Darwin Initiative
Final Report

*To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders (http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/resources/) it is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)*

Darwin project information

Project reference	22-017
Project title	Mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and Plant Treaty
Host countries	Benin and Madagascar
Contract holder institution	Bioversity International
Partner institution(s)	ABS Capacity Development Initiative; Service d'Appui à la Gestion de l'Environnement (SAGE) (Madagascar);Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAE) (Madagascar); ONG Cercle de Sauvegarde des Ressources Naturelles (CeSaReN) (Benin); Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Benin (INRAB); Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity; ITPGRFA Secretariat, Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO); African Union Commission
Darwin grant value	£ 290,502
Start/end dates of project	1 April 2015 – 31 March 2018
Project leader's name	Michael Halewood
Project website	https://www.bioversityinternational.org/darwin_benin_madagascar/
Report author(s) and date	Michael Halewood, Ana Bedmar, Andreas Drews, Lena Fey, Naritiana Rakotoniaina, Michelle Andriamahazo, Bienvenu Bossou, Toussaint Mikpon, Raymond Vodouhe, Kathryn Garforth, Kent Nnadozie, Mahlet Teshome Kebede, 30 June 2018

1 Project Rationale

Biodiversity challenge: Biodiversity is often treated like a global public good — free to exploit without reciprocal obligations to conserve. Local biodiversity stewards often go unnoticed; their contributions overlooked as positive externalities. This neglect contributes to biodiversity's erosion. Madagascar and Benin have ratified the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and the Nagoya Protocol (NP). Neither country has mechanisms to implement either agreement separately, much less in a mutually supportive manner.

Poverty alleviation challenge: Local communities' capacity to exploit these agreements is low in both countries, so their contributions to poverty alleviation, benefit sharing, conservation and sustainable use are sub-optimal.

How problems were identified: All partners identified problems together at a workshop in June 2014 entitled 'The ITPGRFA and the NP – a tandem workshop for National Focal Points'.

2 Project Partnerships

The lead national partners -- the ITPGRFA and the NP National Focal Points from Benin and Madagascar – are members of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC), along with representatives from the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the ITPGRFA, the African Union Commission, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative and Bioversity International. The EGC met regularly throughout project in face-to-face meetings and via teleconference. These teleconferences took place in November 2016; June and November 2017; and in January, February, March, April, May, and June 2018. Face-to-face meetings were organized in Benin, May 2015, Madagascar, July 2015, Ethiopia, April 2016, and in Italy, April 2017, to review progress, develop written outputs, and confirm that the activities were being implemented according to the logframe. The EGC met for the last time on 8 June 2018, when partners gave an overview of what they had accomplished during the three-year project, the lessons learned and the way forward. Since year 2, the project benefitted from additional partnership and support from a Legal Officer of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), who worked closely with partners from Madagascar on law to implement the ITPGRFA and who was able to attend both EGC meetings in April 2016 and in April 2017 and several teleconferences.

3 Project Achievements

Activity 1.1 *Form national project oversight committees, drawing on existing mechanisms, or created de novo, including representatives of farmer, local community, civil society, private sector organisations, ensuring equitable representation of women and men.*

National Project Implementation Committees (NPICs) were formed in both countries. These included representatives of all relevant stakeholder groups in the country. In Benin, these were INRAB, the General Directorate of Waters, Forests and Hunting, the NGO CeSaReN, representatives of the two local communities participating in the project (i.e. Bonou and Tori-Bossito), and a resource person from Bioversity International's Benin office. The NPIC from Madagascar included representatives from the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research; the National Research Center (FOFIFA); the National Research Center Madagascar-Norway/FIFAMANOR, of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the Ministry in charge of the Environment of Ecology and Forests, the Ministry of Industrialization and Private Sector Development, from the 'peasant coalition of Madagascar, of the FAMA Cooperative (Analavory) and from the local community Voi Firaisankina, from Andasibe/Antavolobe.

Both NPICs were co-chaired by the National Focal Points of the NP and ITPGRFA. In Madagascar, the NPIC was created by merging two, pre-existing, committees that had been formed to guide implementation of the NP and the ITPGRFA as separate exercises. In Benin, an ABS National Committee had been created, prior to this project, to address the implementation of the CBD and the NP. With this Darwin Initiative project raising awareness and profile of the ITPGRFA in the country, the lead agencies decided to expand the mandate of the ABS National Committee to include implementation of the ITPGRFA, and added a range of new members to the Committee to reflect that expanded mandate, including plant breeders, farmers and producer organizations from the selected four project communities. Consultations between the Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin (INRAB), and the Direction Générale des Forêts et des Ressources Naturelles resulted in an agreement on the essential contents and the establishment of the NPIC. A formal INRAB Decision[1] defining the duration, duties, composition and operation of the NPIC is included in Annex 7.1 to this report.

Activity 1.2 *Project Steering Committee – coordinates and oversees project supported research and capacity building and policy development activities.*

The NPICs met regularly to guide the implementation of the project. Main tasks undertaken by these committees during the three-year implementation period includes i) developing a detailed

[1] Decision No. 0798 / INRAB / DG / DS / DAHR / DRF / CRA-Sud / SA of 03/07/2016

project action plan based on the project implementation logframe; ii) establishing the terms of reference for consultants engaged in project activities (e.g., baseline surveys); iii) validating the results of the baseline surveys; iv) following up the process for developing, getting approved and implementing juridical instruments (i.e. decrees/orders); v) organizing workshops and consultations to involve national stakeholders and local communities in project activities; vi) coordinating support for the communities to develop biocultural community protocols and community biodiversity registries; vii) supporting discussions/negotiations between providers and recipients of genetic resources; and viii) liaising with the international experts and Secretariats of the ITPGRFA and CBD/NP through the EGC.

Activity 1.3 *Project steering committees submits proposal to competent national authorities for sustainable coordination between the organizations responsible for implementation of the ITPGRFA/MLS and CBD/NP after the three-year life of the project (with continued support from Steering Committee if deemed appropriate by the competent national authorities).*

Benin has developed a unified, 'one window' system for the implementation of both the ITPGRFA and the NP together. This was achieved through the adoption of a single interministerial Decree and appointment of a single National Competent Authority, and creation of a single multistakeholder committee to oversee implementation of the Decree. This system depends upon, and ensures that, the competent national authorities are continuously coordinating, engaging and working together in a long-term, sustainable manner. In Madagascar, the lead agencies developed separate systems for implementing the two agreements with clearly defined boundaries between the two and coordination mechanisms, where necessary, to address 'boundary issues' that could arise in the day-to-day implementation of the system. The National Competent Authority for the ITPGRFA will be a member of the multistakeholder committee guiding implementation of the NP. The commitment of the competent authorities to work together in a long-term, sustainable manner is reflected in the fact that they have jointly developed guidelines to be used by genetic resource access seekers and public servants administering the systems concerned (see activities 3.1 and 3.2 and outcomes 2.4 and 3.3 below).

Activity 2.1 *Steering committees identify implementation options based on baseline survey, expert knowledge, stakeholder consultations.*

Based on the results of the baseline surveys conducted during year 1 (Annexes 7.2 and 7.3) and on expert consultations, the two teams developed a road map of the legal and policy instruments that needed to be developed for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP in their respective countries (see activities 1.3, 2.2 and 2.4). Notably, both Benin and Madagascar chose to first establish an interim legal framework before initiating the process of developing fully-fledged laws to implement the NP and the ITPGRFA. This allowed both countries to create legal certainty for cases related to access and benefit sharing (ABS) within a relatively short time and to gain practical experience, which will inform the development of their future ABS laws. A comparative summary of the two countries' approaches is set out in Annex 7.4.

Activity 2.2 *Expert groups draft policy, legal instruments and guidelines.*

Both country teams developed ministerial decrees and orders to implement the ITPGRFA and the NP in a mutually supportive manner (see activity 1.3). In partnership with representatives of local communities, they also developed community biodiversity protocols, one for each of the four case study communities.

Activity 2.3 *Steering committees organise further consultation on drafts and oversee process of revision.*

Early drafts of the ministerial decrees and orders were subject to consultation meetings with nationally based experts and representatives of immediately affected organizations, including representatives of the four case study communities. The EGC commented on the drafts before they were adopted by the appropriate levels of government. The national teams thereafter decided to develop subsidiary instruments in the form of 'orders' pursuant to the adopted decrees, to implement particular aspects of both the ITPGRFA and the NP in more detail (see activity 2.4).

Over the course of the project seven consultation workshops were organized in Benin and in 11 in Madagascar as part of the process of developing and validating the decrees and orders that were eventually adopted. Many of these workshops were supported by the ABS Initiative. The Darwin project provided resources (experts, additional workshop time) to increase the scope of the exercises to include farmers, representatives from national agricultural research organizations and crop, forage and agroforestry genetic resources.

Activity 2.4 *Steering committees submit draft policies laws, guidelines to relevant competent authorities for consideration/adoption and support follow-up processes.*

The "Decree on national guidelines on access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their use in the Republic of Benin[2]" was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 15 March 2017 (Annex 7.5). At the time of writing this report, it was with the Secretariat of the Government to be signed by the President. In Madagascar, two new decrees were adopted, one linked to each international agreement. On 31 January 2017, the government and the Council of Ministers adopted the Decree for the implementation of the NP (Decree N°2017-066, 31/01/2017 regulating ABS resulting from the use of genetic resources[3] - see Annex 7.6). On May 16 2017, the Prime Minister adopted the order No. 11 567/2017 on Interim Measures to apply for access and benefit sharing to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture under the multilateral system of access and benefit sharing of the ITPGRFA[4] (see Annex 7.7). Both instruments make cross-references to each other, clearly indicating where one applies and the other does not. They are both available at the ABS Clearing House of the CBD (https://absch.cbd.int/countries/MG).

After putting these measures in place, the Madagascar team initiated the process of developing legislation to implement the ITPGRFA. This legislation will build on the two legal instruments recently adopted, further entrenching the ITPGRFA implementation in the country. It is considered by the lead partners that in the longer term, legislation will provide a more durable form of legal support for ITPGRFA implementation. FAO Legal has provided technical assistance to the lead national partners in Madagascar developing a draft legislative text, which was subsequently made the subject of some consultative meetings by the end of this project. Work on the legislation will continue after this project ends. In the meanwhile, the decrees and orders are now in place in Madagascar for the mutual implementation of the ITPGRFA and NP.

Activity 3.1 *National project steering committees develop annotated organigram of governmental and non-governmental actors, promoting equitable representation of women and men, that need to be engaged in daily administration/functioning of the CBD/NP, MLS, including mutually supportive mechanisms, roles, responsibilities, connections, decision-points, processes for consultation through committee on difficult-to-decide cases.*

The project's EGC recommended that this activity be combined with activity 3.3 below to produce a single set of guidelines in each country (that would be a combination of indicator 2.4 'Interagency guidelines for addressing uncertainties about which agreements applies under different situations, promoting efficient, proactive' (as per indicator 2.4) and 3.3 'User manual for the ABS mechanisms developed by the SCs in Benin and Madagascar (as per indicator 3.3). These guidelines introduce the legal instruments and systems established in

[2] Directives nationales pour l'accès et le partage des avantages issus de l'utilisation des ressources génétiques et des connaissances traditionnelles associées

[3] Décret N° 2017 – 066 du 31/01/2017 portant réglementation de l'accès et du partage des avantages découlant de l'utilisation des ressources génétiques.

[4] Arrete Nº 567/2017 Portant sur les mesures intérimaires de demande d'accès aux Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture et de partage des avantages dans le cadre du Système Multilatéral du Traité International sur les Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture.

each country for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP, describing the public bodies involved in the administration of those new laws; they also include 'how to' steps for access seekers applying for access to plant genetic resources in the country, including forms and templates to be completed when submitting requests. Very significantly, in both countries, these guidelines were co-developed by the two lead agencies responsible for the administration of the ITPGRFA and CBD/NP respectively. The guidelines are included in Annexes 7.8 and 7.9.

Activity 3.2 *For functionaries identified in 3.1 above, provide awareness raising and training on how the system will function, how to execute their responsibilities.*

Throughout the project lifespan, numerous workshops and events were organized by the two national teams to increase awareness among stakeholders on the systems and legal frameworks put in place in each country, including public officials who will be responsible for their administration. More details about awareness raising and consultation meetings organized in both countries throughout the project cycle are provided under activities 4.2 and 4.3 below.

Activity 3.3 *Develop and disseminate manual(s) providing guidance for people operating and using the ABS mechanisms in Benin and Madagascar.*

As described under Activity 3.1, the EGC recommended merging these two activities, and the related outputs. The final outputs are included in Annexes 7.8 and 7.9.

Activity 4.1 *Identify a lead organization in each of the four communities across the two countries for in-depth project research, capacity building.*

During year 1, the lead organization in each of the two communities of Benin and Madagascar was identified. In Benin, the two lead organizations comprised local biodiversity management committees: "Comité de gestion des forêts sacrées de Bonou" (13 members, two of which women, who represented the interface between the Committee, as a decision-making body, and the women of the community), and a newly established committee (eight members) in Tori-Bossito, which was supported by Jeunesse Sans Frontière (NGO active in agricultural production and medicinal plants). The lead organizations in the two Madagascar communities were **"**VOI Firaisan-Kina" (62 members, 26 of which, including the president, women), a local community-based organization dealing with forest management, in Antavolobe/Andasibe, and the "FAMA Cooperative", in Analavory (three board members, of which one woman).

Activity 4.2 *Conduct initial awareness raising and capacity strengthening workshops (including 'capacity strengthening for capacity strengtheners'), Co-organised with national competent authorities. Workshops to ensure equitable representation of women and men, proactively promoting participation of women's organisations.*

Throughout the project, awareness-raising workshops at the national, regional and local levels were organized in both countries to boost ITPGRFA awareness and to enhance related technical expertise of key actors, including researchers, extension services, private sector, farmers and community members, about the mutually supportive implementation of both agreements. In both countries, most of these events were covered by local news media.

In Madagascar, a national workshop was held in November 2015, with 130 participants (80 men and 50 women), including representatives from central government and the 22 regions of Madagascar. At the community level, five workshops were conducted in November 2015 in August and September 2016 and in September 2017. In total, 197 community members participated to these events, 76 of which were women).

