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<td>Greenhouse Gas</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGOs</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRA</td>
<td>Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>Integrated Production Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFA</td>
<td>Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARD</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Sustainable Commodity Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFSS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>WBF</td>
<td>World Banana Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

As the market and its opportunities have an increasing impact not only on the sustainability of agricultural production practices but also on other activities in the food value chain, FAO is eager to widen further its approach and scope of action on sustainable agricultural development. The intent is to focus on developing environmental (green) food value chains (GFVC), where food chain participants respond to market opportunities considering important economic incentives that derive from greening activities. An in-depth review of different green food value chains shows evidences on how greening along the food chain provided for increased economic opportunities, innovative processes and operations, upgraded technologies, as well as important social benefits.

The foundations of the green food value chain concept and the green food value chain development concept derive from, among the many, two main subject matter areas: i) sustainable development, and its related fields such as, for example, the green economy, green growth and the circular economy as applied to the agricultural and food sector; ii) and the food value chain development approach.

In 1988, and on the basis of the Bruntland Commission definition of sustainability, the FAO Council defined sustainable agriculture and rural development (SARD) as the management and conservation of the natural resource base, and the orientation of technological and institutional change in such a manner as to ensure the attainment and continued satisfaction of human needs for present and future generations (FAO, 1989). Further in 2012, FAO reinforced its stance on sustainable development by stating that sustainable development processes are those that protect the natural resource base and eco-system functions, enhance economic resilience and promote human rights and well-being in a manner that preserves future generations’ ability to secure their needs (FAO, 2012).

There is now a growing recognition that achieving sustainability rests almost entirely on getting the economy right and this means fostering green growth: this is defined as economic growth and development that ensures that natural assets continue to provide the resources and environmental services on which our well-being relies (OECD, 2011). The green economy is one that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities (UNEP, 2011) considering, importantly, the economic efficiency of such processes. In a green economy, growth in income and employment is driven by public and private investments that reduce carbon emissions and pollution, enhance energy and resource efficiency, and prevent the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP, 2011). These investments need to be catalysed and supported by targeted public expenditure, policy reforms and regulation changes (UNEP, 2011). This development path should maintain, enhance and, where necessary, rebuild natural capital as a critical economic asset and source of public benefits, especially for poor people whose livelihoods and security are most vulnerable to climate change.

1 The bibliography for the background section of this report can be found in Annex 3
depend strongly on nature (UNEP, 2011). Green growth policies must be carefully designed to maximize benefits for, and minimize costs to, the poor and most vulnerable, and policies and actions with irreversible negative impacts must be avoided (World Bank, 2012).

In terms of the green economy FAO’s Greening the Economy with Agriculture (GEA) refers to ensuring the right to adequate food, as well as food and nutrition security and contributing to the quality of rural livelihoods, while efficiently managing natural resources and improving resilience and equity throughout the food supply chain, taking into account countries’ individual circumstances (FAO, 2011).

One major component in greening an economy is private sector development. This inherently needs to consider a more “grass-roots” level focus than a “top-down” focus. There are many approaches to private sector development, for example the market systems approach, developing specific sectors and value chains, creating an enabling environment for private sector activities and partnering with individual companies to encourage risky investments (DCED, 2014).

In this particular instance a food value chain approach is considered, and more in particular the sustainable food value chain approach. The approach, in a simple definition, refers to the full range of farms and firms and their successive coordinated value-adding activities that produce particular raw agricultural materials and transform them into particular food products that are sold to final consumers and disposed of after use, in a manner that is profitable throughout, has broad-based benefits for society, and aims to reduce the environmental footprint (FAO, 2014).

The environmental component of sustainable food value chains looks at the greening of food value chains and how this can contribute to the reduction of the environmental footprint as a result of food chain processes, operations and transactions, and importantly seeks to provide preventive strategies to increase the efficiencies and effectiveness of natural resources as well as impacts on natural life cycles, the climate and so forth. Such strategies relate to carbon and water footprints, for example, as well as food waste and loss prevention, soil, ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation. These preventative strategies though need to be complemented with other strategies that attempt to recapture inefficiencies, for example such as waste, and utilize this waste as a resource. In this perspective waste is seen as an asset that has not only economic value, but also has social and environmental value.

Typically the food value chain approach is linear in nature, the process of adding value from farm to fork, and with the new focus and integration of greening food value chain provides for a more holistic and circular view of how in reality food value chains operate in the context of the natural, social and economic environments. The concept of circularity within food value chains finds its foundations in the subject matter area of the circular economy. The circular economy refers to the industrial economy that is restorative by intention (Ellen MacArthur foundation, 2013) and aims to enable effective flows of materials, energy, labour and information so that natural and social capital can rebuild (Ellen MacArthur foundation, 2013). The concept of a circular economy is grounded in the study of real-world, non-linear, feedback-rich systems and particular living systems: it is the notion of optimizing systems rather than components (Ellen MacArthur foundation, 2013). The circular economy looks at flows that regenerate...
and provide new business models, these new business models creating value in new ways (Ellen MacArthur foundation, 2013).

Within this background and context, the green food value chain concept can be defined as a food chain that provides value at each stage, proactively reducing the usage of the natural environment, (natural resources, ecosystem services and biodiversity), so as to diminish or mitigate adverse impacts, or even have positive impacts, while considering disposal and recycling patterns of generated waste, to recapture value at every stage of the food value chain and thus further reduce environmental impact.

Consequently greening food value chains can be defined as the process that requires the public sector and economy to create partnerships with all stakeholders (public, private, civil society), in a defined social and cultural context, to verify and evaluate the inherent trade-offs involved, the new roles that are involved for the stakeholders, the measurement metrics that are required for tracking environmental performance, the standards and reverse channels that need to be considered, and at the same time not undermining economic opportunities and social consequences of such a process.

