial contribution?
- Is any adjustment in the project governance needed?

Scope:

The evaluation will take place over the course of two weeks in September 2016. All work undertaken by the QUNO Food & Sustainability Programme under the project titled “Food Security in Trade and Intellectual Property Regimes – Towards Equity and Sustainability” from the time of the mid-term review until the present will be reviewed to the end that the evaluation questions may be answered.

Background and rationale:

A mid-term evaluation was conducted in September 2014 by Dr. Geoff Hawtin and Dr. Hartwig de Haen. The evaluators reviewed documentation and conducted interviews with QUNO staff, (hereinafter referred to as “the project management team”), partners and stakeholders.

Evaluators assessed the project’s overall direction and priorities, its scope and relative weights of its components. The log frame was revised to reflect the recommendations made by reviewers, in consultation with the SDC Operations Committee.

A final review will be conducted in September 2016 for the purposes of evaluating the project in accordance with the revised log frame, accountability, institutional learning and providing guidance on priorities for future work

Process Overview:

Dr. Geoff Hawtin and Dr. Chittur Srinivasan will conduct the final evaluation. It will be undertaken through review of documentation including the project proposal, reports to SDC, products produced, records of meetings/workshops/panels organized and other relevant material and through interviews with the project management team, partners and stakeholders.

The project management team will create a Dropbox with relevant documentation and will supply a list of potential interviewees identifying their role and relevance to the project. The evaluators may use this list to select people to interview and also choose to consult with others as appropriate.

The evaluators may propose additional or alternative methods for meeting the stated objectives and answering the evaluation questions.

Methodology:

The project will be evaluated according to recognized standards and carried out by external experts. The validity of recommendations and robustness of conclusions will be ensured by the experience, impartiality, independence and methodological skills of the reviewers.

Impact on policy is inherently problematic to measure both because of the long time frame often involved and because of the difficulty of drawing a precise link between cause and effect. In addition, because much of QUNO’s work is done through “quiet diplomacy”, progress on an issue may not be recognized or attributed to QUNO. The participatory approach of interviewing and talking with partners and those served should help in providing a sense of impact.

Overview of Time-line:

- Step 1: Start-up and document analysis (Dropbox to be created August 2016; selection of interviewees with evaluators and project management team by mid-August)
- Step 2: Interviews with QUNO staff, partners and stakeholders (September 12-16, 2016 in Switzerland)
- Step 3: Evaluation results and report (to be finalized and sent to SDC before end of September 2016)

Step 1: Start-up, Document Analysis and selection of interviewees

Objectives

- 1) Ensure a sound understanding of the overall situation of the project and its objectives;
- 2) Agree in close co-operation with the project management team to the terms of reference (ToR) for the final evaluation.

Implementation

A. Document Analysis

Review of the key documents related to the project (proposal, donor reports, statements and outputs, documents related to meetings and conferences etc.) in order to achieve a reliable overview of the project objectives, implementation and outputs and the information to guide priorities for potential work.

B. Working session with the project management team by phone

Discussion and validation of the list of interviewees. The selection of interviewees will be made according to the relevance of the partners in relation to the project and their knowledge of it. Based on selection, the project management team will set up in person and by phone interviews for week of September 12-16, 2016. Interviews will include colleagues identified by SDC at the Swiss Federal Office for Agriculture, the Swiss IP office and the Permanent Representation of Switzerland in Geneva.

Step 2: Interviews with project management team, partners and stakeholders

Objectives

Discussion with the project management team of the main findings based on the document analysis. Obtain a sample of views issued by close partners and stakeholders of the project, in order to complement the document analysis.

Implementation

Implementation of the interviews based on the working session with the project management team in Step 1 above. Interviews from the Swiss Federal Administration

(Berne and Geneva) need to be carefully prepared together with the QUNO project manager and the SDC Programme Officer in charge.

Step 3: Evaluation results and report

Objectives

- 1) Prepare a final report fitting to the ToRs and to the clients' (QUNO and SDC) expectations.
- 2) Answer evaluation questions.

Implementation

A. Draft final report

Design of a draft final report conform to the ToRs.

B. Detailed discussion of the draft report with the project management team

Detailed discussion of the draft report with the project management team, in order to verify whether the findings and conclusions are being well understood and shared by QUNO as well as on the finalizing conclusions and recommendations.

C. Final report

Finalisation of the report based on the discussion with QUNO and transmission of the report to SDC. The report should provide answers to the questions of the ToRs and should include a final section on priority areas for possible follow up work. The report should not exceed 20 pages, plus Annexes.

D. Completion of the final review

The SDC Global Programme on Food Security will provide a written statement ("management response") to the conclusions and recommendations included in the report.