In Benin, a national awareness-raising workshop was conducted and attended by 39 men and 13 women. Five additional department-level workshops were organized by the national partners, with support from Bioversity-Benin, in December 2015. In total, 43 women and 175 men participated. At the community level, two workshops were organized in January and February 2018, with a total of 99 community member participants, 24 of whom were women.

In addition, Bioversity International worked with the partners from Benin and Madagascar to organize additional (beyond what was proposed in this Darwin project) workshops on resilient

seed systems and adaptation to climate change in the four communities. In Benin, these took place in December 2015 and August 2016 (125 participants in total, 30 of whom women). In Madagascar, these workshops were conducted in July 2016 (46 participants, 27 of whom women). These workshops led to the production of their respective reports (Annexes 7.10, 7.11 and 7.12) and of two additional info notes that had not been anticipated in the project proposal (Annexes 7.13 and 7.14). This activity was made possible using additional funding from another project entitled 'Genetic Resource Policy Initiative' (GRPI project). Furthermore, in year 3, Bioversity International provided the two national teams with an additional USD 3,750 to support the finalization of these community-level project activities.

Activity 4.3 *Support women and men in at least two communities to identify appropriate mechanisms (e.g. biodiversity registries, community ABS protocols, organisations to develop specialised capacity) to help communities address ABS issues.*

As previously reported, this activity required additional time, finances and engaged more partners in the community-level activities than anticipated. Over the three years, the project supported a number of community-level workshops each to raise awareness about the ITPGRFA and NP, and to introduce communities to different tools, methods for developing (or not) biocultural protocols, biodiversity registries, etc. Project partners organized meetings in their respective countries. In total, nine meetings were organized in Benin (attended by 558 stakeholders, including community members) and 11 meetings in Madagascar (393 participants, including community members). As part of this process, in year 2, the communities confirmed their interest in developing biocultural community protocols and community biodiversity registries, and further agreed on the type of registry, who would manage it, and how data would be collected.

Consultants from Natural Justice, supported by the ABS Initiative, together with two staff members from Bioversity's Benin and Uganda offices, supported the community-level work in both countries.

Activity 4.4 *Draft protocols, hold consultations, redraft protocols and/or other forms of guidelines for ABS related decision making at community level, including equitable representation of women and men, with technical support from national competent authorities and scientists from national agricultural and environment research organizations.*

Once the communities decided that they wanted to develop biocultural community protocols, the project sponsored follow-up activities to develop them (and the biodiversity registries). The two national teams organized a number of training workshops during the second and third year of the project to support actors involved in the process of developing and getting the biocultural community protocols recognized at the community, regional and national levels. These workshops allowed communities to make decisions on the biocultural community protocols' content, the way forward for their elaboration, and to reflect on the connections between the community protocols and Farmers' Rights. The first drafts of the biocultural community protocols from the four communities were shared with the EGC for suggestions and comments.

At the community level, in Benin, in total, 12 consultations were organized, attended by 440 people, including 103 women. Additionally, focus groups, attended by 200 people, including 50 women, were held to collect information for the biocultural community protocols. Nine workshops were held in Madagascar, attended by 407 people, including 216 women. Similarly, in Madagascar, two meetings were organized at the community level targeted to different stakeholders, including members of the FAMA cooperative, farmers, and the Mayor of each municipality.

In Benin, workshops were also organized at the regional (departmental) level aiming at building policy and administrative decision-makers' and other stakeholders' capacities in the two regions/departments about the importance of having the protocols recognized by stakeholders outside of the communities. These workshops took place in August, October and December 2017. In total, 148, including 28 women, participated to these events. At the national level, a similar workshop was organized in September 2017. In total, there were 40 participants, eight of whom, women, including representatives of community organizations, professional associations and national NGOs, representatives of ministries and national services, national association of municipalities, and jurists (magistrates and lawyers).

As mentioned in activity 4.2 above, Bioversity International was able to deliver additional funds to the two national teams from the GRPI project to support the finalization of these activities.

Activity 4.5 *Adoption of protocol and possibly related guidelines.*

By the end of the project, the biocultural community protocols for the two communities of Madagascar were adopted by the relevant municipal authorities (December 2017), one of which was also adopted by the Regional Directorate for the Environment, Ecology and Forests (DREEF). In Benin, the protocols were adopted and finalized by participating community members and representatives of the municipal governments (in their personal capacity). These draft protocols were submitted to the municipal governments of the two communities on November 17, 2017 in Tori-Bossito and on March 28 and 29, 2018 in Bonou.

The four protocols are included in Annexes 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 7.18.

As part of the process of developing the protocols in Benin, the Benin NPIC commissioned a study on access to PGRFA in Benin (at national and community level). This study, entitled 'Documentation du mécanisme d'accès aux Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture par les Parties prenantes au Bénin', is included in Annex 7.19.

Activity 4.6 *Development of community biodiversity conservation investment plans by community partners, with support provided by national competent authorities for the implementation of the ITPGRFA, CBD/NP and scientists from national agricultural and environmental organizations.*

This activity was supported by the workshops described in activities 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. The investment plans for the four communities were developed in year 2 by national partners together with the communities concerned (see Annexes 7.20, 7.21, 7.22, 7.23). Bioversity International also provided a further USD 10,000 (from the GRPI project) to support the construction of a community seed bank in Tori-Bossito and in Analavory, as proposed in their investment plans.

Activity 4.7 *Support discussions/negotiations between potential providers and potential recipients of genetic resources and traditional knowledge, (with at least one recipient or provider being located in Madagascar and Benin) with objective of developing ABS agreements. If negotiations are successful, finalise ABS agreements. National competent authorities and scientists from national research organizations will provide support for this process as appropriate.*

The following seven agreements have been formalized by the end of the project:

The two communities from Madagascar (i.e. VOI Firaisan-Kina, from Antavolobe, and Santatra, from Analavory, signed the standard material transfer agreement (SMTA) with Africa Rice (a CGIAR pan-African rice research organization) to transfer samples of seven accessions of rice. In Madagascar, the project team partnered with FOFIFA (the National Center for Applied Research and Rural Development), Africa Rice and DRAE to identify potentially useful plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) to test their performance in the communities through participatory plant breeding. (MTA: 2018-005, 14 March 2018; SMTA2018-AfR-005). (The first page and annex 1 of these agreements are included in Annexes 7.24 and 7.25).

INRAB accesses materials from IITA: The team from Benin requested samples of beans accessions from the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA). Representatives of INRAB and IITA signed an SMTA page and Annex 1 of the SMTA are included in Annex 7.26).

Exchange of materials between the two communities in Benin: National partners organized a workshop for the exchange of seeds between the communities of Bonou and Tori-Bossito on 23 March 2017 (65 participants, of whom 13 women). The materials were: ahipa, white potato, bean, cassava and maize from Bonou to Tori-Bossito and maize from Tori-Bossito to Bonou. Once the materials of interest to each of the respective communities were identified, an ABS agreement was signed between the representatives of each community (Annex 7.27) (see Annex 7.28 for the workshop report). Thereafter, a field visit to Tori-Bossito was conducted on 14 September 2017 to assess the performance of the seeds that had been obtained during the previous visit.

Exchange of materials between the two countries: A teleconference between the two national teams was held on 25 August 2017. National partners discussed about the process to exchange materials between the two communities. Based on the results obtained in the exercises conducted under the 'resilient seed systems' workshop' (see activity 4.2), partners from Benin and Madagascar decided on the materials to be exchanged. As a result, the following two exchanges of

materials were conducted: 1) INRAB, Benin, sent four bean accessions to the FAMA Cooperative, Madagascar, through an SMTA (the first page and annex 1 of that SMTA are included in Annex 7.29). When INRAB received the request from the FAMA Cooperative, a 'prospection mission' was organized in Tori-Bossito to identify whether the requested materials were available. Four varieties of beans that responded to the requests from Madagascar were identified; these varieties were no longer part of large-scale production and were only found on the land of a smallholder farmer. Therefore, the varieties needed to be multiplied and characterized before they were sent to Madagascar. At the moment of writing this report, the material received is being used in the community of Madagascar to conduct participatory plant breeding; 2) The FAMA Cooperative, Madagascar, sent two white and red bean varieties to INRAB, Benin, through a SMTA, on 30 May 2018 (the first page and annex 1 of that SMTA are included in Annex 7.30). The materials of interest were identified based on the results of the baseline survey (see activity 5.2).

Exchange of materials between the two communities in Madagascar: FAMA Cooperative (Analavory) to VOI Firaisankina (Andasibé) through an SMTA (the first page and annex 1 of that SMTA are included in Annex 7.31) on 16 June 2018. National partners organized two field missions to the two communities to recall the participatory exercises conducted under the 'resilient seed systems' workshop (see activity 4.2). The materials to be exchange between the communities were selected based on the results of the baseline survey (see activity 5.2) and on farmers' preferences. It was agreed that the most biodiversity-rich community (i.e. the FAMA Cooperative) would be the supplier and VOI FIRAISANKINA, from the other community, the recipient.

Activity 4.8 *Identify the potential interest of the private sector to collaborate with the project local communities.*

There have been significant in-kind contributions/investments by the four communities in the development of the community biodiversity registries, the biocultural community protocols, and the community investment plans, and by national public authorities in the project overall. In both countries, interactions between the private sector and the local communities were initiated based on the community investment plans (see activity 4.6). In Bonou, Benin, the Mayor gave two hectares of land to the community for the establishment of the botanical garden foreseen in the community investment plan. In Madagascar, farmers belonging to the FAMA cooperative, in Analavory, are currently collaborating with AGRIVET, a large seed company that is interested in collaborating with local seed producer groups. In Antavolobe, based on the investment plans, negotiations are currently underway between the community members and some private companies (e.g. Société Bionexx, Société Sotramex) to establish a value chain for *Centella asiatica*. Meetings and an implementation document have been developed with local communities following these negotiations (Annex 7.32).

Activity 5.1 *The national steering committees develop terms of reference for the baseline surveys and engage research teams, including equitable representation of women and men.*

In year 1, both NPICs reviewed and adapted terms of reference for the baseline studies. They also coordinated individual researchers and surveyors to do the survey.

Activity 5.2 *Researchers appointed by the steering committee complete baseline survey and synthesis. Present to stakeholders at workshops for feedback and revisions.*

The baseline studies (see Annexes 7.1 and 7.2 of this report, and activities 2.1 and 5.1 above) for both countries were finalised in year 1 and the main findings presented during national and local workshops.

Activity 5.3 *Publish synthesis on line and 'spin off' policy briefs related to policy options and processes that need to be followed to put systems in place in each country.*

The 'spin off' policy briefs were laid out and published in year 1 (Annexes 7.33 and 7.34).

Activity 5.4 *Women and men in biodiversity-rich communities develop biodiversity registries (or other forms of collating information about biological diversity and uses) to, among other things, increase local awareness of biological diversity and issues associated with its erosion or conservation, increase their capacity to attract access-seekers, and to develop more advantageous ABS agreements. Women and men in communities working in close collaboration with scientists from national agricultural and environmental research organisations identify stresses to local*

agricultural production systems, and potentially adapted germplasm (and associated know-how) from national and foreign sources that could assist in addressing local needs/vulnerabilities.

Much of this work is reported under Activities 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 above. In all four communities, the biodiversity registries were finalized and validated by the communities (Annexes 7.35, 7.36, 7.37 and 7.38 – for confidentiality, partners have only shared the empty forms to be completed by the community. It was never the project's intention to openly publish these registries).

The two national teams worked hard to raise the communities' awareness and prepare them to meaningfully participate in the process of developing the registries. Steps followed in the four communities for the development of the registries include: 1) Public awareness on the community biodiversity registries; 2) Establishment of a community management committee responsible for making proposals to other farmers for the main contents of the community register; 3) Capacity building of committee members on the identification and collection of data on biological resources and traditional knowledge; 4) Data collection, including: group discussion at the community level, sometimes, divided by gender; literature reviews of the community's natural resources, individual interviews with knowledgeable people and key institutional actors; and field observations; 5) Presentation of early drafts of the registries to all the member of the community; 6) Finalization of the registries taking into account the feedback received from the community members; and 7) Validation of the finalized registries. Documentation included photographs (including digital images), drawings, audio and video recordings, and any other recordings such as available print materials. Newly introduced species to the locality will also be progressively registered.

Different registries were produced in the different communities: In Tori-Bossito, Benin, a register for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and another register for species of local plants with multiple uses or introduced on farms, sacred forests or private plantations, botanical gardens or house gardens, etc. In Bonou, the President and the Secretary of the Biodiversity Management Committee are responsible for the management of the register, which is kept at the royal palace of Bonou. In Tori-Bossito, the Vice-President and the Secretary of the Committee are responsible for the management of the register, which is kept at the Town Hall. In both localities, the entire local community has free access to the registries, but access by people from outside of the community is left to the discretion of the managers.

In Analavory, Madagascar, the biodiversity register was established in 2017. It includes plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (it has started with rice, maize and beans) and associated traditional knowledge existing within the boundaries of the rural Municipality, as well as resources conserved in institutions such as FOFIFA, FIFAMANOR, and NGOs. The president of the FAMA Cooperative, together with the Biodiversity Management Committee, keeps the register and is also responsible for its data management. The Antavolobe biodiversity register was also established at the beginning of 2017. It includes plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (starting with rice, cassava, beans and maize). Literate persons from the community (one per variety included in the register) have been chosen to maintain and update the register. It is foreseen that another register will be developed in the two communities to include medicinal forest species, such as medicinal plants and trees.

Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs

DARWIN INITIATIVE

UKaid from the British people

3.1 Outputs

OUTPUT 1: New national interagency access and benefit-sharing policy coordinating committee in Benin and Madagascar established, instigating and reviewing research, capacity building and policy development and implementation activities.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 1.1: Within 6 months, representatives of lead agencies and other stakeholder groups agree concerning membership, modus operandi for each national project steering committee (SC) (in Benin and Madagascar) & its relationship to other in-country coordination mechanisms.	Neither country had a national project steering committee in place. Benin had a committee for implementation of the NP, but not the ITPGRFA. Madagascar had two separate committees: one for NP and one for the ITPGRFA.	NPICs were formed in both countries in year 1 (see activity 1).	Annex 7.1: Decision No. 0798 / INRAB / DG/ DS / DAHR / DRF/ CRA-Sud / SA of 03/07/2016).
Indicator 1.2: Within 8 months, 2 working papers (one each in Benin & Madagascar) outlining portfolio of legislation, policies & guidelines and complementary research and capacity building activities which need to be developed over life of project endorsed by SCs.	Neither country had identified or developed the full set of policy and legal instruments necessary for mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP at the national level.	A combined road map was produced in year 1 for Benin & Madagascar specifying policy & legal instruments to be developed in each country within the project framework (activity 2.1)	Annex 7.4: White paper: Combined roadmap for Benin and Madagascar.
Indicator 1.3: SC meeting organized in Benin and Madagascar every 4 months to guide project implementation & associated minutes disseminated to stakeholders.	Neither country had a national project steering committee in place.	The NPICs of both countries met regularly to assess the status of implementation of the project.	Minutes of the NPICs meetings, available upon request.
Indicator 1.4: Confirmation by end of project by competent national authorities responsible for implementation of CBD/NP and ITPGRFA that coordination activities as supported by SC during project will be sustainably continued after project ends.	No established mechanisms facilitating collaboration between national authorities responsible for mutually supportive implementing of the CBD/NP & ITPGRFA.	Such mechanisms have been put in place in both countries (see activity 1.3).	