These two concepts provide a basis on which to define a framework for developing green food value chains. The framework provides for a circular (and open-ended) flow of forward and reverse values that progress from the natural environment to final markets. The forward flows increase not only economic value, but importantly environmental, social and cultural values and the value that is lost (wasted) is recaptured with reverse flows that reset such value from an economic, environmental, social and cultural point of view. The intent is to provide for a holistic circular and open-ended framework that inherently reduces and mitigates effects on the natural environment and at the same time attempts to replenish what has been used/consumed from the natural environment.

Figure 1 The Green Food Value Chain Development framework
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Source: Martin Hilmi, FAO - AGS
Some of the aspects of greening food value chains have been identified and as such these aspects not only require awareness raising and technical assistance, but also and importantly support in capacity development and building for the public sector, the private sector and other inherent stakeholders such as community-based organizations (CBOs) within FAO member countries. The components identified are:

- **The new role of the public sector**: This role is far more proactive, typically indirect, working with the private sector and other stakeholders and facilitating “incentive” models that provide new and emerging opportunities for greening food value chains.

- **The options in green food value chain development and trade-offs**: Inevitably, when the public sector has to consider the options in greening food value chains, it will need to consider the trade-offs between environmental, economic as well as social aspects.

- **Multi-stakeholder partnerships and the role of mediation**: This new paradigm for the public sector as well as the challenges it faces call for an **organizational/institutional** approach, as well as a direct intervention role that can be provided by **multi-stakeholder partnerships** as one of the intervention options.

- **Communication and the footprints**: Often environmental appraisals, assessments and impact studies of food value chain activities provide somewhat complex and intricate results. Such information requires simplification and ample distribution and communication to stakeholders.

- **Re-capturing value from waste with reverse channels**: Food value chain activities provide for waste (pollution, food loss, sub-products, etc.) that occur at all stages of the food chain process. However sub-products, for example, may be seen as food that has lost some value, but not all its value. This loss in value may be recaptured by providing for organized activities that enable the sub-product, for example, to be sold in animal feed markets, and thus still retain some of its value.

- **The role of voluntary standards**: Greening initiatives in food value chain development require standards that stakeholders can use as norms, but also and importantly as outcomes (goals) in obtaining environmental soundness of products, activities and operations. These standards have an important environmental concern, offer **market opportunities** through differentiation and positive economic impacts but they also present **challenges** (costs and exclusiveness).

- **The process of green food value chain development**: The process that is required to develop green food value chains requires a holistic (multi-stakeholder), systemic and integrated stance that sees the food value chain as a continuous **cyclical** movement of activities at every level of the food value chain creating environmental impacts, but also benefits. The process considers not only economic costs and benefits but also the stakeholders’ costs and increased values.
Forum objectives

The forum’s main aim was to provide and enable an arena to share differing knowledge and experiences on developing green food value chains. The main objectives of the forum were:

- to agree on a concept and definition of a green food value chain (GFVC) and a related conceptual framework;
- to discuss and agree upon a series of best practices for developing GFVCs;
- to gain a better understanding of the food value chain approach and the “market-led” perspective in greening agricultural development;
- to better understand, define and discuss the informal economy in relation to developing GFVCs;
- to better understand and define as well as discuss the new role of the public sector and public economy in providing incentives for greening food value chains;
- to better define, understand and discuss the required mediation role and its institutional, organizational, economic, social and cultural components in multi-stakeholder partnerships;
- to emphasize the increasing importance of the private sector (retailers, wholesalers, traders, farmers, input suppliers and processing enterprises) as well as consumer demand in rewarding and giving incentives for greening food value chain activities;
- to consider thematic areas relating to the development of GFVCs and devoted to standards, metrics, reverse channel networks and trade-offs;
- to discuss synergies with related approaches (for example Green economy, Green & Blue Growth, Climate Smart Agriculture) and how these can contribute to the development of green food value chains.
Intended outcomes

- The feasibility and viability of a market-oriented approach to promote green food value chain development.
- Provide a commonly agreed upon definition and conceptual framework for green food value chain development.
- Provide an agreed upon set of best practices for green food value chain development.
- Provide a set of guidelines for the public sector and public economy in greening and developing food value chains.
- Sensitize and raise awareness with FAO member countries and provide for an effective communication strategy.
- Identify possible future partners, including donors, for moving in this new direction, including the development of a capacity building strategy and materials to promote green food value chain development.
- Provide a foundation for developing a permanent FAO knowledge exchange forum and publications, including a handbook on green value chain development.
- Develop an agenda for future activities to be conducted.
Introduction
The forum was held in FAO HQ in Rome, Italy from the 27th to 28th November 2015. The forum was attended by a diverse group of participants deriving from international governmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), public sector organizations, research organizations as well as from the private sector (see Annex 1 for the list of participants). The forum followed an agreed agenda (see Annex 2) that comprised a series of brief presentations of case studies, question and answer times, discussions, panel discussions, group exercises and roundtables as well as a final segment of the forum devoted to summarizing the findings and defining an agenda for the way forward.

Case study presentations: Main findings and lessons learnt

Session 2: Private sector development and the role of the market
Moderator: Lourdes Magana de Lavirra – EU delegation

CASE 1: Private partnerships in organic cocoa – the case of São Tomé and Príncipe
Andrea Serpagli – IFAD

Short description: With less than 200,000 inhabitants, the small volcanic islands of São Tomé represent favorable conditions for producing cocoa, coffee and spices. In 1930 São Tomé and Príncipe was the largest international exporter of cocoa. In the mid-80s, a World Bank/IFAD supported land reform enabled 8,000 smallholders to be part of the cocoa value chain. However, the price volatility of cocoa between the end of the 90s and the beginning of 2000s forced most of them to abandon their land.