Annex 3: Persons consulted for the Final Review – September 12-16, 2016

Last Name	First Name	Title	Organization
Argumedo	Alejandro	Executive Director	Asociación ANDES
Bieler	Peter	Head Global Programme Food Security	SDC
Blank	Christina	Global Programme on Food Security	SDC
Bunyi	Jerome	Agricultural Attaché to the Phillipine Permanent Mission to WTO	Philippine Mission to WTO
Clapp	Jennifer	Professor	University of Waterloo
De La Cruz	Jane	Treaty Technical Officer	FAO ITPGRFA
Dutfield	Graham	Professor of International Governance	University of Leeds
Flury	Manuel	Co-Head Global Programme Food Security	SDC
Getahun	Minelik	Assistant Director Global Issues	WIPO
Girsberger	Martin	Head Sustainable Development and International Cooperation	Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property
Huerta	Yolanda	Legal Counsel	UPOV
Ismail	Suzanne	Economic and Human Security Issues	QPSW
Koohafkan	Parviz	Founder and President	World Agricultural Heritage Foundation
Lopez Noriega	Isabel	Legal Specialist on Policies for Crop and Tree Diversity Management	Biodiversity International
Mazzei	Isabel		Permanent Mission Bolivia to the WTO
Rosales	Fernando	First Secretary	Permanent Mission Bolivia to the WTO
Wendland	8Wend	Director of Traditional Knowledge Division	WIPO
Zografos Johnsson	Daphne	Legal Officer Traditional Knowledge Division	WIPO

Annex 4: Project Publications and Reports

Title of Publication	Date of Publication	Link to Publication
TRIPS-Related Patent Flexibilities and Food Security (E*, F*, S*)	September 2012	http://www.quno.org/resource/2012/9/trips-related-patent-flexibilities-and-food-security-options-developing-countries
Agricultural Innovation for the 21st Century: Matching the Intellectual Property Framework with Farmers' Needs	September 2012	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/timeline/files/2013/WTO%20Public%20Forum%202012%20QUNO-IIED%20panel%20report%20HD.pdf
Briefing Paper: Small-scale farmers: The Missing Element in the WIPO-IGC Draft Articles on Genetic Resources	July 2013	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/QUNO%20Genetic%20resources%20Farmers%20Food%202013.pdf
New Framework for Trade and Investment in Agriculture - Draft Mapping of Alternative Proposals	August 2013	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/NFTIA%20draft%20mapping%20of%20alternative%20proposals.pdf
Briefing Paper: Definition of Breeder Under UPOV	October 2013	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/Briefing%20Paper%20Definition%20of%20Breeder.pdf
New Framework for Trade and Investment in Agriculture - QUNO's Vision	November 2013	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/NFTIA%20Vision%20Statement.pdf
Developing country sui generis options for plant variety protection - India	January 2014	http://www.quno.org/resource/2014/1/developing-country-sui-generis-options-plant-variety-protection
Developing country sui generis options for plant variety protection -Thailand	January 2014	http://www.quno.org/resource/2014/1/developing-country-sui-generis-options-plant-variety-protection
Informal Report of 2nd NFTIA Consultation	May 2014	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/Informal%20Report%20of%202nd%20NFTIA%20Consultation.pdf
Trade Liberalization and Food Security: Examining the Linkages (E, F, S, C*)	December 2014	http://www.quno.org/resource/2014/12/trade-liberalization-and-food-security-examining-linkages
Informal Report and Understandings Emerging from the Second Expert Consultation on QUNO's New Framework for Trade and Investment in Agriculture (NFTIA), 22-23 May 2014	December 2014	http://quno.org/resource/2014/12/informal-report-and-understandings-emerging-second-expert-consultation-qunos-new
FWCC Oral Statement on the Role of Small Scale Farmer and the Right to Food in the Era of Climate Change	March 2015	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/FWCC%20Oral%20Statement%20on%20the%20role%20of%20Small%20Scale%20Farmers%20and%20the%20Right%20to%20Food%20in%20the%20era%20of%20Climate%20Change.pdf
The Relationship Between Key Food Security Measures and Trade Rules	April 2015	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/timeline/files/2016/Navigating%20the%20relationship%20between%20trade%20rules%20and%20food%20security%20measures.pdf
The Relationship between Key Food Security Measures and Trade Rules	April 2015	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/Navigating%20the%20relationship%20between%20trade%20rules%20and%20food%20security%20measures.pdf
Realizing the right to food in an era of climate change: The importance of small-scale farmers (E, F, S, C)	August 2015	http://www.quno.org/resource/2015/8/realizing-right-food-era-climate-change

Small-scale Farmer Innovation Systems: Report on the First Expert Consultation 26-27 May 2015 in Geneva	August 2015	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/timeline/files/2016/SSF%20innovation%20consultation%20report.pdf
Small-scale farmer innovation systems: A review of the literature	November 2015	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/SSF%20Innovation%20Systems%20-%20Literature%20Review.pdf
Policy Brief: The relationship between food security policy measures and WTO trade rules (E, F, S, C)	December 2015	http://www.quno.org/resource/2015/12/relationship-between-food-security-policy-measures-and-wto-trade-rules
Project Brief: An Interactive Trade Policy Tool	December 2015	http://www.quno.org/resource/2015/12/project-brief-interactive-trade-policy-tool
Access to Seeds: Lessons From the Access to Medicines Debate	April 2016	http://www.quno.org/sites/default/files/resources/Access%20to%20seeds%20-%20lessons%20from%20the%20access%20to%20medicines%20debate_0.pdf
Policy brief: The relationship between intellectual property rights and small-scale farmer innovation (E, F, S, C)	June 2016	http://www.quno.org/resource/2016/6/policy-brief-relationship-between-intellectual-property-rights-and-small-scale
Forthcoming 2016 for publication or posting on website		
Towards a resilience approach to Farmers' Rights		
Policy Brief: Revitalizing the public sector to achieve food security		
Policy brief: Are Small-Scale Farmers at the Table? A reflection on small-scale farmers' participation within international fora		
Uniting under the Sustainable Development Goals to achieve food security		
The Foundation of Food Security: the need for predictable and consistent support for small scale farmers		