OUTPUT 2: Draft policies, guidelines, orders, legislation, to implement both CBD/NP & ITPGRFA including provisions recognising role of local communities as biological diversity stewards with attendant interests and rights. Mechanisms to promote mutual support in daily administration of those systems.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 2.1: In years 1, 2 and 3, local and national level consultation meetings are held in Benin and Madagascar, regarding implementation options and policies under development, with equitable representation of women and men, local peoples and farmer organisations.	Some draft juridical instruments relating to ITPGRFA in Madagascar since 2009. These were recently rejected. Also an earlier draft ABS law that was not successful. A national ABS strategy for the implementation of the NP was available in Benin since 2014.	In both countries, consultations were organized at the national and level during the preparation and validation of the interim measures and at the local level to discuss with community leaders and other community members regarding the biocultural community protocols and community biodiversity registries (see activities 2.3, 2.4, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4).	Reports of the workshops available upon request.
Indicator 2.2: Expert drafting committee (EDC), including experts from local community and women's organisations, selected by national project SC, with ToR developed by the committee in consultation with Bioversity International and ABS Initiative.		"Biodiversity Management Committees" were set up in the communities for coordinating and managing the development of the community biodiversity registries (see activity 5.4).	
Indicator 2.3: 2 White Papers (1 each in Benin and Madagascar) outlining options with annexed drafts of policies, laws, guidelines developed by 18 months, drafted by EDC and submitted to SCs, and subsequently shared in national level consultations. Revised policies approved by SCs introduced into formal national decision-making processes by end of year 3.		The two white papers were produced in year 2. Thereafter, national instruments were approved for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP in both countries.	White papers - Annexes 7.38 and 7.39.
Indicator 2.4: Interagency guidelines for addressing uncertainties about which agreements applies under different situations, promoting efficient, proactive cooperation between functionaries implementing the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA. Guidelines will be submitted in year 2.5 by the SC to the competent national authorities		Combined with indicator 3.3. National partners have developed a report summarizing the systems that have been put in place in each country throughout the implementation of this project for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP	Annexes 7.8, 7.9.

OUTPUT 2: Draft policies, guidelines, orders, legislation, to implement both CBD/NP & ITPGRFA including provisions recognising role of local communities as biological diversity stewards with attendant interests and rights. Mechanisms to promote mutual support in daily administration of those systems.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
for the implementation of the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA.		(see activity 3.1).	

OUTPUT 3: Critical mass of national actors in each country trained to implement, & operate under, the international regime on access and benefit sharing.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 3.1: By 18 months, list confirmed in Benin and Madagascar of public offices, officers, and other stakeholders that will be involved in the daily implementation of the ABS measure to be implemented, including 'outreach' officers who will be needed to help stakeholders operate under the systems created.	No such list compiled	The different stakeholders involved in the daily implementation of the systems put in place through the project were identified and established by the decrees/orders adopted.	Annexes 7.8, 7.9.
Indicator 3.2: Approximately 50 functionaries per country in Benin and Madagascar trained to implement the international regime of ABS in a series of training sessions, by end of year 3.		Great efforts were made throughout the implementation of the project to support training of a broad range of stakeholders at national and community levels. See activity 3.2.	Reports of the workshops available upon request.
Indicator 3.3: User manual for the ABS mechanisms developed by the SCs in Benin and Madagascar and submitted to the competent national authorities for adoption and disseminated to a wider range of national actors by end of year 3.		See indicator 2.4.	Annexes 7.8, 7.9.

OUTPUT 4: Organisations have capacities strengthened to provide specialised assistance services for communities to access and provide biological resources and know-how pursuant to ABS rules. Representatives from local community, women and farmer organisations receive assistance in making decisions about resources they want to provide or access, and to negotiate access and benefit-sharing agreements. Model community protocols, which guarantee participation of women's organisations in governance developed for decision-making and negotiating by communities.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 4.1: Identification of lead partners (1 in each community) subject to approval by national project steering committee and women and men community representatives within 6 months.	No lead partners prior to project starting	The lead organization in each of the communities in Benin and Madagascar was identified in year 1 (see Activity 4.1).	

OUTPUT 4: Organisations have capacities strengthened to provide specialised assistance services for communities to access and provide biological resources and know-how pursuant to ABS rules. Representatives from local community, women and farmer organisations receive assistance in making decisions about resources they want to provide or access, and to negotiate access and benefit-sharing agreements. Model community protocols, which guarantee participation of women's organisations in governance developed for decision-making and negotiating by communities.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 4.2: 2 awareness-raising workshops per country by mid-year 2 for women and men from the four communities, and 2 capacity-strengthening workshops per country by year 3, including focussed 'capacity strengthening for capacity strengtheners' engagement, co-organized by, and with technical support from national competent authorities and scientists from national agricultural research and environmental research organizations.	Some awareness raising in one community, Bonou, through ABS Initiative activities.	Awareness raising workshops and trainings about the ITPGRFA, climate change resilience, genetic resources management and community ABS tools and mechanisms were conducted throughout the implementation of the project in both countries (see activities 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4).	Minutes of the workshops available upon request. Articles published in the press from both countries about the raising awareness workshops on the project website.
Indicator 4.3: Community protocols adopted by relevant community authorities by year 3 in the four project communities.		By the end of the project, the biocultural community protocols of the four communities were finalized and recognized by the respective local governments.	Annexes 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 7.18.
Indicator 4.4: At least 6 ABS agreements piloted with community organisations as providers or recipients of GR and/or associated knowledge in Benin and Madagascar by year 3.		The six ABS agreements and corresponding exchange of materials were conducted by the end of the project (see activity 4.7).	SMTAs – Annexes 7.24, 7.25, 7.28, 7.29, 7.30, 7.31.

OUTPUT 5: Baseline survey of information about local biodiversity status, trends and needs: women and men users: potential markets. Documentation concerning GRs that are potentially available from Madagascar and Benin for access seekers, including information about potentially valuable traits, geographic areas, uses, etc. Documentation of genetic resources needed by farmers in Madagascar and Benin for improved food security in light of current stresses to agricultural production systems. Conservation investment strategies developed for local communities.			
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 5.1: 1 baseline survey and synthesis per country presented to stakeholders consultation and Steering Committee in year 1; published online by end of year 1.		The baseline studies of both countries were conducted and finalised in year 1. Workshops were organized in both countries to present	Annexes 7.2, 7.3.

		the main findings (activities 2.1, 5.1, 5.2).	
Indicator 5.2: 4 community biodiversity registries developed by specialist steward/user groups (e.g. traditional healers, women's market-chain development initiatives, custodian farmers), with technical support from national and district agricultural and environmental organisations by end of year 3.		The Community Biodiversity Registries were finalized and are currently being used by the four communities (see activity 5.3).	Annexes 7.34, 7.35, 7.36, 7.37.
Indicator 5.3: 2 reports, prepared by local farmer organisations and national and district agricultural and environmental organisations, which analyse stresses to the communities' agricultural production systems and related needs for adapted germplasm in Benin and Madagascar from domestic and international sources, by year 2.		The two reports were written in year 2.	Annexes 7.40 and 7.41.
Indicator 5.4: 4 communities develop conservation investment strategies, by year 3, with technical support from national competent authorities.		The community investment plans were developed in year 2 by the communities concerned, with the support of national partners. In year 3, the investment plans started to be implemented (activity 4.6).	Annexes 7.20, 7.21, 7.22, 7.23.

3.2 Outcome

Outcome: In Madagascar and Benin, a range of stakeholders will make access and benefit-sharing agreements that contribute to pro-poor rural development and offset the cost of conserving genetic resources.			
	Baseline	Change by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 0.1: Access and benefit-sharing policies, orders, guidelines, legislation, community protocols and processes to implement the NP and ITPGRFA/MLS are formally adopted by year 3 (or are in the pipeline for adoption having been properly submitted to the appropriate policymaking bodies).	In Benin, a national strategy for ABS was in place, focussing mainly on the NP. There was no ABS legislation. In Madagascar, there was a national ABS policy focussing mainly on the NP, but no ABS legislation. Much earlier attempts to develop juridical instruments to implement the CBD and ITPGRFA were abandoned.	Both countries developed policies to implement the ITPGRFA and the NP in a mutually supportive manner at the national level (activity 1.3), and Biocultural Community Protocols that address both the mechanism that access seekers need to follow to obtain genetic resources from the communities, and the process to be followed by the communities when a request is received in the community (activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5).	Annexes 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 7.18

Outcome: In Madagascar and Benin, a range of stakeholders will make access and benefit-sharing agreements that contribute to pro-poor rural development and offset the cost of conserving genetic resources.			
	Baseline	Change by 2018	Source of evidence
Indicator 0.2: Formal governmental recognition, by year 3, of the rights of four groups of local communities (and the rights of women within those communities) in Benin and Madagascar to participate in decision-making regarding management of biological/genetic resources and to a share of benefits derived from others uses of those resources. By year 3, protocols developed by communities to guide how the communities themselves will exercise their rights.	In both countries, local communities do have certain, yet limited, rights to participate in natural resource management and benefit sharing. However, these rights only cover certain areas, resources and/or communities, and are not always duly applied. Overall, communities in neither country have clear and comprehensive rights to genetic resources, their management and the participation in ABS under the NP and the ITPGRFA.	The realization of farmers' rights was always present throughout the development of the biocultural community protocols.	
Indicator 0.3: By year 3, organisations from four groups of pilot communities will access genetic resources (and related know-how) of food-security crops, that are adapted for use in their stressed agricultural production systems.	Lack of capacities at the community level to access germplasm from national and international providers.	The capacities of the four communities have been strengthened through various workshops organized at the local level (see activity 4.2) and through the development of the biocultural community protocols and biodiversity registries (activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5). The four communities requested, received and exchanged materials from external sources (activity 4.7).	Annexes 7.13, 7.14, 7.40, 7.41. Reports of the workshops available upon request
Indicator 0.4: Investments by communities (year 1), public authorities (year 2) and access-seekers (at least two agreements by year 3) to strengthen the communities' capacity to conserve and sustainably use biological/genetic resources.	Prior to the project's commencement, there were no investments specifically targeting the four communities' capacity to conserve and sustainable conserve biological/genetic resources, with the exception of some investment from the ABS Initiative through a project with links to Bonou, Benin.	There have been significant investments by the four communities in the development of biodiversity registries, biocultural protocols, and community investment plans, and by public authorities in the project overall (activity 4.8). Bioversity and the ABS Initiative also made substantial in-kind contributions for the implementation of the community-level project activities (activities 4.2 and 4.3).	

3.3 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

Impact statement from logframe: 'Increased investment in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources in Benin and Madagascar and increased equitable benefit sharing with stewards and providers of those resources'.

The project has increased community and national public research organizations' investments in the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources in Madagascar and Benin. These investments are reflected in the creation and maintenance of community biodiversity registries and community seed banks. They are further reflected in the community biodiversity investment plans developed through the project, and the four community biocultural protocols. By putting in place national-level mechanisms to implement the ITPGRFA and NP, both countries have set up infrastructures for increased investments in the future, by the communities themselves, and public and private organizations that seek to access, use, conserve and commercially exploit genetic resources. The project has furthermore piloted the use of those systems, by identifying/locating potentially useful genetic resources for deployment in stressed local agroecosystems, and demonstrating how agreements for the legal exchange of those materials can be made to benefit local, resource poor recipients/users of those genetic resources. At the same time, the project has strengthened the links between local communities and national and international organizations involved in conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

4 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Objectives

4.1 Contribution to Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)

By promoting the mechanisms of ABS under the NP and the ITPGRFA, this project has directly contributed to: SDG 2 ('End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture'); Target 5 ('By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and promote access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed'); SDG 15 ('Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss'); and Target 6, which makes direct reference to ABS ('Promote fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and promote appropriate access to such resources, as internationally agreed').

By conducting research on and promoting the exchange of germplasm for adaptation to climate change, the project supports the implementation of Target 13.1 ("Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries"). By ensuring its activities fully support the empowerment and resource rights of local communities, the project contributes to Target 1.4 ("…ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources…"). By including the development of sound and just legal instruments in its activities, the project contributes to Target 16.6 ("Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels").

4.2 Project support to the Conventions or Treaties (CBD, CMS, CITES, NP, ITPGRFA)

As the project title indicates, the project has focused on putting systems in place for national-level (including community level) implementation of the ITPGFA and the CBD/NP.

The main sections of the ITPGRFA promoted through the project are Articles 10-13 (Multilateral System of Access and Benefit Sharing), Article 6 (Sustainable use), and Article 9 (Farmers'

rights). The main sections of the CBD promoted by the project are Article 15 (Access to genetic resources), article 16 (Access to technologies) and article 10 (Sustainable use of biodiversity). The main sections of the NP promoted by the project are: Article 5 (Fair and equitable benefit sharing), Article 6 (Access to genetic resources), Article 12 (Access to traditional knowledge), Article 13 (Appointment of national focal points and competent national authorities), Article 21 (Awareness raising), Article 22 (Capacity building), Article 23 (Technology transfer, cooperation, collaboration), and Article 4 (Relationship to other international agreements).

Aichi Targets to which the project has contributed are indicated in Annex 4.