In 2003, in conjunction with an increasing worldwide demand of organic cocoa, IFAD started a long-term project (12 years) supporting the organic and fair-trade value chain in São Tomé and Príncipe (Participatory Smallholder Agriculture & Artisanal Fisheries Development Project, PAPAFPA). This program is based mainly on public-private partnership (PPP) establishment, organization of producers and production upgrading, using organic certification and standards to access EU niche (certified) markets. In 2005, the first PPPs were established between CECAB (export cooperative of organic farmers) and KAOKA (leading French enterprise in EU organic chocolate market). In 2009 another
partnership between CECAQ (export cooperative of fair-trade products) and CafèDirect and GEPA (FT organizations) followed.

**Findings:** The public-private partnership (PPP) instrument is a very effective way to connect poor smallholders in developing countries to green food value chains, facilitate such a development process, mitigate risks and create win-win solutions for all stakeholders involved. Through the public sector benefits derived from expertise, access to local institutions (local government), funds, and long-term follow-up and evaluation provided by IFAD, as well as institutional/financial support in terms of land investments, inputs, brokerage, etc. The private sector provided technical know-how, access to final-niche markets, certification schemes (organic and fair-trade), land, labour and some capital, and commitment to produce/process according to agreements.

The most important challenges identified were the strengthening of corporate social responsibility of private firms in particular SMEs (which expanded but still requires major changes at enterprise level), the organization of smallholders, insecurity and instability of the target market, quality improvement and traceability, and taking a long term perspective for development.

**Lessons learnt from the case study:** Professional collaboration among committed partners with clear ideas is required for greening food value chains. Working within ethical/organic certification schemes also seems to provide leverage points for greening food value chains as well as working through organized producers. There is also the need, as well as the ability to exploit opportunities and create and provide win-win models within food value chains for all involved stakeholders, to make them greener.

**CASE 2: Value-chain dynamics and the small-scale sector: Policy recommendations for small-scale fisheries and aquaculture trade**

**Audum Lem – FAO**

**Short description:** From 2009 to 2013, FAO conducted a value chain analysis of international fish trade with an impact assessment for the small-scale fisheries and aquaculture sector with the financial support of NORAD. The aim of this assessment was to gain insights on how the small-scale sector could capture more market value and develop respective policy recommendations.

**Findings:** Relative to other players in the value chain, small-scale fishers and fish farmers were receiving lower economic benefits and gender matters could not be ignored. Fish price was dependent on a wide range of variables beyond the control of fishers and included market conditions, processors and retail markets that were found to be receiving more of the distributional benefits of the value chain owing to their stronger bargaining power and most fish suppliers in developing countries are acting as raw material suppliers to developed nations’ industries.

**Lessons learnt:** There is a need for organization among small-scale fishers, collaboration and long-term relationships with the private sector, adoption of standard pricing methods, awareness creation of seasonal patterns and markets trends, development of new domestic and regional markets, improved
distribution systems and infrastructures, increased focus on the promotion of fish consumption, further promotion for the reduction of post-harvest losses and a sustainable use of by-products establishing reverse channels and reducing overcapacity and overfishing of big fishing boats.

**Main lessons learnt from Session 2**
The main lessons learnt from Session 2 were:

- the importance of public-private partnerships (PPP);
- the need of farmer/fishers organization, their proper development and their role in contributing to greening food value chains;
- creation of markets at local, regional and international level for greener products and the role of consumers and their choices in influencing marketing and production;
- improving access to markets and food value chains that provide rewards for greening and improving the frameworks of standards to make them more comprehensive and holistic to better enable the greening of food value chains.

**Session 3: The new roles of public actors and importance of multi-stakeholders platforms**

**CASE 3: Making red meat greener through certification, the case of Brazil**

*Helena Nery Alves-Pinto – Brazilian Beef Cattle Program, International Institute for Sustainability*

*Short description:* The Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN) has developed and implemented the world’s first program for sustainable cattle production. Multi-stakeholder consultation was an integral part of the design process of the SAN cattle program. Initially, before the cattle program was launched, the SAN conducted an extensive consultation that elicited input from individuals and organizations representing the private sector (e.g. cattle farmers, meat processors, and retailers), government (e.g. Embrapa), and civil society (e.g. researchers, NGOs). It is largely composed of environmentally-oriented non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In this sense, it differs from the governance structure of some other certification bodies, such as commodity roundtables which are dominated by business (e.g. the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, RSPO). The SAN cattle program demands a very high standard of sustainability from farms that wish to certify, which explains its low adoption rate to date.

*Findings:* In general it is very difficult for farmers to comply with environmental law, not many farms are willing to adopt the standard, and there is a lack of incentives for producers to change their production practices.

*Lessons learnt:* Greening needs to be done in a step by step, ladder, phased manner. Green cannot be seen as an absolute, but as differing shades of green. Multi-stakeholder participation in the design of
certification standards lends credibility and rigor to standards; certification programs are not implemented in isolation, but in a complex institutional context with other governance interventions; and certification programmes can lead to environmental and socio-economic benefits. Different perspectives are needed to evaluate sustainability and public initiative is required for monitoring. There is a need for incentives to change and adopt new agriculture practices and such incentives need to provide for premium prices.

**CASE 4: Assessing public and private involvement in agrobiodiversity conservation mechanisms; a Bolivian experience**

*Adam Drucker and Diego Martinez de la Cruz – Bioversity International*

**Short description:** In order to promote a sustainable conservation of less commercially attractive varieties (which may hold interesting climate resistant and nutritional traits), an innovative Payment for Environmental Services (PES-type approach) called PACS (*Payments for Agrobiodiversity Conservation Services*) pilot scheme has been successfully run in 2010-2011 in Bolivia and Peru. Only very recently, research has been done to assess the potential of PACS to create incentives for the conservation of agrobiodiversity, especially in the context of poor rural communities in developing countries where most threatened and valuable local varieties can still be found. This scheme links service purchasers (e.g. agro-industries, governmental agencies, banks etc.) with service providers (the farmers sustaining the on-farm utilization of local rare varieties). As an incentive to cultivate non-marketable rare quinoa varieties, farmers have been rewarded with agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizer and construction material.