*E= English F=French S=Spanish C=Chinese

Annex 5: Project Logframe and Activities

Outcomes	Outputs	Activities	Activities carried out	
1. Factors influencing small-scale farmer livelihoods and innovation, as well as IP and other innovation-promoting options, are better understood and have influenced national policies and negotiating positions in international IP, trade and investment fora.	1. A strong body of credible knowledge on more flexible IP options is available to delegates and others, and used by them	Series of informal lunches at Quaker House, some of which will focus on a presentation by an invited speaker	Lunches with Secretariats WIPO X4 (delegates weren't here because IGC was on hiatus); Workshop dinner on Farmers Rights in Geneva on May 28, 2016.	
		Commissioning, writing or compiling at least 5 publications during Phase I.	Realizing the right to food in an era of climate change, Research paper on the relationship between intellectual property rights and small-scale farmer innovation; Research paper on access to seeds: Lessons from the access to medicines debate; Literature review on SSF innovation systems; Policy brief on SSF innovation systems, Small-scale Farmer Innovation Systems: Report on the First Expert Consultation 26-27 May 2015 Chateau de Bossey, Switzerland; Briefing papers: Developing country sui generis options for plant variety protection (India, Thailand); Small-scale Farmers: The missing element in the WIPO-IGC Draft Articles on Genetic Resources.	
	2. A strong body of credible knowledge on factors influencing small-scale farmer livelihoods and innovations collected and developed.	Identifying key issues of concern on which information is lacking		Role of the public sector in supporting SSF innovation; best practices and challenges with the implementation of Farmers' Rights; relationship between SSF and IP; lack of cohesion / collaboration amongst Secretariats; farmers' participation in multilateral processes; links between resilience and Article 9 on Farmers' Rights.
		Producing literature review and background paper(s) on drivers, facts, pressures and challenges related to small-scale farmer innovation.		Literature review on SSF innovation systems; Policy brief on SSF innovation systems, Small-scale Farmer Innovation Systems: Report on the First Expert Consultation 26-27 May 2015 Chateau de Bossey, Switzerland.
		Regular informal meetings with key thinkers in this area from academia, governmental and non-governmental organizations (including those representing small-scale farmers).		Meetings with key thinkers: Wend Wendland, Minalek, Daphne Johnsson; Derek Eaton; Chidi Oguamanam, Biswajit Dhar, Paul, Andrew Mushita, Graham Duffield, Lori Anthrup, Jorge Larson Guerra, Jerome Bunyi, Fernando Rosales, Isabel Mazzei, Tony Taubman, Peter Button, Yolanda Huertes, June Sekera, Isabel Noriega (Bioversity), Shakeel Bhatti, Tobias Keen, Mary-Jane de la Cruz, Valerie Normand, Michael Clark (governance at FAO), Cary Fowler, Pablo Eyzaguirre, Susan Matthews (OHCHR), Manuel Ruiz, see also below on network establishment (Jan 2015). Meetings with NGOs: South Centre, ICTSD, USC Canada, ETC Group, ANDES, Andrew's group,

			SPDA, Prolinnova.
		Holding a series of workshops and consultations to inform development of the interactive policy decision tool (hereafter “the policy tool”).	Consultations held in 2014/2015 (changed directions -- dialogue series in lieu of tool; we co-produce knowledge, so we decide together what the output is, tool wasn't appropriate, premature)
		Development of the policy tool.	Developing workshop, project design and dialogue series instead (Nov 2016)
	3. Interface between innovation policies and flexible IP options within current agreements is actively identified and implications for small-scale farmers explored.	Regular informal meetings between QUNO staff and delegates to ensure that QUNO is abreast of delegates' evolving needs.	Susan and Patrick met with a series of permanent representatives, trade delegations to discuss the possibility of submitting a proposal on SSF innovation (ongoing) -- met with Secretariats first, now meeting with delegates. During IGC connecting with delegates. Bolivia and India on IP. Reached out to Philippines and Ecuador (Monica Martinez) (This is where we are moving next)
		Producing background paper on interface between intellectual property and other policies and factors influencing small-scale farmer innovation.	Research paper on the relationship between intellectual property rights and small-scale farmer innovation published June 2016
		Incorporating findings from above activity into policy tool.	Input into work program moving forward (dialogue series on the role of the public sector and project design/tool development stemming from November consultation)