4.3 Project support to poverty alleviation

The project has developed systems (national laws, community protocols, community genebanks) to increase poor communities' and poor farmers' access to assets (genetic resources and knowledge). Those same systems activate the increased recognition of community rights to make management decisions, both in terms of resources they want to access, how to manage those resources and the under which they are willing to provide those resources to others. Very significantly, the Benin national decree implementing the ITPGRFA and NP explicitly recognizes community protocols. The project also strengthened the actual technical capacity of communities to manage their genetic resources through the creation of community biodiversity registries, and community genebanks. As part of the 'piloting' of those systems, the project supported exchanges of genetic resources subject to seven legal agreements. In each case, the piloting communities gained access to potentially useful genetic resources that may prove to be useful (after in-field and on-station evaluations) for the communities' collective ability to adapt to climate change. The project has demonstrated 'proof of concept' for multistakeholder national research teams, including local farmers and farmer organizations, to identify more such diversity in the future, and access it legally under the ITPGRFA or the NP.

Most of the project has been dedicated to developing draft policies and mechanisms. While the project has exceeded original expectations in getting those laws approved (we assumed it would take more than three years to develop, submit and get governmental adoption), there has not been time to test their operation, beyond the piloting work linked to the four communities. The premise behind the development of the ITPGRFA and the NP is that they will create incentives and means for exchanges of genetic materials in return for commercial and non-commercial benefit sharing. Now that those systems are in place in both countries, the scene is set for increasing poverty alleviation through the sustainable use of plant genetic resources, in addition to exchange of traditional knowledge and planting materials subject to ABS agreements.

4.4 Gender equality

The project has placed particular emphasis on boosting women's participation in project activities to create new governance mechanisms, such as during the development of the community protocols, biodiversity registries, and the community investment plans, so that women's views were considered and included. Women's participation was also promoted during all the meetings and workshops held at both local and national levels (see activities 4.2 and 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 5.4). The two national teams highlighted the importance of including women during the community discussions, particularly in those related to the biocultural protocols and the community biodiversity registries. Women's participation was generally higher in Madagascar than in Benin. Women's organizations *per se* were not selected at community level to assume leadership or decision-making roles under the community biocultural protocols, or in the management of the community seed banks. Instead, existing traditional community leaders and municipal authorities, as well as community organizations (with both men and women members), were selected to take on these responsibilities.

4.5 Programme indicators

- **Did the project lead to greater representation of local poor people in management structures of biodiversity?**

Yes it did. The main beneficiaries of the work conducted under this project ultimately are local communities, holders of traditional knowledge, farmers, peasants, and local enterprises, including women's groups (see activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 5.4).

- **Were any management plans for biodiversity developed?**

Yes. Biocultural community protocols, community biodiversity registries and community investment plans were developed in the four communities to promote sustainable use of genetic resources and traditional knowledge and to identify and access needed genetic resources and information from outside the communities (see activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 5.4)

- **Were these formally accepted?**

Yes they were. Please see activity 4.5.

- **Were they participatory in nature or were they 'top-down'? How well represented are the local poor including women, in any proposed management structures?**

The project's approach was entirely participatory. Women and men from the case study communities actively participated, from the very beginning, in the development of the biocultural community protocols, community biodiversity registries and the community investment plans (see activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, as some examples).

- **Were there any positive gains in household (HH) income as a result of this project?**

Not as a direct result of the project or within the project cycle. As mentioned above, household income gains can only materialize over time, once the national and community policies and mechanisms established by the project are used and become effective.

- **How many HHs saw an increase in their HH income?**

None as a direct outcome of the project.

- **How much did their HH income increase (e.g. x% above baseline, x% above national average)? How was this measured?**

N/A

4.6 Transfer of knowledge

Practitioners and policy makers were the primary targets of all the project awareness raising, capacity building, and policy development. As such, the project sought to transfer knowledge to the policy makers through a wide range of means including all of the workshops and consultations described in this report. In addition, the project took advantage of local public news media whenever possible. There has been considerable media coverage of project activities and outcomes in the newspapers in Madagascar and Benin. All media coverage sources are available online on the project website[5]. Project partners shared project outputs through meetings, and online distribution. Some of their products are published through CGIAR listservers and publication outlets. In addition, the project developed a website through which key project activities, outputs and media are shared publicly.

Project partners also organized or participated in four side events organized during international negotiating meetings under the frameworks of the CBD, NP and the ITPGRFA, including: i) a side event entitled 'Progress, plans and perspectives on mutually supportive

[5] Available at: https://www.bioversityinternational.org/darwin_benin_madagascar/

implementation of the NP and the multilateral system of access and benefit-sharing under the ITPGRFA', organized during the 12th Conference of the Parties to the CBD in Korea, October 2014 (Annex 7.43); ii) a side event entitled 'Mutually Supportive Implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP' during the 6th Session of the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA, in Italy, October 2015 (Annex 7.44); iii) a side event with the same name as the previous one during the during 13th Conference of the Parties to the CBD in Mexico, December, 2016 (Annex 7.45); and iv) in a side event entitled 'Joint Capacity Building Programme for the Implementation of the International Treaty and its Multilateral System of ABS', during the 7th Session of the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA, October 2017, Rwanda (Annex 7.46). In addition, the project was presented during the first meeting of the 'informal advisory committee on capacity-building for the implementation of the NP', Canada, September, 2015 (the agenda is available in Annex 7.47).

The project also contributed an article to the Darwin Initiative Newsletter in May 2016 on the project's contribution to 'mainstreaming biodiversity'. Page 8 in the following link: http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/assets/uploads/2016/05/May-2016-IDB-Newsletter-FINAL.pdf

Did the project result in any formal qualifications?

No, it did not. It was never anticipated that it would.

4.7 Capacity building

As described in sections above, the four national partners (two men and two women) have been supported (with additional funding) to participate in a number of international meetings, side events such as international meetings, interaction with the other members of the EGC, in particular from the Secretariats of ITPGRFA and CBD related to the subject of this project (see 'Lessons learned section below). Likewise, the participation of community members to the different workshops and capacity building initiatives organized at the local, regional and national levels, has contributed to raise the profile and opportunities, for local-level representatives for engagement in decision-making processes taking place even at national levels.

5 Sustainability and Legacy

The legal and administrative structures supported by the project will almost certainly endure. It also seems likely that mechanisms for coordination between lead agencies responsive for national implementation of the NP and ITPGRFA will continue now that stakeholders have worked together for three years on developing mechanisms for coordination and ensuring mutual supportiveness. This outcome is reinforced by the content of the laws that have been passed (which explicitly promote coordination/consultation between lead agencies), and by the recent development by the lead agencies of guidelines for genetic resources users and national system administrators (Annexes 8 and 9).

6 Lessons learned

The development and adoption of juridical instruments progressed faster than we planned. We believe that this confirms the strategy of engaging key policy actors in the development and management of the project. The activities conducted at the community level progressed according schedule, but they required considerably more resources (both time and financial) than what we anticipated. If we were starting 'from scratch' we would budget more for the community-level activities. Overall, the project has worked very well, with all the key partners meeting every six months, and monthly during the last few months of implementation, to review the project progress against the logframe, etc. However, we would recommend to others conducting similar projects to be less ambitious in terms of community-level deliverables or that they have access to additional resources from other projects to subsidize community activities, as we have been able to do.

Over the course of three years, Bioversity International sourced additional financial support from two other complementary sources. Firstly, from another project (GRPI project), financed by the government of the Netherlands for the following activities: i) Additional workshops, in both Benin and Madagascar, to raise awareness about the ITPGRFA; ii) Analyzing impacts of climate change on local crops in case-study communities and identifying potentially adapted

materials in national and international genebanks for use in those communities; iii) Increased, intensified activities at the community level in the four communities, to develop biodiversity registries, biocultural protocols and community seed banks; iv) Supporting lead national partners' attendance at international meetings such as 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 13) of the CBD in Mexico, in December 2016; 16th Regular Session of the CGRFA, January 2017, and the 7th Session of the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA in Rwanda, 30 October - 3 November 2017; and v) Supporting the lead national partners to attend three international training workshops, including: the four-day 'Workshop to develop a decision-making tool for developing national policies to implement the multilateral system of ABS' in Rome, June 2015; the five-day workshop entitled 'Embedding mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP in the context of broader national policy goals – A workshop for national teams of policy actors' in Ethiopia, November 2015; and the four-day 'Genetic Resources Capacity Building Workshop for CGIAR Francophone Scientists and their close collaborators' in Morocco, 27-30 November 2017.

Secondly, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative also supported a range of activities in both Madagascar and Benin. These activities mainly focussed on the NP and constituted a source of lessons learned, information and enhanced capacity upon which this project has been able to capitalize and build. The ABS Initiative funding provided legal and financial support to the development of the interim ABS frameworks in both countries; with their financial support, the process of developing the biocultural community protocol in Bonou (Benin) was initiated and they supported the participation of Natural Justice in the development of these protocols in both countries. The ABS Initiative also supported the participation of national partners in a number of workshops including: i) Sub-regional workshop on ABS for French-speaking African countries, Cote D'Ivoire, 24-28 October 2016; ii) 10th Pan-African workshop on ABS, Senegal, 6-10 March, 2017; and iii) Workshop on the negotiation of mutually agreed terms for ABS of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, Morocco, 19-23 March, 2018. It is important to underline that the partnership with (and in-kind contributions from) the ABS Initiative, and from GRPI, were critical to the success of this project, supporting more activities than the 'core' grant from Darwin Initiative could cover. This partially reflects the understanding that the original proposal was clearly too ambitious, in terms of predicting what could be achieved with the resources requested. Yet, it also reflects the fact that when opportunities for additional, useful, complementary investments in new activities arose, the ABS Initiative and GRPI were able and willing to respond favourably, providing additional support, given their own complementary mandates and modus operandi. In this respect, this project was 'in the right place, at the right time' and therefore able to attract substantial additional investments, without losing its Darwin Initiative identity.

In-kind contributions from the other members of the EGC were used to cover one of the meetings of the EGC (African Union Commission), staff time of members of the Treaty Secretariat and of a representative of the CBD, and to support the work of the EGC.

6.1 Monitoring and evaluation

The development of the project proposal in close collaboration with our national partners, and the inclusion of a highly detailed project logframe with outputs and activities, have guided our approach to M&E and allowed us to monitor progress against set milestones. On average every 6 months we have held meetings with the EGC (including the four lead national partners) to review progress against the logframe. We consider the logframe to be the best we have ever worked with from this point of view.

6.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

We received some comments on the Annual Report for year 2, which lead us to conclude that we didnot report clear enough on certain elements of progress. Therefore, we have included below some responses to the main comments that we received in the hope of clarifying these.

Comment No. 1: *What is the scale of the financial support provided by the Netherlands and the ABS Initiative?*

- Past reports highlighted the areas of work in this project that benefitted from additional support from the GRPI project and the ABS Initiative. We have included more detailed information in this report, both at an aggregate level in Annex 3 "Standard Measures" and in

the Lessons Learned section below. Furthermore, we have indicated throughout this report, under each relevant activity, where additional support from GRPI or ABS Initiative was provided.

Comment No. 3: *Is there any significance to the delay in Benin producing its organigram of how ABS will be implemented?*

- The delay in Benin's production of its organigram was insignificant. Based on information available, the national team thought it relevant to wait until the Decree was implemented before developing the organigram. The EGC considered that the point raised by the Beninese team was reasonable and agreed on postponing the delivery of that particular outcome. In the end, the organigram was incorporated into the document entitled 'Document synthese sur l'acces et le partage des avantages issus de l'utilisation des ressources genetiques (APA) et des connaissances traditionnelles associées au Benin (a l'intention des utilisateurs et des fournisseurs et autres acteurs concernés par l'APA)' (see Annex 7.9).

Comment No.4: *Is the uncertainty about the third outcome-level assumption likely to cause problems? - the AR notes that in Madagascar there is some uncertainty 'about the degree of flexibility that communities should have in defining their rights in the process to implement the NP.'*

- The third outcome-level assumption states that ´The national governments are willing to promote indigenous peoples, local communities and farmer organisations proactive, empowered engagement in regulating access to genetic resources and related traditional knowledge, including equitable representation of women and men'.
- All national governments are cautious when recognizing or creating new rights at lower levels of government or for social groups in their countries. In the context of the NP, countries commit to promoting IPLK's rights to provide genetic resources and TK subject to prior informed consent (PIC) and mutually agreed terms (MAT). However, the protocol is silent on the means by which appropriate processes for PIC and MAT are defined. Community biocultural protocols are one way communities have of defining the related processes for themselves. In Madagascar, we think understandably, was reluctant to legally commit itself to honouring all community protocols, no matter what they may say, in the future, especially when none existed in the country at the time they developed their national decree. Instead, they prefer to wait and see what protocols develop and then see if there is a way of developing soft norms or best practices for determining if there needs to be an outer limit in terms of what can be defined through community biocultural protocols. There has not actually been a case in the project where there was disagreement about the particular content of a draft protocol. Instead, the governments cautionary approach was more out of principle.

Other comments throughout the report:

With regard to Partnerships, it is mentioned that "*AR2 does not mention how the partnerships are managed on a day-to-day basis*".

- As already indicated, the EGC has been in constant communication throughout the implementation of the project via email, and periodic teleconferences have been organized. In addition, as highlighted in the year 1 Annual Report, Bioversity hired a Research Assistant (using additional sources of complementary funds) to help keep track of product development and activities and to ensure clear communication with other partners.

Darwin Initiative branding is missing from some of the published material, but it (or at least an acknowledgement of funding support) appears on others, and Darwin is credited in both text and the logo on the project webpage.

- The ´Darwin identity´ of the project is clearly acknowledged in all of the publications and outcomes ensuing from the project. As recognized by the reviewers, most of the reports and publications developed and annexed to this and the previous annual reports, contain the Darwin Initiative logo. It was, however, not included, for example, in the adopted legal instruments since it did not feel appropriate. In addition, and as it has been also noted by the reviewers, the webpage that Bioversity has created dedicated to the project, makes constant reference to the Darwin Initiative.