**Findings:** Private sector incentives for the conservation of agriculture are not enough, some direction from external actors is needed and according to the situation, other types of incentives might be needed. It is challenging to conserve a broad range of threatened species as the focus is generally more oriented towards the market success of underutilized varieties than on successful conservation outcomes, in other words, not everything can be conserved through niche product market development, as not all species and varieties have a market potential. There is also a lack of long-term impact assessment regarding the potential sustainability of value chain development over the longer-term.

The main challenge for the implementation of biodiversity projects is the lack of awareness of benefits from farm conservation and the limited public and private involvement in biodiversity mechanisms.

**Lessons learnt:** There is a general lack of awareness on the benefits of biodiversity. The public sector has many resources but lacks technical and managerial skills as well as awareness on the benefits of biodiversity. The private sector is a crucial actor for raising funding and long term stability, and there are many multi-stakeholder platforms that currently do not include private sector entities.
CASE 6: The World Banana Forum (WBF): a multi-stakeholder platform for sustainable production and trade

Pascal Liu – FAO

Short description: The World Banana Forum (WBF) was launched in 2009 as a permanent space of collaboration for all participants in the global banana supply-chain, including producers, companies (production, trade and retail), trade Unions, CSOs, trade associations and exporter groups, research institutions governmental institutions and international organizations. The forum promotes the adoption of good practices for sustainable production and trade by the banana industry worldwide. It operates through specialized working groups where the stakeholders jointly develop practical guidance in various areas such as reduction of pesticide use, occupational health and safety, gender equity, costs of sustainable production and distribution of value.

Findings: Banana sustainable production practices are still not being rewarded significantly by markets, the platform is a complex international challenge, and therefore there is a need for involvement of all stakeholders in the banana sector worldwide. These types of roundtables are really needed, as they address major issues at the commodity specific level and fill a gap that other initiatives do not cover. Roundtables are effective and have low implementation costs. The challenges found were uneven participation of stakeholders or over dominance of few large players, a lack of support from governments, which are not willing to dedicate resources (even if it was only time), and building trust between different stakeholders so that they were willing to work together.

Lessons learnt: There is a need for a long-term perspective for this type of roundtable to materialize and of dedicated financial supporters to get things moving for the greening of specific food value chains. There is also a need of support from a neutral institution like FAO that can bring different types of actors to the discussion table in greening efforts devoted to specific food value chains.

Main lessons learnt from Session 3

The main lessons learnt from session 3 were:

- Green is not an absolute and needs to be seen in a greening perspective: a step by step ladder approach to developing green food value chains;
- The private sector and markets cannot do it alone, but are an important element to greening food value chains;
- The public sector has a role to play with varying levels of involvement in greening food value chains, for example that of being the initial promoter of greening food value chains;
- Multi-stakeholder partnerships can work in greening food value chains but require a long term development perspective, sustainable funding sources, an equal balancing of stakeholders (large vs. small stakeholders), trust building and an impartial mediator.
Session 4: Group work on what is a green food value chain and how to green a food value chain

Moderator: Thomas Bernet – FiBL

Participants were divided into two groups and following the fish bowl methodology they discussed two questions:

1. What is a green food value chain?
2. How to promote green food value chains?

Main summary of group discussions

What is a Green food value chain?

- Efficient use of resources
- Provide for quality products
- Include environmental services
- Cost efficiency and provide products that are affordable to broader markets
- Governance: Inclusion of different stakeholders and management of power
- Consideration for the resilience of environment
- Consideration for the resilience of communities
- Consideration for life-cycle analysis
- Respect the absolute limits of resource usage
- Consider the social aspect – improve livelihoods

How to promote a green food value chain?

- Role of the public sector:
  - Facilitate the participation of smaller actors
  - Develop proper regulations, including appropriate incentives
  - Enforcement of the law
  - Too much intervention can damage sustainability, so there is the question of when public actors should really step in to implement this approach
- “De-browning” the food value chain
- Green products should be affordable and have cost efficiencies
• Certification is good, but is not enough: promoting green food value chains should be much more than just private/public standards
• Look at resources to address trade-offs and find some synergies

Main issues raised during the discussion:

• A green food value chain is seen as an absolute and does not provide for differing shades of green for developing food value chains: Possibly there is a need to focus more on the process of greening the food value chain;
• Greening in terms of food value chain development needs to be mainstreamed as it is absolutely necessary;
• The distinction between a sustainable food chain and a green food chain needs to be made clearer: The green food value chain looks far more in-depth at the environmental component and considers a wider holistic and circular systems perspective to food value chain development;
• Greening food value chains is complex process;
• Measurement is difficult as per lack of data and information on what may constitute a green food value chain as well as the fact that there are different levels of green;

Session 5: Developing synergies among approaches
Moderator: Florence Tartanac, FAO - AGS

During this session, a set of panelists from various backgrounds presented and discussed their practical experiences in green food value chain development.

Eleanor Bell – DCED:
Main objective: Sharing experiences to promote economic opportunities and jobs for the poor.

Experiences: The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) was created in 1979, and is currently involved with 23 agencies. The Green Growth Working Group is focusing its efforts on sharing tools and theories and importantly sharing information about what works for promoting greener initiatives by Donors and recipient Governments. It also provides knowledge on public policies and energy initiatives for greening industries, and about mitigation of climate change.

Frank Grothaus – UNCTAD and UNFSS
Main objective: Optimizing the use of voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) so as to harness their potential for achieving public policy objectives related to sustainable development, including better market access.
Experiences: Five UN bodies have joined forces to provide information, analysis and support to developing countries through the UN Forum on Sustainability Standards, which is a policy-discussion forum on pro-active governmental approaches. The UNFSS platform fosters well-informed policy dialogue among key (public/private sector & civil society) stakeholders drawing on impartial information and analysis on VSS in response to the demands expressed by its members. National VSS platforms are being created upon national initiatives following briefing sessions in several countries to foster national public-private dialogue on VSS and interface with UNFSS policy dialogue and analytical activities. One working groups is concerned with impact assessment and enhancing interoperability.