		Establishment of an informal network or roster of experts (hereafter “the informal network”) who can provide input and advice into development of background papers and tools.	At CGRFA contact made with Andrew Mushita, Alejandro Argumendo to secure their participation of our innovation work. Also went to side event on biocultural innovation and have contact for Yiching Song, Centre for Chinese Agricultural Policy. Continue contact and work with Manuel Ruiz, David Vivas and Isabel Noreiga. Ongoing, CGRFA 01/2015 Also met with Kostas Stamoulis, Gerda Verberg, Shakeel Bhatti as well as several Bioversity Staff (M. Halewood, Devra Jarvis, Toby Hodgkin.) Graham Dutfield commented on/contributed to paper draft. Susan Walsh and Faris Ahmed (USC) and Pat Mooney (ETC Group) are collaborators with expertise in agrobiodiversity, informal seed networks and private/public sector issues (corporate consolidation in particular). Brewster Grace (access to medicines), [everyone from innovation consultation]
	4. Based on Outputs 1-3, awareness and sustained interest in supporting the innovative activities of small-scale farmers through IP or other measures is built among LDCs and other governmental delegations in Geneva, as well as relevant policy-makers and policy-influencers in Rome and elsewhere.	Holding 4 workshops, seminars and/or outreach events in Geneva and Rome with delegates and policy-makers on development and use of the policy tool as a means to support innovative activities of small-scale farmers	Global Donor Platform, UPOV side event and lunch, WIPO IGC seminars, Farmers' Rights pre-consultation dinner, side events hosted WIPO IGC about how they are including SSF in IP
		Organizing dialogues and meetings between government officials, QUNO staff and the informal network.	Innovation consultation, Farmers' Rights consultation, WIPO IGC side event, November consultation, UPOV side event.
		Developing and maintaining contacts with delegates and others to ensure that QUNO remains aware and up-to-date of key staff and institutional changes, as well as the needs of delegates, particularly those from LDCs and civil society representing small-scale farmers and other public interest concerns.	As above
		Development and maintenance of a database of key contacts of Geneva- and Rome-based delegates, counterparts in capitals, as well as other policy-makers and decision-influencers (including from the private sector), farmers' groups, public	CGRFA provided more contacts for database. Ongoing collection of contacts in database.

		research institutions, NGOs, staff of national and international organizations, and others.	
	5. Availability of an effective system for the dissemination and further discussion of information relating to outputs 1 and 3	Translating QUNO publications into selected UN languages	Policy brief: SSF innovation systems; Policy Brief: The relationship between food security policy measures and WTO trade rules (French, Spanish, Chinese)
		Participating in side events and panels	Presented at two WIPO IGC seminars; hosted UPOV lunch/side event; host CFS 41 Side Event; co-host CFS 42 side event; active participant at numerous side events; ITPGRFA/QUNO workshop on Farmers' Rights, including IP aspects.
		Holding meetings and workshops (as per activities for Output 3 and 4)	See above
		Disseminating QUNO publications at relevant events	Distributed QUNO publications at UNFCCC negotiations; meetings of CFS; Governing Body of ITPGRFA; negotiating sessions of WIPO IGC; WTO Public Forums; hosted table at CFS marketplace
		Developing means of tracking website use relating to outputs 1-3.	Role of communications person.
2. Negotiations on food security-relevant topics in IP, trade and investment fora involve the more effective participation of small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other	6. A body of knowledge developed on ways and means for ensuring the full range of interests of small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other vulnerable groups are accurately represented in international negotiating fora.	Identifying the gaps in available information and information-distribution channels preventing participation of small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other vulnerable groups in discussions about international IP, trade and investment policy.	Attended WG on a Declaration for the Rights of Peasants and Rural Workers, February 2015. Study undertaken comparing participation of small-scale farmers and civil society (representing the interests of small-scale farmers) and access to information among international fora relating to PGRFA.
		Incorporating findings from above activity into publications, so that participation is often a component of these outputs.	Policy brief on farmer participation in decision-making in PGRFA (draft form)
		Ensuring participation of small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other vulnerable groups in development of	Raised issue of participation within intergovernmental fora, all of our publications, contributions to NA CSM (for CFS) emphasizes lack of participation; consultation includes representatives from SSF organizations, work with ProInnova

vulnerable groups.		policy tools.	to ensure that people have access to our work on the ground.
		Developing component in each policy tool on participation of small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other vulnerable groups.	Trade policy tool includes content on participation, dialogue series and work plan will of course include representatives.
		Actively raising participation as an important issue in fora organized.	Comments submitted to the CFS outline for HPLE on connecting small-scale farmers to markets. Written submission to North American Regional Conference imploring them to include civil society in their meetings and reflect the values and priorities of SSF in NA. WIPO IGC presentation; SSF participation raised for first time at WIPO based on side event on SSF being a missing link in the IGC negotiations; at request of IGC Secretariat identifying a SSF representative to participate in the Indigenous People's Panel (also a first); and consistently raising issue of lack of this voice in workshops, panels, including written and oral presentations at the Human Rights Council. Moderated FAO online consultation and brought up the issue of participation (did background note on this too)
	7. Awareness raised among country delegations and the Secretariats and Bureaus of international IP, trade and investment fora of the need for broader and more effective participation by small-scale farmers (and/or organizations representing them) and other vulnerable groups.	Organizing working lunches, workshops and consultations to bring together different concerned actors (in particular off-the-record or non-attributed, informal discussions) with a view to enabling actors to listen and actively engage with concerns of groups that might differ from their own.	With the goal of becoming the convening body between IT Secretariat, UPOV, TRIPS, we gained the support of key representatives from each (Wend Wendland, Peter Button, Shakeel Bhatti) and are currently seeking financial support to carry out meetings. Our SSF workshop was also aimed in part at establishing links between SSF in the north and south to build alliances of common interest. We also coordinate our message at WTO with other CSO, where we cover IP issues and interject with different perspective on the role of IP at the side events at the WTO public forum.
		Organizing public events (conferences, seminars, round table discussions) to facilitate sharing of ideas, concerns, and exploration of solutions.	Presentation on the legal instruments related to genetic resources and intellectual property at a WIPO seminar in June 2015; speak at the IGC Seminar on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources before the first negotiating session in February 2016. Lunch side event hosted during UPOV Council.