7 Darwin identity

Bioversity has created a space within its webpage dedicated to this project. Information about the different workshops, trainings and other events conducted under the scope of this study can all be found through the following link:

https://www.bioversityinternational.org/darwin_benin_madagascar/

The project also contributed an article to the Darwin Initiative Newsletter in May 2016 on the project's contribution to 'mainstreaming biodiversity'. Page 8 in the following link: http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/assets/uploads/2016/05/May-2016-IDB-Newsletter-FINAL.pdf

On 31 October 2017, project partners from Madagascar (Naritiana Rakotoniaina) and Benin (Toussaint Mikpon) participated in a side event during the 7th Session of the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA. The side event was organized by Bioversity and the Treaty Secretariat, and sponsored by the governments of Netherlands and Rwanda. Naritiana and Toussaint presented their work on mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and NP at the community and national levels, as supported by the Darwin Initiative. Other members of the Expert Guidance Committee were also present at this meeting. A photograph of the team was included in the Earth Negotiations Bullet on line reporting of 7th Session of the Governing Body at http://enb.iisd.org/biodiv/itpgrfa/gb7/3nov.html

8 Finance and administration

8.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2017/18 Grant (£)	2017/18 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)			15%	Staff costs were charged in US$ in line with budget. The difference is due to the adverse exchange rate US$/GBP after the Brexit.
Consultancy costs			-6%	
Overhead Costs			4%	
Travel and subsistence			-30%	In order to cover the overspending in Personnel line item, due to the adverse exchange rate fluctuation after the Brexit, savings have been planned in this line item.
Operating Costs			-1%	
Capital items (see below)			0%	
Others (see below)			-1%	
Audit costs			0%	
TOTAL				

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
Michael Halewood, Coordinator (Bioversity International)	5,421

VODOUHE, Sognon- Technical Support for Benin (Bioversity)	
BOSSOU Bienvenu - Project Coordinator (CESARAN ONG)	
LOKOSSOU Orphée - Project Assistant in Monitoring and evaluation (CESARAN ONG)	
GBEDEDJI Bibiane- Administrative and financial assistant (CESARAN ONG)	
ADJADO Ramanou - Driver (CESARAN ONG)	
Rakotoniana Naritiana (Service d'Appui) (SAGE Madagascar)	
Ranivoarisandy Njaka Fanasina (Service d'Appui) (SAGE Madagascar)	
HOUNGNIHIN Rosemonde,Assistant Lawyer (INRAB-Benin)	
Toussaint Mikpon, National ITPGRFA Focal Point (INRAB-Benin)	
ANDRIAMAHAZO Michelle -Head of Service of Environment (MINAGRI-Madagascar)	
RAKOTONANDRASANA Mino (Chargée d'Etudes Service de l'Environnement MINAGRI/DR) (SERN-Madagascar)	
TOTAL	

Capital items – description	**Capital items – cost (£)**
TOTAL	

Other items – description	**Other items – cost (£)**
Paper (INRAB-Benin) Ink (INRAB-Benin) Mailing (INRAB-Benin) Materials (light bulbs, kraft paper rolls) (INRAB-Benin) Ink cartridge and paper for printing machine (SAGE-Madagascar) Ink cartridge and paper for photocopyng machine (SAGE-Madagascar) HP61 N&B and colour (SAGE-Madagascar) Reams of paper (CESARAN ONG-Benin) Envelopes (CESARAN ONG-Benin) Pens (CESARAN ONG-Benin) Felt pens (CESARAN ONG-Benin) Marker pens (CESARAN ONG-Benin) Note books (CESARAN ONG-Benin) Research support services (Bioversity) Bank charges (MINAGRI SENV-Madagascar) Phone cards (MINAGRI SENV-Madagascar) Computer supplies (MINAGRI SENV-Madagascar)	

Bank charges (MINAGRI SENV-Madagascar) Phone cards (MINAGRI SENV-Madagascar) Computer supplies (MINAGRI SENV-Madagascar)	
TOTAL	

8.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
Bioversity International	
CESAREN ONG	
INRAB	
Service d'Appui à la Gestion de l'Environnement SAGE	
Service de l'Environnement MINAGRI/DR	
ABS Capacity Development Initiative	
ITPGRFA Secretariat	
CBD Secretariat	
African Union Commission	
TOTAL	

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
Bioversity International	
Service de l'Environnement MINAGRI/DR	
INRAB	
TOTAL	

8.3 Value for Money

We believe the project represented extremely 'good value for money'. The project exceeded expectations in terms of actually getting laws approved and implemented during the life of the project, and having the lead agencies adopting long term, sustainable mechanisms for mutually supportive implementation of the NP and ITPGRFA in the two countries. We believe the work developing mechanisms for mutually supportive implementation at community levels is also unprecedented. We believe these linked up, community and national level mechanisms for mutually supportive implementation of the two international agreements will serve as models for other countries (and communities) to follow in the future. Indeed they will be promoted as such, in the future, by the organizations who have been partners in the project. The project also demonstrated value for money in terms of the additional, complementary funding/support/expertise it attracted from other organizations and projects. In the end, the overall investment in project activities carried out under the Darwin Initiative banner far exceeded the amount of money invested by the Darwin Initiative.

Annex 1 Project's original (or most recently approved) logframe, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Impact: Increased investment in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources in Benin and Madagascar and increased equitable benefit-sharing with stewards and providers of those resources.			
Outcome: In Madagascar and Benin, a range of stakeholders will make access and benefit sharing agreements that contribute to pro-poor rural development and offset the cost of conserving genetic resources.	Measuring outcomes – Indicator 1. Access and benefit-sharing policies, orders, guidelines, legislation, community protocols and processes to implement the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA/MLS are formally adopted by year 3 (or are in the pipeline for adoption having been properly submitted to the appropriate policymaking bodies). Measuring outcomes – Indicator 2. Formal governmental recognition, by year 3, of the rights of four groups of local communities (and the rights of women within those communities) in Benin and Madagascar to participate in decision-making around management of biological/genetic resources, and to a share of benefits derived from other uses of those resources. By year 3, protocols developed by communities to guide how the communities themselves will exercise their rights. Measuring outcomes – Indicator 3. By year 3, organisations from four groups of pilot communities will access genetic resources (and related know-how) of food-security crops, that are adapted for use in their stressed agricultural production systems.	Verifying outcomes - Indicator 1. National gazette, council and parliamentary records of draft laws, policies, and decisions introduced for consideration by national policymaking bodies. Confirmation of plant genetic resources from Benin and Madagascar included in the multilateral system of access and benefit sharing by 2017. (Madagascar published a list in 2010. The list needs to be re-examined in the context of fuller national implementation). Verifying outcomes - Indicator 2. National gazette, council and parliamentary records of draft laws, policies, decisions introduced for consideration by national policymaking bodies. Guidelines adopted by competent ABS authorities. Community protocols published by community, civil society, governmental organisations. Annual reports from partnering local organisations and the national focal points for the ITPGRFA and CBD/NP. Verifying outcomes - Indicator 3. Records published in the clearing house mechanisms established under the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA regarding completed ABS agreements. Project reports and publications, impact assessment reports.	Assumption 1. There is political will to implement the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA in the countries. Assumption 2. The lead agencies in both countries will work together to develop mutually supportive policies, laws, guidelines and mechanisms and actively promote their adoption by relevant decision-making bodies. Assumption 3. The national governments are willing to promote indigenous peoples, local communities and farmer organisations proactive, empowered engagement in regulating access to genetic resources and related traditional knowledge, including equitable representation of women and men.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	At present the communities are not empowered /able to initiate/negotiate such agreements on their own terms with a range of national and international GR providers. Measuring outcomes – Indicator 4. Investments made by communities (year 1), public authorities (year 2) and access-seekers (at least two agreements by year 3) to strengthen the communities' capacity to conserve and sustainably use biological/genetic resources. There are currently no investments in genetic resource conservation programmes in the 4 tentatively identified groups of communities.	Verifying outcomes - Indicator 4. Project reports regarding conservation programmes in the communities; community organisation websites. Conservation investment strategies. Records published in the clearing house mechanisms established under the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA regarding completed ABS agreements.	
Output 1 New national interagency access and benefit-sharing policy coordinating committee in Benin and Madagascar established, instigating and reviewing research, capacity building and policy development and implementation activities.	1a. Within 6 months, representatives of lead agencies and other stakeholder groups agree concerning membership, modus operandi for each national project steering committee (SC) (in Benin and Madagascar), and its relationship to other coordination mechanisms in the country. 1b. Within 8 months, two working papers (one each in Benin and Madagascar) outlining a portfolio of legislation, policies and guidelines and complementary research and capacity building activities, which need to be developed over the life of the project, endorsed by the SCs. 1c. SC meetings organised in Benin and Madagascar every 4 months to guide project implementation, and associated minutes disseminated to relevant stakeholders. 1d. Confirmation by the end of the project, by competent national authorities	1a. Newspaper reports, publications, meeting minutes and reports, on-line data bases, project partners websites 1b. Training materials 1c. Records published in clearing house mechanisms established under the CBD/NP and ITPGRA, community biodiversity registries	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	responsible for implementation of the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA, that the coordination activities as supported by the Steering Committee during the project will be continued, in a sustainable form, after the life of the project.		
Output 2 Draft policies, guidelines, orders, legislation, to implement both the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA including provisions recognising of the role of local communities as biological diversity stewards with attendant interests and rights. Mechanisms to promote mutual support in daily administration of those systems	2a. In year 1, year 2 and year 3, local and national level consultation meetings are held in Benin and Madagascar, regarding implementation options and policies under development, with equitable representation of women and men, local peoples and farmer organisations. 2b. Expert drafting committee (EDC), including experts drawn from local community and women's organisations, selected by the national project steering committee, with terms of reference developed by the committee in consultation with Bioversity International and ABS Initiative. 2c. 2 White Papers (1 each in Benin and Madagascar) outlining options with annexed drafts of policies, laws, guidelines developed by 18 months, drafted by EDC and submitted to SCs, and subsequently shared with national level consultation meetings. Revised policies approved by SCs introduced into formal national decision-making processes by end of year 3. 2d. Interagency guidelines for addressing uncertainties about which agreements apply under different situations, promoting efficient, proactive cooperation between functionaries implementing the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA.	2a. <*Verified by consultation meeting reports, video, photographs … (example)*> 2b.	2a. <*We are assuming that people are willing and able to express their views freely without social or political pressures to follow a certain line. (example)*>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	The guidelines will be submitted in year 2.5 by the steering committee to the competent national authorities for the implementation of the CBD/NP and the ITPGRFA.		
Output 3 Critical mass of national actors in each country trained to implement, and operate under, the international regime on access and benefit sharing	3a. By 18 months, list confirmed in Benin and Madagascar of public offices, officers, and other stakeholders that will be involved in the daily implementation of the ABS measure to be implemented, including 'outreach' officers who will be needed to help stakeholders operate under the systems created 3b. Approximately 50 functionaries per country in Benin and Madagascar trained to implement the international regime of ABS, through a series of training sessions, by end of year 3. 3c. User manual for the ABS mechanisms developed by the SCs in Benin and Madagascar and submitted to the competent national authorities for adoption and disseminated to a wider range of national actors by end of year 3.	3a.	
Output 4 Organisations have capacities strengthened to provide specialised assistance services for communities to access and provide biological resources and know-how pursuant to ABS rules. Representatives from local community, women and farmer organisations receive assistance in making decisions about resources they want to provide or access, and to negotiate access and benefit-sharing agreements. Model community protocols which guarantee participation of	4a. Identification of lead partners (1 in each community) subject to approval by national project steering committee and women and men community representatives within 6 months. 4b. 2 awareness-raising workshops per country by mid-year 2 for women and men from the four communities, and 2 capacity-strengthening workshops per country by year 3, including focussed 'capacity strengthening for capacity strengtheners' engagement, co-organized by, and with technical support from national competent		

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
women's organisations in governance developed for decision-making and negotiating by communities.	authorities and scientists from national agricultural research and environmental research organizations. 4c. Community protocols adopted by relevant community authorities by year 3 in the four project communities. 4d. At least 6 ABS agreements piloted with community organisations as providers or recipients of GR and/or associated knowledge in Benin and Madagascar by year 3.		
Output 5 Baseline survey of information about local biodiversity status, trends and needs; women and men users; and potential markets. Documentation concerning GRs that are potentially available from Madagascar and Benin for access seekers, including information about potentially valuable traits, geographic areas, uses, etc. Documentation of genetic resources needed by farmers in Madagascar and Benin for improved food security in light of current stresses to agricultural production systems. Conservation investment strategies developed for local communities	5a. 1 baseline survey and synthesis per country presented to stakeholders consultation and Steering Committee in year 1; published online by end of year 1. 5b. 4 community biodiversity registries developed by specialist steward/user groups (e.g. traditional healers, women's market-chain development initiatives, custodian farmers), with technical support from national and district agricultural and environmental organisations by end of year 3. 5c, Indicator 3. 2 reports, prepared by local farmer organisations and national and district agricultural and environmental organisations, which analyse stresses to the communities' agricultural production systems and related needs for adapted germplasm in Benin and Madagascar from domestic and international sources, by year 2. 5d. 4 communities develop conservation investment strategies, by year 3, with technical support from national competent authorities.		

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1) Activity 1.1 Form national project oversight committees, drawing on existing mechanisms, or created de novo, including representatives of farmer, local community, civil society, private sector organisations, ensuring equitable representation of women and men. Activity 1.2 Project steering committee coordinates and oversees project supported research and capacity building and policy development activities Activity 1.3 Project steering committees submits proposal to competent national authorities for sustainable, coordination between the organizations responsible for implementation of the ITPGRFA/MLS and CBD/NP after the three-year life of the project (with continued support from Steering Committee if deemed appropriate by the competent national authorities). Activity 2.1 Steering committees identify implementation options based on baseline survey, expert knowledge, stakeholder consultations. Activity 2.2 Expert groups draft policy, legal instruments and guidelines. Activity 2.3 Steering committees organise further consultation on drafts and oversee process of revision. Activity 2.4 Steering committees submit draft policies laws, guidelines to relevant competent authorities for consideration/adoption and support follow-up processes. Activity 3.1 National project steering committees develop annotated organigram of governmental and non-governmental actors, promoting equitable representation of women and men, that need to be engaged in daily administration/functioning of the CBD/NP, MLS, including mutually supportive mechanisms, roles, responsibilities, connections, decision-points, processes for consultation through committee on difficult-to-decide cases. Activity 3.2 For functionaries identified in 3.1 above, provide awareness raising and training on how the system will function, how to execute their responsibilities. Activity 3.3 Develop and disseminate manual(s) providing guidance for people operating and using the ABS mechanisms in Benin and Madagascar. Activity 4.1 Identify at 1 lead organization in each of the 4 communities across the two countries for in-depth project research, capacity building. Activity 4.2 Conduct initial awareness raising and capacity strengthening workshops (including 'capacity strengthening for capacity strengtheners'), Co-organised with national competent authorities. Workshops to ensure equitable representation of women and men, proactively promoting participation of women's organisations. Activity 4.3 Support women and men in at least two communities to identify appropriate mechanisms (e.g. biodiversity registries, community ABS protocols, organisations to develop specialised capacity) to help communities address ABS issues. Activity 4.4 Draft protocols, hold consultations, redraft protocols and/or other forms of guidelines for ABS related decision making at community level, including equitable representation of women and men, with technical support from national competent authorities and scientists from national agricultural and environment research organizations. Activity 4.5 Adoption of protocol and possibly related guidelines. Activity 4.6 Development of community biodiversity conservation investment plans by community partners, with support provided by national competent authorities for the implementation of the ITPGRFA, CBD/NP and scientists from national agricultural and environmental organizations. Activity 4.7 Support discussions/negotiations between potential providers and potential recipients of genetic resources and traditional knowledge, (with at least one recipient or provider being located in Madagascar and Benin) with objective of developing access and benefit sharing agreements. If negotiations are successful, finalise ABS agreements. National competent authorities and scientists from national research organizations will provide support for this process as appropriate. Activity 4.8 Identify the potential interest of the private sector to collaborate with the project local communities. Activity 5.1 The national steering committees develop terms of reference for the baseline surveys and engage research teams, including equitable representation of women and men.			