David Cuming – Sustainable Commodity Initiative /SCI/Agrofuturo Global

Main objective: SAMCERT (strengthening smallholders’ access to markets for certified sustainable products) is an IFAD-led three year project implemented by focusing on the role of certification in green food value chain development in nine countries for five different commodities.

Experiences: The project assists producers in the utilization of certification to enable access to international markets via trainings and gap analysis of value chains and the context in which such value chains operate in. It also promotes synergies and partnerships with the private sector.

Laura Ciacci – Slow Food

Main objective: To promote a food model which respects the environmental, traditional and cultural identities, that is capable of bringing consumers closer to producers, by creating a virtuous network of international relationships and greater sharing of knowledge so as to change food systems and act on market transformation.

Experiences: In order to guarantee the vitality of the ecosystem, Slow Food strengthens local food systems (10 000 gardens in Africa, local food markets), rediscovers and catalogues traditional knowledge (native species and breeds), promotes local food as a means for food security and sovereignty, raises awareness with consumers and producers (Presidia) as well as promotes initiatives with the private sector.

Nadia Scialabba – FAO (NRL)

Main objective: SAFA (Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agricultural Systems) is a multi-purpose framework for governments, businesses and NGOs that integrates all sustainability dimensions (environmental integrity, social equity, economic resilience and good governance).

Experiences: The SAFA framework is divided into 21 themes (universal sustainability goals), 58 sub-themes (sustainability objectives specific to supply chains) and a set of 116 indicators. Concerning the environmental approach, the SAFA system considers 6 themes (atmosphere, water, land, biodiversity, material and energy and animal welfare) sub-divided in 14 sub-themes, bringing together different indicator-based methodologies to assess environmental integrity (more comprehensive and goes beyond the Life-Cycle Assessment (LCA)). SAFA has been used so far for some countries export credentials (e.g. New Zealand), private companies’ claims, capacity-building and impact assessment.
Furthermore a small and open-source app for smart phones is being developed to be used directly by farmers.

**Louis Bockel – FAO (ESA)**

*Main objective:* FAO EX-ACT-tool enables to estimate GHG emissions and emission reductions of alternative practices at the agricultural production stage and allows users to organize GHG emissions of agricultural products along the entire value chain and identify improvement potentials.

*Experiences:* As an example, the tool was used in Madagascar in rice production. The results of utilizing the tool showed that a change to intermittent flooding and non-flooded pre-season irrigation and the improvement of organic amendment and of fertilizers used on 300 000 hectares could save 5.6 million tons of CO₂eq/year between 2003 and 2020, of which 45 percent due to CH₄ reduction, and 54 percent in deforestation reduction.

**Andreas Springer-Heinze – GIZ**

*Main objective:* Hot Spot Analysis is a qualitative assessment instrument that estimates the resource use intensity of a product along its value chain which enables to quickly identify critical processes and greening potentials in the value chain. The instrument follows two different dimensions: the impact of the value chain on the environment and the impact of the environment on the value chain.

*Experiences:* The instrument was used in a rice value chain in Benin. The analysis was divided into five steps: defining the value chain stages (full life cycle of the selected commodity) and resource categories (water, energy, soil, etc.); identifying environmental problems (environmental impact of value chain and on value chain); identifying the “hot spots” among the list of impacts (relevance of each resource category, importance of value chain stage); potential solutions to tackle hot spots problems (technical, institutional and economic aspects) and adjusting the value chain development strategy and actions.

**Anne Sophie Poisot – FAO (AGP)**

*Main objective:* How market-based mechanisms support/incentivize the adoption of sustainable agriculture practices in developing countries, focusing on local value chains and local institutions.

*Experiences:* The joint FAO/INRA study is based on 15 case studies (agro-ecology (10), Integrated Production Systems (IPS) (3), and IPM/GAP (2)). One of the key findings of the study includes that international voluntary standards have a positive impact on smallholder access to markets when local institutions have the capacity to support smallholder adoption of standards (NGOs, extension services, public policies, sector-specific characteristics/corporate culture, local certification bodies, easily accessible testing laboratories). Institutional innovations that have the capacity to facilitate collective marketing have been grouped in Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) (producer-consumer networks created to certify organic practices based on peer-review, less formal methods for guaranteeing the organic status of organic farmers production), Community-supported Agriculture (CSA) (producer-consumer networks created to support community development through direct markets) and Multi-actor Innovation Platforms (MIP) (producer-researcher networks created to work on
developing/promoting a specific sustainable agriculture practice or technology). As a preliminary conclusion, the study provided that standards and market-based initiatives act as incentives by integrating knowledge, markets, resources and policy support into local networks that engage with national and international organizations. The public, private and the civil actors play a key role in the support of local sustainable value chains.

**Summary of main lessons learnt**

With the presentation of various approaches taken in terms of green food value chains and possible synergies that can derive what has emerged is the need for:

- Providing and sharing information on the objectives and intended outcomes of the approaches
- Carefully reviewing the approaches provided and the experiences gained with such approaches
- Finding specific and well defined commonalities in the approaches that could possibly develop into synergies and/or partnering of approaches
- Relational and communicational aspects that need to be considered for synergies and/or partnering
- Clearly defining common objectives and outcomes of the intended synergies and/or partnership as well as action and implementation plans

**Session 6: Developing a framework to GFVC**

Moderators: Thomas Bernet, Emilie Vandecandelaere and Florence Tartanac

The main aim of this session, in accordance with the objectives of the forum and its intended outcomes, was to summarize and elaborate on the participants’ shared knowledge and experiences in contributing to the green food value chain framework that was previously developed by FAO-AGS.