	8. New links exist between small-scale farmers and organizations that represent them and policy-makers with responsibilities in the relevant area.	Identifying appropriate small-scale farmer organizations and including them in our work.	Farmers' organizations were identified during all three trade consultations. List of 13 farmers' organizations engaged in domestic policy making identified (project proposal for second phase of trade tool), ANDES and CTDI in particular. In innovation, farmers' organizations have been identified for November innovation consultation.
		Holding workshops and consultations including groups identified above and policy-makers.	Farmers' Rights pre-consultation small scale farmer innovation workshop; all trade consultations
		Co-producing knowledge and strategies for dissemination and use, during above-noted meetings and through working relationships created.	Part of CSM NA, discussion of outreach to include more SSF and how to overcome hurdles. Part of SDG 2 indicator working group, raise issue of SSF and agrobiodiversity as important indicators; the meeting report from our consultation on innovation would fit here too wouldn't it? We also produced a statement on TTIP with other Quaker organizations that raise these issues. Part of CSO strategy group (with Biraj, Deborah, TWN, South Centre, ROPA, Our World is not for Sale, others...) to ensure that conversations within WTO Public Forum are broadened, bring up issue of participation of SSF -- we cover IP stuff more, they have expertise with AoA, trade side of things.
3. Actual and potential elements of international trade agreements that affect the food security of vulnerable groups in general and small-scale farmers in particular, are identified and better understood, and have influenced international trade negotiations.	9. Creative and robust potential new elements within trade, investment rules are considered and explored that promote food security and take account of the needs of small-scale farmers and other vulnerable groups.	Organizing a consultation with presentations by key thinkers about alternative trade and investment frameworks, followed by a day's exploratory and strategy session amongst a smaller group of key actors.	Strategy session Jan 2014, Consultations held in 2014/2015. *See prep-work on website (presentations, mapping exercises on creating an alternative framework, but then we decided to move towards creating a tool rather than just an academic exercise)
		Commissioning and compiling analyses of what is not working in the current agriculture trade and investment system, from a food security perspective.	Policy Brief: The relationship between food security policy measures and WTO trade rules published December 2015; all the research commissioned by Kim that makes up the content of the trade tool. Also prep-work on the website (not published, just links)
		Organizing an off-the-record two-day consultation with representatives from academia, farmers' organisations and state trade negotiators, to discuss problems and shortcomings of the current international agriculture trade framework, and to identify areas in which further understanding, research and analysis is needed; followed by a	Consultations held in 2014/2015.

		day of conversation with key thinkers from this consultation to discuss strategy and identify work products.		
		Identifying potential elements that would safeguard food security within trade and investment rules.	60 food security policies identified.	
		Bringing the identified elements to the attention of trade and investment negotiators, policy-makers and policy-influencers, in a way that is user-friendly.	Development of interactive policy tool	
		Hiring web developer to work with team towards establishment of online platform for the policy tool.	Yes.	
	10. New ideas generated from the assessment of the current dominant thinking in trade agreements		During Phase II, organising off-the-record informal meetings with different government actors to explore the possibilities for policy shifts within countries.	Our reaching out to missions for a resolution at TRIPS Council fits here no? Bolivia delegation, India, Phil. (Reached out to Ecuador and South Africa, Brazil). Figuring out what countries we want involved in pilot project, asking which delegates should be involved.
			Developing a work plan for the organisation of seminars in different regions of the world to pilot and continue to develop the policy tool.	Ongoing.