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Activity 5.2 Researchers appointed by the Steering Committee complete baseline survey and synthesis. Present to stakeholders at workshops for feedback and revisions. Activity 5.3 Publish synthesis on line and 'spin off' policy briefs related to policy options and processes that need to be followed to put systems in place in each country. Activity 5.4 Women and men in biodiversity-rich communities develop biodiversity registries (or other forms of collating information about biological diversity and uses) to, among other things, increase local awareness of biological diversity and issues associated with its erosion or conservation, increase their capacity to attract access-seekers, and to develop more advantageous ABS agreements. Women and men in communities working in close collaboration with scientists from national agricultural and environmental research organisations identify stresses to local agricultural production systems, and potentially adapted germplasm (and associated know-how) from national and foreign sources that could assist in addressing local needs/vulnerabilities.			

Annex 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
Impact *Increased investment in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources in Benin and Madagascar and increased equitable benefit-sharing with stewards and providers of those resources.*		The project has increased community and national public research organizations' investments in the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources in Madagascar and Benin. These investments are reflected in the creation and maintenance of community biodiversity registries and community seed banks. They are further reflected in the community biodiversity investment plans developed through the project, and the four community biocultural protocols. By putting in place national-level mechanisms to implement the ITPGRFA and Nagoya Protocol, both countries have set up infrastructures for increased investments in the future, by the communities themselves, and public and private organizations that seek to access, use, conserve and commercially exploit genetic resources. The project has furthermore piloted the use of those systems, by identifying/locating potentially useful genetic resources for deployment in stressed local agroecosystems, and demonstrating how agreements for the legal exchange of those materials can be made to benefit local, resource poor recipients/users of those genetic resources. At the same time, the project has strengthened the links between local communities and national and international organizations involved in conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.
Outcome In Madagascar and Benin, a range of stakeholders will make access and benefit sharing agreements that contribute to pro-poor rural development and offset the cost of conserving genetic resources.	Indicator 1. Access and benefit-sharing policies, orders, guidelines, legislation, community protocols and processes to implement the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA/MLS are formally adopted by year 3 (or are in the pipeline for adoption having been properly submitted to the appropriate policymaking bodies). Indicator 2. Formal governmental recognition, by year 3, of the rights of four groups of local communities (and the rights of women within those communities) in Benin and Madagascar to	Indicator 1. Both countries developed policies to implement the ITPGRFA and the NP in a mutually supportive manner at the national level (activity 1.3), and Biocultural Community Protocols that address both the mechanism that access seekers need to follow to obtain genetic resources from the communities, and the process to be followed by the communities when a request is received in the community (activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5). Indicator 2. Indicator 2. The realization of farmers' rights was always present throughout the development of the biocultural community protocols. Indicator 3. The capacities of the four communities have been strengthened through various workshops organized at the local level (see activity 4.2) and through the development of the biocultural community protocols and biodiversity registries (activities 4.3, 4.4, 4.5). The four communities requested, received and exchanged materials

	participate in decision-making around management of biological/genetic resources, and to a share of benefits derived from other uses of those resources. By year 3, protocols developed by communities to guide how the communities themselves will exercise their rights. Indicator 3. By year 3, organisations from four groups of pilot communities will access genetic resources (and related know-how) of food-security crops, that are adapted for use in their stressed agricultural production systems. At present the communities are not empowered/able to initiate/ negotiate such agreements on their own terms with a range of national and international GR providers. Indicator 4. Investments made by communities (year 1), public authorities (year 2) and access-seekers (at least two agreements by year 3) to strengthen the communities' capacity to conserve and sustainably use biological/genetic resources. There are currently no investments in genetic resource conservation programmes in the four tentatively identified groups of communities.	from external sources (activity 4.7). Indicator 4. There have been significant investments by the four communities in the development of biodiversity registries, biocultural protocols, and community investment plans, and by public authorities in the project overall (activity 4.8). Bioversity and the ABS Initiative also made substantial in-kind contributions for the implementation of the community-level project activities (activities 4.2 and 4.3).
Output 1. New national interagency access and benefit-sharing policy coordinating committee in Benin and Madagascar established, instigating and reviewing research, capacity building and policy development and implementation activities.	Indicator 1. Within 6 months, representatives of lead agencies and other stakeholder groups agree concerning membership, modus operandi for each national project steering committee (SC) (in Benin and Madagascar), and its relationship to other coordination mechanisms in the	Indicator 1. NPICs were formed in both countries in year 1 (see activity 1). Indicator 2. A combined road map was produced in year 1 for Benin & Madagascar specifying policy & legal instruments to be developed in each country within the project framework (activity 2.1). Indicator 3. The NPICs of both countries met regularly to assess the status of implementation of the project.

	country. Indicator 2. Within 8 months, two working papers (one each in Benin and Madagascar) outlining a portfolio of legislation, policies and guidelines and complementary research and capacity building activities, which need to be developed over the life of the project, endorsed by the SCs. Indicator 3. SC meetings organised in Benin and Madagascar every 4 months to guide project implementation, and associated minutes disseminated to relevant stakeholders. Indicator 4. Confirmation by the end of the project, by competent national authorities responsible for implementation of the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA, that the coordination activities as supported by the Steering Committee during the project will be continued, in a sustainable form, after the life of the project.	Indicator 4. Such mechanisms have been put in place in both countries (see activity 1.3).
Activity 1.1 Form national project oversight committees, drawing on existing mechanisms, or created de novo, including representatives of farmer, local community, civil society, private sector organisations, ensuring equitable representation of women and men.		National Project Implementation Committees (NPICs) were formed in both countries. These included representatives of all relevant stakeholder groups in the country. In Benin, these were INRAB, the General Directorate of Waters, Forests and Hunting, the NGO CeSaReN, representatives of the two local communities participating in the project (i.e. Bonou and Tori-Bossito), and a resource person from Bioversity International's Benin office. The NPIC from Madagascar included representatives from the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research; the National Research Center (FOFIFA); the National Research Center Madagascar-Norway/FIFAMANOR, of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the Ministry in charge of the Environment of Ecology and Forests, the Ministry of Industrialization and Private Sector Development, from the 'peasant coalition of Madagascar, of the FAMA Cooperative (Analavory) and from the local community Voi Firaisankina, from Andasibe/Antavolobe. Both NPICs were co-chaired by the National Focal Points of the NP and ITPGRFA. In Madagascar, the NPIC was created by merging two, pre-existing, committees that had been formed to guide implementation of the NP and the

	ITPGRFA as separate exercises. In Benin, an ABS National Committee had been created, prior to this project, to address the implementation of the CBD and the NP. With this Darwin Initiative project raising awareness and profile of the ITPGRFA in the country, the lead agencies decided to expand the mandate of the ABS National Committee to include implementation of the ITPGRFA, and added a range of new members to the Committee to reflect that expanded mandate, including plant breeders, farmers and producer organizations from the selected four project communities. Consultations between the Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin (INRAB), and the Direction Générale des Forêts et des Ressources Naturelles resulted in an agreement on the essential contents and the establishment of the NPIC. A formal INRAB Decision defining the duration, duties, composition and operation of the NPIC is included in Annex 7.1 to this report.
Activity 1.2, Project steering committee coordinates and oversees project supported research and capacity building and policy development activities.	The NPICs met regularly to guide the implementation of the project. Main tasks undertaken by these committees during the three-year implementation period includes i) developing a detailed project action plan based on the project implementation logframe; ii) establishing the terms of reference for consultants engaged in project activities (e.g., baseline surveys); iii) validating the results of the baseline surveys; iv) following up the process for developing, getting approved and implementing juridical instruments (i.e. decrees/orders); v) organizing workshops and consultations to involve national stakeholders and local communities in project activities; vi) coordinating support for the communities to develop biocultural community protocols and community biodiversity registries; vii) supporting discussions/negotiations between providers and recipients of genetic resources; and viii) liaising with the international experts and Secretariats of the ITPGRFA and CBD/NP through the EGC.
Activity 1.3 Project steering committees submits proposal to competent national authorities for sustainable coordination between the organizations responsible for implementation of the ITPGRFA/MLS and CBD/NP after the three year life of the project (with continued support from Steering Committee if deemed appropriate by the competent national authorities).	Benin has developed a unified, ‘one window’ system for the implementation of both the ITPGRFA and the NP together. This was achieved through the adoption of a single interministerial Decree and appointment of a single National Competent Authority, and creation of a single multistakeholder committee to oversee implementation of the Decree. This system depends upon, and ensures that, the competent national authorities are continuously coordinating, engaging and working together in a long-term, sustainable manner. In Madagascar, the lead agencies developed separate systems for implementing the two agreements with clearly defined boundaries between the two and coordination mechanisms, where necessary, to address ‘boundary issues’ that could arise in the day-to-day implementation of the system. The National Competent Authority for the ITPGRFA will be a member of the multistakeholder committee guiding implementation of the NP. The commitment of the competent authorities to work together in a long-term, sustainable manner is reflected in the fact that they have jointly developed guidelines to be used by genetic resource access seekers and public servants administering the

		systems concerned (see activities 3.1 and 3.2 and outcomes 2.4 and 3.3 below).
Output 2. Draft policies, guidelines, orders, legislation, to implement both the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA including provisions recognising of the role of local communities as biological diversity stewards with attendant interests and rights. Mechanisms to promote mutual support in daily administration of those systems.	Indicator 1. In year 1, year 2 and year 3, local and national level consultation meetings are held in Benin and Madagascar, regarding implementation options and policies under development, with equitable representation of women and men, local peoples and farmer organisations. Indicator 2. Expert drafting committee (EDC), including experts drawn from local community and women's organisations, selected by the national project steering committee, with terms of reference developed by the committee in consultation with Bioversity International and ABS Initiative. Indicator 3. 2 White Papers (1 each in Benin and Madagascar) outlining options with annexed drafts of policies, laws, guidelines developed by 18 months, drafted by EDC and submitted to SCs, and subsequently shared with national level consultation meetings. Revised policies approved by SCs introduced into formal national decision-making processes by end of year 3. Indicator 4. Interagency guidelines for addressing uncertainties about which agreements applies under different situations, promoting efficient, proactive cooperation between functionaries implementing the CBD/NP and ITPGRFA. The guidelines will be submitted in year 2.5 by the steering committee to the competent national authorities for the implementation of the CBD/NP and the ITPGRFA.	Indicator 1. In both countries, consultations were organized at the national and level during the preparation and validation of the interim measures and at the local level to discuss with community leaders and other community members regarding the biocultural community protocols and community biodiversity registries (see activities 2.3, 2.4, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4). Indicator 2. "Biodiversity Management Committees" were set up in the communities for coordinating and managing the development of the community biodiversity registries (see activity 5.4). Indicator 3. The two white papers were produced in year 2. Thereafter, national instruments were approved for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP in both countries. Indicator 4. Combined with indicator 3.3. National partners have developed a report summarizing the systems that have been put in place in each country throughout the implementation of this project for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP (see activity 3.1).
Activity 2.1 Steering committees identify implementation options based on baseline		Based on the results of the baseline surveys conducted during year 1 (Annexes

survey, expert knowledge, stakeholder consultations.	7.2 and 7.3) and on expert consultations, the two teams developed a road map of the legal and policy instruments that needed to be developed for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP in their respective countries (see activities 1.3, 2.2 and 2.4). Notably, both Benin and Madagascar chose to first establish an interim legal framework before initiating the process of developing fully-fledged laws to implement the NP and the ITPGRFA. This allowed both countries to create legal certainty for cases related to access and benefit sharing (ABS) within a relatively short time and to gain practical experience, which will inform the development of their future ABS laws. A comparative summary of the two countries' approaches is set out in Annex 7.4.
Activity 2.2. Expert groups draft policy, legal instruments and guidelines.	Both country teams developed ministerial decrees and orders to implement the ITPGRFA and the NP in a mutually supportive manner (see activity 1.3). In partnership with representatives of local communities, they also developed community biodiversity protocols, one for each of the four case study communities.
Activity 2.3 Steering committees organise further consultation on drafts and oversee process of revision.	Early drafts of the ministerial decrees and orders were subject to consultation meetings with nationally based experts and representatives of immediately affected organizations, including representatives of the four case study communities. The EGC commented on the drafts before they were adopted by the appropriate levels of government. The national teams thereafter decided to develop subsidiary instruments in the form of 'orders' pursuant to the adopted decrees, to implement particular aspects of both the ITPGRFA and the NP in more detail (see activity 2.4). Over the course of the project seven consultation workshops were organized in Benin and in 11 in Madagascar as part of the process of developing and validating the decrees and orders that were eventually adopted. Many of these workshops were supported by the ABS Initiative. The Darwin project provided resources (experts, additional workshop time) to increase the scope of the exercises to include farmers, representatives from national agricultural research organizations and crop, forage and agroforestry genetic resources.
Activity 2.4 Steering committees submit draft policies laws, guidelines to relevant competent authorities for consideration/adoption and support follow-up processes.	The "Decree on national guidelines on access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their use in the Republic of Benin" was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 15 March 2017 (Annex 7.5). At the time of writing this report, it was with the Secretariat of the Government to be signed by the President. In Madagascar, two new decrees were adopted, one linked to each international agreement. On 31 January 2017, the government and the Council of Ministers

		adopted the Decree for the implementation of the NP (Decree N°2017-066, 31/01/2017 regulating ABS resulting from the use of genetic resources - see Annex 7.6). On May 16 2017, the Prime Minister adopted the order No. 11 567/2017 on Interim Measures to apply for access and benefit sharing to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture under the multilateral system of access and benefit sharing of the ITPGRFA[6] (see Annex 7.7). Both instruments make cross-references to each other, clearly indicating where one applies and the other does not. They are both available at the ABS Clearing House of the CBD (https://absch.cbd.int/countries/MG). After putting these measures in place, the Madagascar team initiated the process of developing legislation to implement the ITPGRFA. This legislation will build on the two legal instruments recently adopted, further entrenching the ITPGRFA implementation in the country. It is considered by the lead partners that in the longer term, legislation will provide a more durable form of legal support for ITPGRFA implementation. FAO Legal has provided technical assistance to the lead national partners in Madagascar developing a draft legislative text, which was subsequently made the subject of some consultative meetings by the end of this project. Work on the legislation will continue after this project ends. In the meanwhile, the decrees and orders are now in place in Madagascar for the mutual implementation of the ITPGRFA and NP.
Output 3. Critical mass of national actors in each country trained to implement, and operate under, the international regime on access and benefit sharing, etc.	Indicator 1. By 18 months, list confirmed in Benin and Madagascar of public offices, officers, and other stakeholders that will be involved in the daily implementation of the ABS measure to be implemented, including 'outreach' officers who will be needed to help stakeholders operate under the systems created. Indicator 2. Approximately 50 functionaries per country in Benin and Madagascar trained to implement the international regime of ABS, through a series of training sessions, by end of	Indicator 1. The different stakeholders involved in the daily implementation of the systems put in place through the project were identified and established by the decrees/orders adopted. Indicator 2. Great efforts were made throughout the implementation of the project to support training of a broad range of stakeholders at national and community levels. See activity 3.2. Indicator 3.See indicator 2.4.