This involved discussions on two main topics:

**What is a green food value chain?**

Summary of main points:
From the participant’s inputs a green food value chain definition should also consider that it can have varying shades and levels of green, should define what at minimum can be considered a green food value chain, how it effects the natural environment and how the natural environment affects it and also considers a long term development perspective. A green food value chain has: high social (improved incomes, livelihoods, etc.), cultural, territorial (spatial) and gender connotations; should be seen from a systems perceptive (products, functions, processes, organizations, life cycles and ecosystem services); and has a strong public policy and public economy dimension to it.
How to green food value chains?
Summary of main points:
From the participant’s inputs on how to green a food value chain what should also be considered are a long term commitment, public-private partnerships and multi-stakeholder platforms with adequate funding. A public sector engagement should consider its capacity and funding, in terms of green food value chain development, an integration of policies, organization and coordination at all levels (micro, meso and macro), incentives, green extension services and the capacity of law enforcement. Mechanisms need to be found that can provide for greening of food value chains and consideration needs to be given to value chain finance. There is a need to consider green food value chain development at national, regional and global levels, thus including national and export markets (as well as informal markets), ensuring that it is inclusive of smallholders, provides for equal participation of all stakeholders in the development process and is based on true-cost accounting (polluters pay) to avert the burden falling only on consumers. Consideration is required in the development process of large versus small food value chains as well. Technical solutions are also important in terms of technology and know-how and the development process needs to go beyond standards.

Session 7: Developing partnership and an agenda
Moderators: Thomas Bernet, Martin Hilmi, Dominique Barjolle, Florence Tartanac

The participants in this session were engaged in small group discussion rounds, composed of four – six persons (using the world café methodology) and dealing with the following topics:

1. Awareness creation for greening food value chains
2. Finding funds for greening food value chain projects
3. Introducing the green food value chain framework into existing projects
4. Out of the box thinking

1. Awareness creation for greening food value chains
Summary of findings:
The target audiences identified were policymakers, value chain actors and consumers. For each of these target groups, a set of points were elaborated:

- **Food value chain actors**: increased sensitization on greening, its potential benefits and long term cost benefits; provide simplified information (for example on footprints and relate them to brown costs); promote green technologies via initiatives and demonstrations; provide true costs of brown activities.
- **Consumers**: raise awareness in general and educate on impact of consumer choices; raise awareness on health aspects of consumption; raise awareness on brown products being too cheap and green products not being comparatively expensive; promoting dialogue between producers and consumers.
• **Policymakers**: Support multi-stakeholder platforms to improve dialogue within the private sector and civil society; awareness raising and education campaigns with consumers; promoting direct dialogue between farmers and consumers; identification and development of incentives to promote green technologies; legislation that supports true-cost accounting and internalization of externalities; provide for policies that show the way forward in terms of greening food value chains.

2. **Finding funds for greening food value chain projects**
Summary of findings:
Three main funding sources were identified: the private sector, the public sector and other sources. The main points identified for each were provided:

- **Private sector**: Corporate Social Responsibility as a good entry point for companies; large enterprise cost savings via going green; show case on mitigation of reputation risks; engage dialogue with the private sector at national and global level; advection of partnerships with retailers (e.g. increasing their share of certified products)

- **Public sector**: Increasing financial support for greening food value chains from government (in many countries municipalities provide funds for green projects); appropriate pricing of environmental assets; incentives for green investments; brokerage between impact donors/investors and “greening entrepreneurs”

- **Other sources**: Build up a strategy to enroll the big donor foundations; link with SOAAN (Sustainable Organic Agriculture Action Network); link with GEF (Global Environment Facility at the World Bank) for accountability of projects related to greening (invest funds); engaging in dialogue with large NGOs

3. **Introducing the green food value chain framework into existing projects**
Summary of findings:
Mainstreaming greening projects; designing projects with a green lens, vision and mission; setting green objectives; impact assessment to ensure greening; identifying potential green partners in the project; moving from Green for “greenable” in terms of projects: what can be effectively greened in terms of the project; the smallest trade-offs which can actually be greened; leveraging on traditional-based green practices; promoting the visibility of traditional-based green practices; demonstrations of the project; capacity development for greening projects; greening through strategic resources; shifting from local to national level projects; make light green projects dark green.

4. **Out of the box thinking**
Summary of findings:
National festivals for promoting green food value chains; review of efficient production technology and its promotion; finding ways for citizens to engage beyond green consumption: Looking for social media opportunities to create awareness for citizens; communicate good and bad green practices downstream
in the food value chain; become more sensitive to what it really means to green initiatives and to implement green in practice; involving UN women organization as a partner; training women as green food value chain trainers (as traditionally practiced) for scaling up; not compete with what there is already in place; support strategic research and dissemination; green school food programme; award support schemes for greening in practice; experience of cost inclusion in practice.
Forum findings

The knowledge exchange forum had set defined objectives to arrive at intended outcomes with knowledge and experiences shared during the course of the forum. In this regard the following forum findings can be provided:

**The feasibility and viability of a market-oriented approach to promote green food value chain development**

There are some clear findings from the forum that show that markets cannot do it alone in greening food value chains. There is a need for not only green demand and raised awareness among consumers, but the long term perspective and the investment required call on other players in an economy to provide support for greening food value chains.

However there are some signs that market mechanisms can provide for some form of greening of food value chains:

- Relationship and linkages, in the form of public private partnerships, have in some cases provided for private investments in greening and markets for green products.
- Organization and coordination of producers have provided for some greening initiatives.
- Standards.
- Access to international markets has encouraged greening.
- Intermediaries in food value chains can be a source of incentives and financing (value chain finance) for green initiatives.
- Private sector raising funds for greening can provide for developing greener technologies and processes.
- True cost accounting can provide for greening initiatives within private organizations.

**Main conclusion**

The signs coming from market mechanisms do provide the viability for greening food value chains, but the type of greening, and the level of greening, is not clear. What is clear is that there is a need for multi-sectorial approach to greening food value chains that includes the public and social economy as well as the private economy. This can be seen in the recurrence during the forum of references to, for example, public-private partnerships and multi-stakeholder platforms.
A commonly agreed upon definition and conceptual framework for green food value chain development

At the end of the forum, there was no agreed upon definition, apart from the one provided, of what is a green food value chain or a conceptual framework devoted for green food value chain development. However the forum provided a number of insights and inputs that could be considered in the current definition and conceptual framework of greening food value chains.