<p>4. Discussions in Geneva, especially in WTO, UNCTAD and HRC, are better informed about the international agricultural investment discussions by Rome-based agencies; space identified for further project work in this area and appropriate plans developed</p>	<p>11. Geneva-based missions briefed on the outcomes of the discussions at the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) regarding responsible investment in agriculture.</p>	<p>Exploring how better to ensure the flow of expertise and information between Rome-based organisations and entities and the trade community in Geneva (Phase I) with a view to implementing strategies to facilitate such flow of expertise and information (Phase II).</p>	<p>When we present at WIPO we are bringing in the perspectives of the ITPGRFA to the table; at CFS we have very actively worked to raise the trade issue including hosting the first side event with trade as the issue, bringing a GVA institution to FAO; that year we worked with different CSOs to get delegations to raise trade as an issue from the floor and from the podium; now it is regularly raised by delegations and CSOs. We moderated an FAO online forum on the relationship between trade and food security, again bringing what historically been a Geneva issue and a Rome issue together. QUNO drafted the background note and questions for the forum with input and advice from a network of advisors. Our writing distributed at these bodies is consistently highlighting both the linkages but the larger issues that unite them and how that argues for not only more coherence but a shift in attitudes and narrative.</p>
		<p>Organising a panel discussion in Geneva on the relationship between the normative principles governing agricultural trade and investment, hosted with Geneva and Rome-based agencies, inviting relevant delegates and Geneva-based NGOs.</p>	
	<p>12. By mid-2015, a decision made regarding the need and opportunity for further project work on agricultural investment, and, assuming such a need is identified, appropriate plans developed.</p>	<p>Meeting with Secretariats and Bureau members, non-governmental organisations and institutions to keep abreast of developments and get advice on QUNO's comparative advantage in this area.</p>	<p>Ongoing, we meet regularly with the IGC, UPOV and IT Secretariats.</p>
		<p>Producing plan on QUNO's programme of work on agricultural investment.</p>	<p>Participating in working groups.</p>

Annex 6: Verification of Achievements

The following information relating to the achievements of the project was compiled by Chelsea Smith of QUNO.

Means of Verification

Outcome 1 – Small-scale farmer innovation is better understood and reflected in negotiating positions in IP and trade fora.

- Requests for QUNO input
 - Request to participate in WIPO Seminars on IP and GR
 - Request to provide advice and perspective on how instruments developed by WIPO IGC will fit into existing international architecture of GR governance
 - Request to comment on HLPE report on sustainable livestock
 - Request to draft letter on behalf of CSM North America on civil society participation
- Literature available
 - Google search of ‘small scale farmer innovation’ yields entire page of publications and news updates about side-events hosted by QUNO ²
 - FAO publication on The State of Food and Agriculture 2014: Innovation in family farming
- Side events at Rome-based agencies
 - QUNO contributed behind-the-scenes to three events at CFS 42 hosted by CSM, ensuring that the role of small-scale farmers was a central theme in each.
 - Side event at CFS 43 will be co-hosted by SDC and QUNO on the topic of finding complementarity among different strategies for achieving food security, with a focus on small-scale farmers.
- References to **IP and innovation** made in statements issued by Rome-based agencies
 - From the FAO statements archive:
 - Intellectual property mentioned for the first time in 2016
 - Innovation mentioned for the first time in 2013; 6 times so far in 2016
 - FAO pronounced 2014 the Year of Family Farming; special event held on Innovation in Family Farming on World Food Day.
 - Innovation emphasized throughout Final Report for CFS 41.
 - IFAD new strategy framework emphasizes innovation, investing in rural people and enabling inclusive and sustainable transformation of rural areas, notably through smallholder agriculture-led growth.
 - The IT Secretariat invited submissions on experience and implementation of Farmers’ Rights, according to the request made by the Governing Body through resolutions 6/2011 and 8/2013; and submissions of information on interrelations with UPOV and WIPO.³ The majority of submissions discuss IP and/or innovation.

² <https://www.google.ch/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=small%20scale%20farmer%20innovation>

³ Call for and list of submissions available at: <http://www.fao.org/plant-treaty/areas-of-work/farmers-rights/farmers-rights-submissions/en/?q=content/farmers-rights-submissions>

- Collaboration between WIPO and FAO to create Alternative Dispute Resolution for IT SMTA.
- Collaboration between WIPO and FAO to interpret Article 6 of the IT (“in the form received”).⁴
- Civil society statement made at Governing Body

Outcome 2 – Participation in relevant fora

- Greater participation of SSF in relevant meetings
 - Limitation: There is no funding available for farmers’ direct participation in the WIPO voluntary fund, or any other relevant fora with the exception of the CBD. The CBD has funded mostly indigenous representatives to attend meetings but not specifically SSFs.
 - Over the past five years there has been increasing numbers of civil society representatives at CFS that explicitly represent the interests of small-scale farmers, including QUNO, South Centre, USC Canada, ETC Group and la Via Campesina.
 - WIPO IGC Secretariat, when funds were available, asked QUNO to identify a SSF to attend a three-person panel with two other representatives of indigenous and local communities. This was after the QUNO paper on SSF being a missing element at the IGC and a side event on the same.
- References by others to the diverse range of groups in preparatory meetings and meetings themselves
 - QUNO is part of a WTO Public Forum informal group that means at the Third World Network office to determine who should attend which events and discuss emergent issues. Through this group, QUNO is able to ensure that the importance of small-scale farmer participation is raised at many different events.
 - This September there will be a WTO Public Forum meeting on inclusive trade policy making in LDCs, emphasizing the importance of inter-ministerial coordination and inclusive consultation.
 - QUNO participates in CSM meetings. QUNO provides comments through the CSM (sometimes taking the lead) emphasizing small-scale farmers and agricultural biodiversity conservation.
- A more diverse range of civil society-organized events in WTO, WIPO, UPOV and Rome-based meetings
 - QUNO hosted a WIPO side event that highlighted the lack of SSF participation in relevant fora among all secretariats in 2014.
 - QUNO discussed observership with UPOV and raised issues relevant to SSFs in 2015 at a QUNO hosted luncheon/side event at UPOV meeting where 20+ member states attended.
 - QUNO hosted a side event and contributed to a collaborative joint CSM side event to highlight the trade tool at CFS 41 and 42, respectively.
 - QUNO participated in two WTO Public Forums on SSF and agricultural biodiversity, hosting two side events in addition to attending others as active participants.