[6] Arrete Nº 567/2017 Portant sur les mesures intérimaires de demande d'accès aux Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture et de partage des avantages dans le cadre du Système Multilatéral du Traité International sur les Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture.

	year 3. Indicator 3. User manual for the ABS mechanisms developed by the SCs in Benin and Madagascar and submitted to the competent national authorities for adoption and disseminated to a wider range of national actors by end of year 3.	
Activity 3.1 National project steering committees develop annotated organigram of governmental and non-governmental actors, promoting equitable representation of women and men, that need to be engaged in daily administration/functioning of the CBD/NP, MLS, including mutually supportive mechanisms, roles, responsibilities, connections, decision-points, processes for consultation through committee on difficult-to-decide cases.		The project's EGC recommended that this activity be combined with activity 3.3 below to produce a single set of guidelines in each country (that would be a combination of indicator 2.4 'Interagency guidelines for addressing uncertainties about which agreements applies under different situations, promoting efficient, proactive' (as per indicator 2.4) and 3.3 'User manual for the ABS mechanisms developed by the SCs in Benin and Madagascar (as per indicator 3.3). These guidelines introduce the legal instruments and systems established in each country for the mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP, describing the public bodies involved in the administration of those new laws; they also include 'how to' steps for access seekers applying for access to plant genetic resources in the country, including forms and templates to be completed when submitting requests. Very significantly, in both countries, these guidelines were co-developed by the two lead agencies responsible for the administration of the ITPGRFA and CBD/NP respectively. The guidelines are included in Annexes 7.8 and 7.9.
Activity 3.2 For functionaries identified in 3.1 above, provide awareness raising and training on how the system will function, how to execute their responsibilities.		Throughout the project lifespan, numerous workshops and events were organized by the two national teams to increase awareness among stakeholders on the systems and legal frameworks put in place in each country, including public officials who will be responsible for their administration. More details about awareness raising and consultation meetings organized in both countries throughout the project cycle are provided under activities 4.2 and 4.3 below.
Activity 3.3 Develop and disseminate manual(s) providing guidance for people operating and using the ABS mechanisms in Benin and Madagascar.		As described under Activity 3.1, the EGC recommended merging these two activities, and the related outputs. The final outputs are included in Annexes 7.8 and 7.9.
Output 4. Organisations have capacities strengthened to provide specialised assistance services for communities to access and provide biological resources and know-how pursuant to ABS rules. Representatives from local community, women and farmer organisations receive assistance in making decisions about resources they want to provide or	Indicator 1. Identification of lead partners (1 in each community) subject to approval by national project steering committee and women and men community representatives within 6 months. Indicator 2. 2 awareness-raising workshops per country by mid-year 2 for women and men from the four	Indicator 1. The lead organization in each of the communities in Benin and Madagascar was identified in year 1 (see Activity 4.1). Indicator 2. Awareness raising workshops and trainings about the ITPGRFA, climate change resilience, genetic resources management and community ABS tools and mechanisms were conducted throughout the implementation of the project in both countries (see activities 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4). Indictor 3. By the end of the project, the biocultural community protocols of the four communities were finalized and recognized by the respective local

access, and to negotiate access and benefit-sharing agreements. Model community protocols which guarantee participation of women's organisations in governance developed for decision-making and negotiating by communities.	communities, and 2 capacity-strengthening workshops per country by year 3, including focussed 'capacity strengthening for capacity strengtheners' engagement, co-organized by, and with technical support from national competent authorities and scientists from national agricultural research and environmental research organizations. Indicator 3. Community protocols adopted by relevant community authorities by year 3 in the four project communities. Indicator 4. At least 6 ABS agreements piloted with community organisations as providers or recipients of GR and/or associated knowledge in Benin and Madagascar by year 3.	governments. Indicator 4. The six ABS agreements and corresponding exchange of materials were conducted by the end of the project (see activity 4.7).
Activity 4.1 Identify 1 lead organization in each of the 4 communities across the two countries for in-depth project research, capacity building.		During year 1, the lead organization in each of the two communities of Benin and Madagascar was identified. In Benin, the two lead organizations comprised local biodiversity management committees: "Comité de gestion des forêts sacrées de Bonou" (13 members, two of which women, who represented the interface between the Committee, as a decision-making body, and the women of the community), and a newly established committee (eight members) in Tori-Bossito, which was supported by Jeunesse Sans Frontière (NGO active in agricultural production and medicinal plants). The lead organizations in the two Madagascar communities were **"**VOI Firaisan-Kina" (62 members, 26 of which, including the president, women), a local community-based organization dealing with forest management, in Antavolobe/Andasibe, and the "FAMA Cooperative", in Analavory (three board members, of which one woman).
Activity 4.2 Conduct initial awareness raising and capacity strengthening workshops (including 'capacity strengthening for capacity strengtheners'), Co-organised with national competent authorities. Workshops to ensure equitable representation of women and men, proactively promoting participation of women's organisations.		Throughout the project, awareness-raising workshops at the national, regional and local levels were organized in both countries to boost ITPGRFA awareness and to enhance related technical expertise of key actors, including researchers, extension services, private sector, farmers and community members, about the mutually supportive implementation of both agreements. In both countries, most of these events were covered by local news media. In Madagascar, a national workshop was held in November 2015, with 130 participants (80 men and 50 women), including representatives from central government and the 22 regions of Madagascar. At the community level, five workshops were conducted in November 2015 in August and September 2016 and in September 2017. In total, 197 community members participated to these

	events, 76 of which were women). In Benin, a national awareness-raising workshop was conducted and attended by 39 men and 13 women. Five additional department-level workshops were organized by the national partners, with support from Bioversity-Benin, in December 2015. In total, 43 women and 175 men participated. At the community level, two workshops were organized in January and February 2018, with a total of 99 community member participants, 24 of whom were women. In addition, Bioversity International worked with the partners from Benin and Madagascar to organize additional (beyond what was proposed in this Darwin project) workshops on resilient seed systems and adaptation to climate change in the four communities. In Benin, these took place in December 2015 and August 2016 (125 participants in total, 30 of whom women). In Madagascar, these workshops were conducted in July 2016 (46 participants, 27 of whom women). These workshops led to the production of their respective reports (Annexes 7.10, 7.11 and 7.12) and of two additional info notes that had not been anticipated in the project proposal (Annexes 7.13 and 7.14). This activity was made possible using additional funding from another project entitled 'Genetic Resource Policy Initiative' (GRPI project). Furthermore, in year 3, Bioversity International provided the two national teams with an additional USD 3,750 to support the finalization of these community-level project activities.
Activity 4.3 Support women and men in at least two communities to identify appropriate mechanisms (e.g. biodiversity registries, community ABS protocols, organisations to develop specialised capacity) to help communities address ABS issues.	As previously reported, this activity required additional time, finances and engaged more partners in the community-level activities than anticipated. Over the three years, the project supported a number of community-level workshops each to raise awareness about the ITPGRFA and NP, and to introduce communities to different tools, methods for developing (or not) biocultural protocols, biodiversity registries, etc. Project partners organized meetings in their respective countries. In total, nine meetings were organized in Benin (attended by 558 stakeholders, including community members) and 11 meetings in Madagascar (393 participants, including community members). As part of this process, in year 2, the communities confirmed their interest in developing biocultural community protocols and community biodiversity registries, and further agreed on the type of registry, who would manage it, and how data would be collected. Consultants from Natural Justice, supported by the ABS Initiative, together with two staff members from Bioversity's Benin and Uganda offices, supported the community-level work in both countries.
Activity 4.4 Draft protocols, hold consultations, redraft protocols and/or other forms of guidelines for ABS related decision making at community level, including equitable representation of women and men, with technical support from national competent authorities and scientists from national agricultural and environment research organizations.	Once the communities decided that they wanted to develop biocultural community protocols, the project sponsored follow-up activities to develop them (and the biodiversity registries). The two national teams organized a number of training workshops during the second and third year of the project to support actors involved in the process of developing and getting the biocultural community protocols recognized at the community, regional and national levels. These workshops allowed communities to make decisions on the biocultural

	community protocols' content, the way forward for their elaboration, and to reflect on the connections between the community protocols and Farmers' Rights. The first drafts of the biocultural community protocols from the four communities were shared with the EGC for suggestions and comments. At the community level, in Benin, in total, 12 consultations were organized, attended by 440 people, including 103 women. Additionally, focus groups, attended by 200 people, including 50 women, were held to collect information for the biocultural community protocols. Nine workshops were held in Madagascar, attended by 407 people, including 216 women. Similarly, in Madagascar, two meetings were organized at the community level targeted to different stakeholders, including members of the FAMA cooperative, farmers, and the Mayor of each municipality. In Benin, workshops were also organized at the regional (departmental) level aiming at building policy and administrative decision-makers' and other stakeholders' capacities in the two regions/departments about the importance of having the protocols recognized by stakeholders outside of the communities. These workshops took place in August, October and December 2017. In total, 148, including 28 women, participated to these events. At the national level, a similar workshop was organized in September 2017. In total, there were 40 participants, eight of whom, women, including representatives of community organizations, professional associations and national NGOs, representatives of ministries and national services, national association of municipalities, and jurists (magistrates and lawyers). As mentioned in activity 4.2 above, Bioversity International was able to deliver additional funds to the two national teams from the GRPI project to support the finalization of these activities.
Activity 4.5 Adoption of protocol and possibly related guidelines.	By the end of the project, the biocultural community protocols for the two communities of Madagascar were adopted by the relevant municipal authorities (December 2017), one of which was also adopted by the Regional Directorate for the Environment, Ecology and Forests (DREEF). In Benin, the protocols were adopted and finalized by participating community members and representatives of the municipal governments (in their personal capacity). These draft protocols were submitted to the municipal governments of the two communities on November 17, 2017 in Tori-Bossito and on March 28 and 29, 2018 in Bonou. The four protocols are included in Annexes 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 7.18. As part of the process of developing the protocols in Benin, the Benin NPIC commissioned a study on access to PGRFA in Benin (at national and community level). This study, entitled 'Documentation du mécanisme d'accès aux Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture par les Parties prenantes au Bénin', is included in Annex 7.19.
Activity 4.6 Development of community biodiversity conservation investment plans by community partners, with support provided by national competent authorities for	This activity was supported by the workshops described in activities 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. The investment plans for the four communities were developed in year 2 by

the implementation of the ITPGRFA, CBD/NP and scientists from national agricultural and environmental organizations.	national partners together with the communities concerned (see Annexes 7.20, 7.21, 7.22, 7.23). Bioversity International also provided a further USD 10,000 (from the GRPI project) to support the construction of a community seed bank in Tori-Bossito and in Analavory, as proposed in their investment plans.
Activity 4.7 Support discussions/negotiations between potential providers and potential recipients of genetic resources and traditional knowledge, (with at least one recipient or provider being located in Madagascar and Benin) with objective of developing access and benefit sharing agreements. If negotiations are successful, finalise ABS agreements. National competent authorities and scientists from national research organizations will provide support for this process as appropriate.	The following seven agreements have been formalized by the end of the project: The two communities from Madagascar (i.e. VOI Firaisan-Kina, from Antavolobe, and Santatra, from Analavory, signed the standard material transfer agreement (SMTA) with Africa Rice (a CGIAR pan-African rice research organization) to transfer samples of seven accessions of rice. In Madagascar, the project team partnered with FOFIFA (the National Center for Applied Research and Rural Development), Africa Rice and DRAE to identify potentially useful plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) to test their performance in the communities through participatory plant breeding. (MTA: 2018-005, 14 March 2018; SMTA2018-AfR-005). (The first page and annex 1 of these agreements are included in Annexes 7.24 and 7.25). INRAB accesses materials from IITA: The team from Benin requested samples of beans accessions from the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA). Representatives of INRAB and IITA signed an SMTA page and Annex 1 of the SMTA are included in Annex 7.26). Exchange of materials between the two communities in Benin: National partners organized a workshop for the exchange of seeds between the communities of Bonou and Tori-Bossito on 23 March 2017 (65 participants, of whom 13 women). The materials were: ahipa, white potato, bean, cassava and maize from Bonou to Tori-Bossito and maize from Tori-Bossito to Bonou. Once the materials of interest to each of the respective communities were identified, an ABS agreement was signed between the representatives of each community (Annex 7.27) (see Annex 7.28 for the workshop report). Thereafter, a field visit to Tori-Bossito was conducted on 14 September 2017 to assess the performance of the seeds that had been obtained during the previous visit. Exchange of materials between the two countries: A teleconference between the two national teams was held on 25 August 2017. National partners discussed about the process to exchange materials between the two communities. Based on the results obtained in the exercises conducted under the ‘resilient seed systems’ workshop’ (see activity 4.2), partners from Benin and Madagascar decided on the materials to be exchanged. As a result, the following two exchanges of materials were conducted: 1) INRAB, Benin, sent four bean accessions to the FAMA Cooperative, Madagascar, through an SMTA (the first page and annex 1 of that SMTA are included in Annex 7.29). When INRAB received the request from the FAMA Cooperative, a ‘prospection mission’ was organized in Tori-Bossito to identify whether the requested materials were available. Four varieties of beans that responded to the requests from Madagascar were identified; these varieties were no longer part of large-