In terms of the defining of a green food value chain this is what was provided by the forum participants: From the participant’s inputs a green food value chain definition should also consider that it can have varying shades and levels of green, should define what at minimum can be considered a green food value chain, provide efficient use of resources (limits of resource use), how the food chain effects the natural environment and how the natural environment affects the food chain and considers a long term development perspective. A green food value chain has high social (improved incomes, livelihoods, etc.), cultural, territorial (spatial) and gender (especially women) connotations, should be seen from a systems perspective (products, functions, processes, organizations life cycles and ecosystem services), including cost efficiencies that provides products affordable to all, and has a governance system that is socially manageable and inclusive and provides for resilience of the environment and communities alike and has a strong public policy and public economy dimension.

Main conclusions
The participants’ inputs have provided a series of points that may further enhance the current definition of a green food value chain. The points to consider are that greening food value chains should consider:

- taking a system and network perspective including the life cycle approach which includes ecosystems;
- economic efficiency (including natural resources);
- environmental impact (both the impact of the VC on the environment and vice versa);
- social impact (considering cultural and gender as well as territorial aspects);
- governance;
- public policy and economy;
- intensity and level of greening.
In terms of the conceptual framework for green food value chain development this is what was provided during the forum:

From the participant’s inputs on how to green a food value chain what should also be considered are a focus on the process, that is complex and occurs in defined contexts (agro-ecological, social, cultural), includes ecosystems and has a long term commitment. Mainstreaming greening, public-private partnerships and multi-stakeholder platforms with adequate funding are also required, and the public sector engagement should consider its capacity and funding, in terms of green food value chain development, an integration of policies, organization and coordination at all levels (micro, meso and macro), incentives, green extension services and the capacity of law enforcement. Mechanisms need to be found that can provide for greening of food value chains and consideration needs to be given to value chain finance. There is a need to consider green food value chain development at national, regional and global levels, thus including national and export markets (as well as informal markets), ensuring that it is inclusive of smallholders, provides for equal participation of all stakeholders in the development process and is based on true-cost accounting (polluters pay) to avert the burden falling only on consumers. Consideration in the development process needs to be given to more commercial versus less commercial and smaller food value chains as well. Technical solutions are also important in terms of technology and know-how and the development process needs to go beyond standards.

Main conclusion
The participants’ inputs have provided a series of points that may further and enhance the current conceptual framework for green food value chain development. The points to consider are:

- A focus on an inclusive, contextual and long term process of green food value chain development
- Mainstreaming greening, public-private partnerships and multi-stakeholder platforms
- Public sector engagement that provides a set of integrated multi-level policies and activities considering local, national, regional and global factors
- Funding mechanisms that consider value chain finance
- Equity in the distribution of environmental costing
- Technology and know-how

Provide an agreed upon set of best practices for green food value chain development

The forum provided a set of practices but did not define precisely and concisely a set of best practices. The following practices in terms of developing green food value chains were provided:

- Awareness creation practices for greening food value chains for target audiences identified as policymakers, value chain actors and consumers
- Practices for finding funds for greening food value chain projects from the private sector, the public sector and other sources
- Practices for introducing the green food value chain framework into existing projects

Examples of practices mentioned during the workshop are:

**Agricultural production stage:**
- Local sourcing of inputs (e.g. seedlings and compost)
- Agro-ecology
- Organic farming systems
- Low-input farming systems in general
- IPS (Integrated Production Systems)
- Good Agricultural Practices (un-certified and certified through international standards)
- Climate Smart Agriculture
- Combining traditional farming techniques with sustainable modern farming techniques
- Permaculture
- Urban and Peri-Urban farming

**Processing and distribution:**
- Post-harvest waste reduction
- Reuse of byproducts and waste (reverse channel networks, recycling)
- Direct sales and national markets
- Use of renewable energies and resource-efficiency during the processing stage
- Reduction of packaging

*Main conclusion*
The multitude of practises provided indicates that there is a need to not only provide for field verification of such practices, but also and importantly find field-based practices that can complement pre-existing practices. Subsequently this can provide for a set of best practices that can be shared with the public sector and thus contribute to green food value chain development.
Guidelines for the public sector and public economy in greening and developing food value chains

Main conclusion
The forum provided for some general guidelines for the public sector but did not define precisely and concisely a set of field tested guidelines. The guidelines that derived from participants’ inputs at the forum will need to be further field tested and further field research will be required to find other possible guidelines that did not arise during the forum. Only once this research has been conducted can guidelines be prepared and implemented with the public sector.

Sensitize and raise awareness with FAO member countries and provide for an effective communication strategy

Main conclusions
Awareness creation for greening food value chains towards policy-makers was provided during the course of the forum by participants but it did not tackle the issue of sensitizing and raising awareness in particular with FAO member countries with an effective communication strategy. Undoubtedly an effective communication strategy will need to be developed during the early course of 2015.

Identify possible future partners, including donors, for moving in this new direction, including the development of a capacity building strategy and materials to promote green food value chain development

Main conclusions
Partnering
During the course of the forum, and considering the green food value chain approach as developed by FAO-AGS and FiBL, there are definitely opportunities for partnerships to further develop and integrate with The Green Growth Working Group of DCED, with CIRAD, Slow Food, UNFSS, ITC, ILO and IFAD. There is also a possibility of synergy with the GIZ “Hotspots” approach. Within FAO initiatives there are possibilities of collaboration with AGP, ESA and NRC initiatives (Ex-Act Tool, bioenergy, agro-ecology, etc.).