⁴ <http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/databases/contracts/texts/smta.html>

- Meetings with state delegations regarding need for greater participation
 - Representatives from delegations of Ghana, India, Nigeria and Indonesia attended Farmers' Rights stakeholder 'pre-consultation' hosted in August, 2016.
 - Meet with delegates from Philippians, Bolivia and Ethiopia on a bilateral basis.
 - Representatives from delegations of Mexico, Philippines and Indonesia attended trade consultation hosted in May, 2014.

Outcome 3 – Elements that affect food security, particularly of small-scale farmers, are better understood within trade fora and have influenced trade negotiations.

- Literature available
 - Google search of 'trade liberalization and food security' or 'food security trade policy' yields paper by Jennifer Clapp, commissioned by QUNO.
 - 3 publications on trade policy and food security on QUNO website
- Delegates to WTO and WIPO refer to research about diverse range of trade options for food security
 - 2014 WTO meeting on public stockholdings and food security.⁵
 - QUNO participates in CSO strategy group to ensure that SSF and agricultural biological diversity are raised at WTO meetings.
 - Tool and research paper has been used by researchers and appreciation expressed by trade delegates including a desire for further development and diffusion.
- References to **food security** in WIPO IGC.
 - Prior to IGC 27 (2014) very few references were made to food at all and an FAO representative was not always present. Food security is still not a primary focus at WIPO, however there is an increasing number of references to using IT's SMTA as certificate of compliance to satisfy disclosure requirements.
 - Qualitative trend:
 - IGC 27: Statement by representative of BIO referenced food security, Delegation of Argentina discussed disclosure requirements consistent with IT. FAO observed.⁶
 - IGC 28: 'Food' was highlighted as an important cross-cutting issue arising across the three areas of work: GRs, TK and TCEs.⁷
 - IGC 29: Representative of CropLife International discussed IP, innovation, climate change and food security. FAO observed.
 - IGC 30: Susan Bragdon and representative from South Centre participated in roundtable on GR, raising issues of food security and SSF. Delegate from Iran made statement about disclosure requirements consistent with IT. Statements

⁵ PREPARATORY COMMITTEE ON TRADE FACILITATION – PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENT, AND POST-BALI WORK meeting minutes available at https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/FE_Search/FE_S_S009-DP.aspx?language=E&CatalogueIdList=129697,120108,120067,95419,30537,14311,44853,59526,68768,85011&CurrentCatalogueIdIndex=0&FullTextHash=371857150

⁶ http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/tk/en/wipo_grtkf_ic_27/wipo_grtkf_ic_27_ref_grtkf_26_8.pdf

⁷ http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/tk/en/wipo_grtkf_ic_29/wipo_grtkf_ic_29_ref_28_11.pdf

made by delegations of Namibia and Bolivia referenced food security. Representatives from FAO and IT Secretariat observed.⁸

- Normative outcomes: Draft articles on TK incorporated food security into its preamble in 2012; no mention in draft articles on GR.⁹
- References to **food security** in trade fora.
 - No clear trend in WTO documents referencing “food security” (8 in 2010; 20 in 2013; 10 in 2016 as of Sept 12).
 - Clear increasing trend in WTO documents referencing “small-scale farmers” or “smallholder farmers” (0 from 2010 to 2012; 20 in 2013; 11 in 2014; 139 in 2015; 347 in 2016 as of Sept 12).
- References to **trade** in Rome-based agencies.
 - CFS 40: In 2013, the Committee agreed to hold a high level forum on connecting smallholders to markets in 2015. The CSM has been actively engaged with this process since.¹⁰
 - CFS 41: In 2014, QUNO hosted the first side event on trade. That same year, three member states (one from the podium and two from the floor) raised trade as a food security issue. The Final Report discusses the linkages between sustainable fisheries, food security and trade.¹¹
 - CFS 42: In 2015, multiple CSOs collaborated to put on a side event on trade. This has continued to be a priority area for the CSM.¹² Final report discusses high level forum on linking smallholders to markets.¹³
 - Bioversity International is beginning to engage with perverse subsidies and implications for food security and nutrition.¹⁴

⁸ http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/tk/en/wipo_grtkf_ic_31/wipo_grtkf_ic_31_ref_30_10_prov_2.pdf

⁹ Comprehensive list of draft articles on GR, TK and TCEs available at http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/igc/draft_provisions.html

¹⁰ CSM strategy document on increasing smallholders’ access to markets available at <http://www.csm4cfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2015-csm-Draft-Strategy-Note-Smallholders-final.pdf>