		scale production and were only found on the land of a smallholder farmer. Therefore, the varieties needed to be multiplied and characterized before they were sent to Madagascar. At the moment of writing this report, the material received is being used in the community of Madagascar to conduct participatory plant breeding; 2) The FAMA Cooperative, Madagascar, sent two white and red bean varieties to INRAB, Benin, through a SMTA, on 30 May 2018 (the first page and annex 1 of that SMTA are included in Annex 7.30). The materials of interest were identified based on the results of the baseline survey (see activity 5.2). Exchange of materials between the two communities in Madagascar: FAMA Cooperative (Analavory) to VOI Firaisankina (Andasibé) through an SMTA (the first page and annex 1 of that SMTA are included in Annex 7.31) on 16 June 2018. National partners organized two field missions to the two communities to recall the participatory exercises conducted under the 'resilient seed systems' workshop (see activity 4.2). The materials to be exchange between the communities were selected based on the results of the baseline survey (see activity 5.2) and on farmers' preferences. It was agreed that the most biodiversity-rich community (i.e. the FAMA Cooperative) would be the supplier and VOI FIRAISANKINA, from the other community, the recipient.
Activity 4.8 Identify the potential interest of the private sector to collaborate with the project local communities.		There have been significant in-kind contributions/investments by the four communities in the development of the community biodiversity registries, the biocultural community protocols, and the community investment plans, and by national public authorities in the project overall. In both countries, interactions between the private sector and the local communities were initiated based on the community investment plans (see activity 4.6). In Bonou, Benin, the Mayor gave two hectares of land to the community for the establishment of the botanical garden foreseen in the community investment plan. In Madagascar, farmers belonging to the FAMA cooperative, in Analavory, are currently collaborating with AGRIVET, a large seed company that is interested in collaborating with local seed producer groups. In Antavolobe, based on the investment plans, negotiations are currently underway between the community members and some private companies (e.g. Société Bionexx, Société Sotramex) to establish a value chain for *Centella asiatica*. Meetings and an implementation document have been developed with local communities following these negotiations (Annex 7.32).
Output 5. Baseline survey of information about local biodiversity status, trends and needs; women and men users; and potential markets. Documentation concerning GRs that are potentially available from Madagascar and Benin for access seekers, including information about	Indicator 1. 1 baseline survey and synthesis per country presented to stakeholders consultation and Steering Committee in year 1; published online by end of year 1. Indicator 2. 4 community biodiversity registries developed by specialist	Indicator 1. The baseline studies of both countries were conducted and finalised in year 1. Workshops were organized in both countries to present the main findings (activities 2.1, 5.1, 5.2). Indicator 2. The Community Biodiversity Registries were finalized and are currently being used by the four communities (see activity 5.3). Indicator 3. The two reports were written in year 2.

potentially valuable traits, geographic areas, uses, etc. Documentation of genetic resources needed by farmers in Madagascar and Benin for improved food security in light of current stresses to agricultural production systems. Conservation investment strategies developed for local communities.	steward/user groups (e.g. traditional healers, women's market-chain development initiatives, custodian farmers), with technical support from national and district agricultural and environmental organisations by end of year 3. Indicator 3. 2 reports, prepared by local farmer organisations and national and district agricultural and environmental organisations, which analyse stresses to the communities' agricultural production systems and related needs for adapted germplasm in Benin and Madagascar from domestic and international sources, by year 2. Indicator 4. 4 communities develop conservation investment strategies, by year 3, with technical support from national competent authorities.	Indicator 4. The community investment plans were developed in year 2 by the communities concerned, with the support of national partners. In year 3, the investment plans started to be implemented (activity 4.6).
Activity 5.1 The national steering committees develop terms of reference for the baseline surveys and engage research teams, including equitable representation of women and men.		In year 1, both NPICs reviewed and adapted terms of reference for the baseline studies. They also coordinated individual researchers and surveyors to do the survey.
Activity 5.2 Researchers appointed by the steering committee complete baseline survey and synthesis. Present to stakeholders at workshops for feedback and revisions.		The baseline studies (see Annexes 7.1 and 7.2 of this report, and activities 2.1 and 5.1 above) for both countries were finalised in year 1 and the main findings presented during national and local workshops.
Activity 5.3 Publish synthesis on line and 'spin off' policy briefs related to policy options and processes that need to be followed to put systems in place in each country.		The 'spin off' policy briefs were laid out and published in year 1 (Annexes 7.33 and 7.34).
Activity 5.4 Women and men in biodiversity-rich communities develop biodiversity registries (or other forms of collating information about biological diversity and uses) to, among other things, increase local awareness of biological diversity and issues associated with its erosion or conservation, increase their capacity to attract access-seekers, and to develop more advantageous ABS agreements. Women and men in communities working in close collaboration with scientists from national agricultural and environmental research organisations identify stresses to local agricultural production systems, and potentially adapted germplasm (and associated know-how) from national and foreign sources that could assist in addressing local needs/vulnerabilities.		Much of this work is reported under Activities 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 above. In all four communities, the biodiversity registries were finalized and validated by the communities (Annexes 7.35, 7.36, 7.37 and 7.38 – for confidentiality, partners have only shared the empty forms to be completed by the community. It was never the project's intention to openly publish these registries). The two national teams worked hard to raise the communities' awareness and prepare them to meaningfully participate in the process of developing the registries. Steps followed in the four communities for the development of the registries include: 1) Public awareness on the community biodiversity registries; 2) Establishment of a community management committee responsible for making proposals to other farmers for the main contents of the community register; 3) Capacity building of committee members on the identification and

	collection of data on biological resources and traditional knowledge; 4) Data collection, including: group discussion at the community level, sometimes, divided by gender; literature reviews of the community's natural resources, individual interviews with knowledgeable people and key institutional actors; and field observations; 5) Presentation of early drafts of the registries to all the member of the community; 6) Finalization of the registries taking into account the feedback received from the community members; and 7) Validation of the finalized registries. Documentation included photographs (including digital images), drawings, audio and video recordings, and any other recordings such as available print materials. Newly introduced species to the locality will also be progressively registered. Different registries were produced in the different communities: In Tori-Bossito, Benin, a register for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and another register for species of local plants with multiple uses or introduced on farms, sacred forests or private plantations, botanical gardens or house gardens, etc. In Bonou, the President and the Secretary of the Biodiversity Management Committee are responsible for the management of the register, which is kept at the royal palace of Bonou. In Tori-Bossito, the Vice-President and the Secretary of the Committee are responsible for the management of the register, which is kept at the Town Hall. In both localities, the entire local community has free access to the registries, but access by people from outside of the community is left to the discretion of the managers. In Analavory, Madagascar, the biodiversity register was established in 2017. It includes all plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (it has started with rice, maize and beans) and associated traditional knowledge existing within the boundaries of the rural Municipality, as well as resources conserved in institutions such as FOFIFA, FIFAMANOR, and NGOs. The president of the FAMA Cooperative, together with the Biodiversity Management Committee, keeps the register and is also responsible for its data management. The Antavolobe biodiversity register was also established at the beginning of 2017. It includes plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (starting with rice, cassava, beans and maize). Literate persons from the community (one per variety included in the register) have been chosen to maintain and update the register. It is foreseen that another register will be developed in the two communities to include medicinal forest species, such as medicinal plants and trees.

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Title or Focus	Language	Comments
Training Measures							
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis						
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained						
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained						
3	Number of other qualifications obtained						
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training						
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students						
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)						
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students						
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification (e.g., not categories 1-4 above)						
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (e.g., not categories 1-5 above)	Approximately 3.500 people	Beninese and Malagasy	M/F	Resilient seed systems, development of biocultural community protocols and biodiversity registries	French/Malagasy	Activities 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification						
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use						

	by host country(s) (describe training materials)						

Research Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Title	Language	Comments/ Weblink if available
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (ies)						
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	4	Beninese and Malagasy	M / F	Biodiversity Community Registries	Madagasy, French	Project's webpage
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals						
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere	4	Beninese and Malagasy	M/F	CCAFS Info Note	English/French	Project's webpage
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country						
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country						
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)						
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)						

Dissemination Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work						

Dissemination Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	4	Beninese and Malagasy	M / F	Mutually supportive implementation of the ITPGRFA and the NP	English	National partners participated in a side events (see section 4.6 'Transfer of knowledge' above)

Physical Measures		Total	Comments
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)		
21	Number of permanent educational, training, research facilities or organisation established		
22	Number of permanent field plots established		Please describe

Financial Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
23	Value of additional resources raised from other sources (e.g., in addition to Darwin funding) for project work	544,098 (£)					

Annex 4 Aichi Targets

	Aichi Target	Tick if applicable to your project
1	People are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.	x
2	Biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.	x
3	Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions.	
4	Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.	
5	The rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.	
6	All fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.	
7	Areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	x
8	Pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.	
9	Invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.	
10	The multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.	
11	At least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.	
12	The extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.	
13	The genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.	x
14	Ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking	

	into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	
15	Ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.	
16	The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	x
17	Each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.	
18	The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.	x
19	Knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.	
20	The mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.	

Annex 5 Publications

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Nationality of lead author	Nationality of institution of lead author	Gender of lead author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. web link, contact address etc.)
Report	Baseline study Benin Bienvenu Bossou, Toussaint Mikpon	Beninese	Beninese	M	N/A	Link available on the project website.
Report	Baseline study Madagascar Naritiana Rakotoniaina, Michelle Andriamahazo	Malagasy	Malagasy	F	N/A	Link available on the project website.
TV report Benin	Video Espace Agro, 2015	Beninese	Beninese	F	Benin	Available link at: Lancement officiel de la mise en oeuvre du projet Mutuel soutien du Protocole de Nagoya et le Traité international au Benin
TV report Madagascar	Video Service Information et Communication du MinAgri (novembre 2015)	Malagasy	Malagasy	M	TVM, Madagascar	
Media coverage Madagascar	TV journal TV PLUS Madagascar TVM Madagascar	Malagasy	Malagasy	F	TV PLUS Madagascar TVM Madagascar	
CCAFS Info	Enhancing capacity	Kenyan	Bioversity	F	Copenhagen,	Link available on the project

Note	of local communities to use the multilateral system of access and benefit sharing for climate change adaptation in Benin Gloria Otieno, Sognigbe N'Danikou, Bienvenu Bossou, Toussaint Mikpon, Raymond Vodouhe		International		Denmark. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS).	website.
CCAFS Info Note	Renforcement des capacités des communautés locales à utiliser le système multilatéral d'accès et de partage des avantages pour l'adaptation au changement climatique à Madagascar Naritiana Rakotoniaina, Michelle Andriamahazo, Nandrianina Rakotonandrasana, Rakotoniarivo Rodin, Gloria Otieno		Malagasy	F	Copenhagen, Denmark. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS).	Link available on the project website.

CCAFS Info Note	Activités au niveau communautaire au Bénin pour la mise en oeuvre en synergie du Protocole de Nagoya (PN/APA) et du Traité International sur les Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture Bienvenu Bossou, Toussaint Mikpon, Zounoukon Degnon Oba, Agbahounzo K. Blaise	Beninese	Beninese	M	Copenhagen, Denmark. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS).	Link available on the project website.
CCAFS Info Note	Engagements des communautés locales dans la mise en oeuvre mutuellement soutenue du Protocole de Nagoya et le Traité sur les Plantes Naritiana Rakotoniaina, Michelle Andriamahazo	Malagasy	Malagasy	F	Copenhagen, Denmark. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS).	Link available on the project website.
Manual	Guide simplifie de acces aux ressources	Malagasy	Malagasy	F	N/A	Link available on the project website.

	genetiques a Madagascar Naritiana Rakotoniaina, Michelle Andriamahazo					
Manual	Document synthese sur l'acces aux ressources genetiques au Benin Bienvenu Bossou, Toussaint Mikpon	Beninese	Beninese	M	N/A	Link available on the project website.
Manual/report	Documentation du mécanisme d'accès aux Ressources Phytogénétiques pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture par les Parties prenantes au Bénin Romuald A. Dossou	Beninese	Beninese	M	N/A	Link available on the project website.

Annex 6 Darwin Contacts

Ref No	22-017
Project Title	Mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and Plant Treaty
Project Leader Details	
Name	Michael Halewood
Role within Darwin Project	Project leader. Member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Lena Fey
Organisation	ABS Capacity Development Initiative, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
Role within Darwin Project	Member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 2	
Name	Naritiana Rakotoniaina
Organisation	Service d'Appui à la Gestion de l'Environnement (SAGE) (Madagascar)
Role within Darwin Project	Implementation of the project in Madagascar and member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 3	
Name	Michelle Andriamahazo
Organisation	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAE) (Madagascar)
Role within Darwin Project	Implementation of the project in Madagascar and member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 4	
Name	Bienvenu Bossou

Organisation	ONG Cercle de Sauvegarde des Ressources Naturelles (CeSaReN) (Benin)
Role within Darwin Project	Implementation of the project in Benin and member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 5	
Name	Toussaint Mikpon
Organisation	Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Benin (INRAB)
Role within Darwin Project	Implementation of the project in Benin and member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 6	
Name	Kathryn Garforth
Organisation	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Role within Darwin Project	Member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 7	
Name	Kent Nnadozie
Organisation	ITPGRFA Secretariat, Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)
Role within Darwin Project	Member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 8	
Name	Mahlet Teshome Kebede
Organisation	African Union Commission
Role within Darwin Project	Member of the project's Expert Guidance Committee (EGC)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	