¹¹ CFS 41 Final Report available at http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1314/CFS41/FinalReport/CFS41_Final_Report_EN.pdf

¹² Ongoing CSM input documented at <http://www.csm4cfs.org/working-groups/connecting-smallholders-to-markets/>

¹³ CFS 42 Final Report available at http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs/Docs1415/cfs42/CFS_42_Final_Report_As_Adopted.pdf

¹⁴ See for example <http://www.bioversityinternational.org/e-library/publications/detail/enabled-or-disabled-is-the-environment-right-for-using-biodiversity-to-improve-nutrition/>

Annex 7: Participants in Project Consultations

Surname	Given name	Country	Organization
Expert Consultation on Small Scale Farmer Innovation - May 2015			
Oguamanam	Chidi	Canada	University of Ottawa
Walsh	Susan	Canada	USC Canada
Song	Yiching	China	Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Waters-Bayer	Ann	Germany	Prolinnova
Ouko	Joe	Kenya	Farmer innovator
Larson Guerra	Jorge	Mexico	Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad
Sthapit	Bhuwon	Nepal	Bioversity International
Shresha	Pratap	Nepal	USC Canada
Argumendo	Alejandro	Peru	Asociación ANDES
Ruiz	Manuel	Peru	La Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental
Wettasinha	Chesha	Sri Lanka	Prolinnova / ETC International
Pacini	Henrique	Switzerland	UNCTAD
Dutfield	Graham	UK	University of Leeds
Thrupp	Lori Ann	US	Berkeley Food Institute, Univ of California Berkeley
Bragdon	Susan	US	QUNO
Mushita	Andrew	Zimbabwe	Community Technology Development Trust
First Expert Consultation on New Framework for Trade and Investment in Agriculture (NFTIA) Jan 2014			
Alam	Aftab	Pakistan	Action Aid Pakistan
Breger	Thomas		Lascaux Process
Campeau	Christine	Switzerland	Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance
Chemnitz	Christine	Germany	Heinrich-Boll Stiftung
Claeys	Priscilla	Belgium	University of Louvain la Neuve
Clapp	Jennifer	Canada	University of Waterloo
de Torre Urgate	Daniel	US	Agricultural Policy Analysis Centre
Douillet	Mathilde	France	CIRAD
Ismail	Suzanne	UK	QPSW
Kwa	Aileen	Switzerland	South Centre
Lunenborg	Peter	Switzerland	South Centre
Mooney	Pat	Canada	ETC Group
Ramdas	Sagari	India	Anthra
Sharma	Sharma	US	IATP
Sherwood	Stephen	Ecuador	EkoRural
Suarez-Franco	Ana Maria	Switzerland	Food First Information and Action Network
Wen	Dale	China	Independent
Wilkinson	John	Brazil	Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro
Second Expert Consultation on New Framework for Trade and Investment in Agriculture - May 2014			
Ahmed	Faris	Canada	USC Canada

Angeli	Marietta	Switzerland	The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies
Bernabe	Riza	Philippines	Adviser to the Government of the Philippines on matters relating to the Agreement on Agriculture under the WTO
Bunyi	Jerome	Philippines	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Philippines to the World Trade Organization
Christie	Jean	Canada	Independent
Clapp	Jennifer	Canada	University of Waterloo
De Schutter	Olivier	Belgium	UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food
Dhar	Biswajit	India	Research and Information System for Developing Countries
Dominguez	Enrique	Mexico	Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva
Fuchs	Nikolai	Switzerland	Nexus Foundation
Kuipa	Prince	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe Farmers` Union
Mayaya	Billy	Malawi	Malawi Right to Food Network
Mazzei	Isabel	Bolivia	Permanent Mission of the Plurinational State of Bolivia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva
Polanco	Ivan	Mexico	Asociación Nacional de Empresas Comercializadoras de Productores del Campo
Rebagay	Lany	Philippines	Asian Farmers` Association
Rudjimin	Rudjimin	Indonesia	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations Office, WTO and other international organizations in Geneva
Trujillo Paredes	Luisa	Switzerland	The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies
Wise	Tim	Canada	Global Development & Environment Institute
Third Expert Consultation on New Framework for Trade and Investment in Agriculture April 2015			
Rwakakamba	Morrison	Uganda	Agency for Transformation
Suarez	Victor	Mexico	Asociación Nacional de Empresas Comercializadoras de Productores del Campo (ANEC)
Ugas	Roberto	Peru	Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina
Burnett	Kimberley	Canada	University of Waterloo
Patnaik	Biraj	India	Indian Supreme Court
de Schutter	Olivier	Belgium	University of Louvain; UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food
Clapp	Jennifer	Canada	University of Waterloo
Bunyi	Jerome	Philippines	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Philippines to the World Trade Organization
Kuipa	Prince	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe Farmers` Union
Mayaya	Billy	Malawi	Malawi Right to Food Network
Wise	Timothy A.	US	Global Development & Environment Institute
Dhar	Biswajit	India	Research and Information System for Developing Countries
Ahmed	Faris	Canada	USC Canada