Capacity building
During the course of the forum many and recurring references were made in terms of capacity building, but no references and specific points were raised over what strategy to adopt and what typology of training could be provided to promote further green food value chain development. Undoubtedly an effective capacity building strategy, coupled with training materials, will need to be developed during the course of 2015.
Foundations for developing a permanent FAO knowledge exchange forum and publications, including a handbook on green value chain development

Main conclusions
The forum provided for an agreement to the proposal for the setting up of an initial e-mail network of experts on green food value chain development. This was seen as viable in terms of budget and also timing. This could be seen as a first step to integrating such a network into an on-line platform.

Also, an FAO publication will be released in 2015 to share knowledge on greening food value chains targeted at policy-makers, project designer’s and field practitioners.
Conclusions

The results of the forum, as discussed previously, provided for the following conclusions:

- **Market oriented approach to green food value chain development**
  The signs coming from market mechanisms (private sector) do provide for the viability for greening food value chains, but the type of greening, and the level of greening, is not clear. What is clear is that there is a need for multi-sectorial approach to greening food value chains that includes the public and social economy as well as the private economy. This can be seen in the recurrence during the forum of references to, for example, public-private partnerships and multi-stakeholder platforms.

- **A commonly agreed upon definition and conceptual framework for green food value chain development**
  At the end of the forum, there was no agreed upon definition, apart from the one provided, of what is a green food value chain or a conceptual framework devoted for green food value chain development. However the forum provided a number of insights and inputs that could be considered in the current FAO-AGS definition and conceptual framework of greening food value chain.

- **Provide an agreed upon set of best practices for green food value chain development**
  The forum provided a set of practices but did not define precisely and concisely a set of best practices. The multitude of practices provided indicates that there is a need to not only provide for field verification of such practices, but also and importantly find field-based practices that can complement pre-existing practices. Subsequently this can provide for a set of best practices that can be shared with the public sector and thus contribute to green food value chain development.

- **Guidelines for the public sector and public economy in greening and developing food value chains**
  The forum provided for some general guidelines for the public sector but did not define precisely and concisely a set of field tested guidelines. The guidelines that derived from participants’ inputs at the forum will need to be further field tested and further field research will be required to find other possible guidelines that did not arise during the forum. Only once this research has been conducted can guidelines be prepared and implemented with the public sector.
• Sensitize and raise awareness with FAO member countries and provide for an effective communication strategy
  Awareness creation for greening food value chains towards policy-makers was provided during the course of the forum by participants but it did not tackle the issue of sensitizing and raising awareness in particular with FAO member countries with an effective communication strategy. Undoubtedly an effective communication strategy will need to be developed during the early course of 2015.

• Identify possible future partners, including donors, for moving in this new direction, including the development of a capacity building strategy and materials to promote green food value chain development
  Partnering
  During the course of the forum, and considering the green food value chain approach as developed by FAO-AGS, there are definitely opportunities for partnerships to further develop and integrate with The Green Growth Working Group of DCED, with CIRAD, Slow Food, UNFSS, ITC, ILO and IFAD. There is also a possibility of synergy with the GIZ “Hotspots” approach. Within FAO initiatives there are possibilities of collaboration with AGP, ESA and NRC initiatives (Ex-Act Tool, bioenergy, agro-ecology, etc.).

  Capacity building
  During the course of the forum many and recurring references were made in terms of capacity building, but no references and specific points were raised over what strategy to adopt and what typology of training could be provided to promote further green food value chain development. Undoubtedly an effective capacity building strategy, coupled with training materials will need to be developed during the course of 2015.

• Foundations for developing a permanent FAO knowledge exchange forum and publications, including a handbook on green value chain development
  The forum provided for an agreement to the proposal for the setting up of an initial e-mail network of experts on green food value chain development. This was seen as viable in terms of budget and also timing. This could be seen as a first step to integrating such a network into an on-line platform.
  Also, an FAO publication will be released in 2015 to share knowledge on greening food value chains targeted at policy-makers, project designer’s and field practitioners.
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Annex 2: Forum programme

Thursday 27 November

Session 1: Introduction
9:00 Introduction to the workshop
- Exegesis Serova – FAO
- Florence Tartar – FAO
- Dominique Barjolle – FiBL
9:20 Introduction to FAO’s work on the development of green food value chains, Martin Hili – FAO

Session 2: Private sector development and the role of the market
Moderator: Loreto Magana de Larriva – EU delegation
9:30 CASE 1: Private partnerships in organic cocoa, the Sao Tome and Principe case, Andrea Serpogi – IFAD
9:50 CASE 2: The Guatemalan Highland Value Chain Development Alliance, Michele Bruni – Sustainable Food Laboratory
10:10 CASE 3: Green value chains in the case of small fisheries, Audum Lam – FAO
10:30 Discussion
10:50 Coffee break

Session 3: The new roles of public actors and importance of multi-stakeholders platforms
Moderator: Eve Fonblanq – CIRAD
11:20 CASE 4: Making red meat greener through certification, the case of Brazil, Helena Neves Pinto – Brazilian Beef Cattle Program, International Institute for Sustainability
11:40 CASE 5: Assessing public and private involvement in agrobiodiversity conservation mechanisms; a Bolivian experience, Adam Drucker and Diego Martinez de la Cruz – Bioversity International
12:00 CASE 6: The World Banana Forum: a multi-stakeholder platform for sustainable production and trade, Pascal Liu – FAO
12:20 Discussion
12:40 Explanation of group work
13:00 Lunch break

Session 4: Group work, on what is a green food value chain and how to “green” a food value chain
Moderator: Thomas Bernet – FiBL
14:00 Group work:
- Assessment of the case studies to derive factors that can contribute to the greening of food value chains and that could be promoted and supported
- Proposal for a definition of the green value chain
16:00 Coffee break
16:15 Presentation of group work
17:15 End of first day
Friday 28 November

8:45  Introduction to Day 2

Session 5: Developing synergies among approaches  
Moderator: Florence Tartanac – FAO

9:00  Round table to discuss synergies, with participation of:
  • Eleanor Bell - DCED
  • Frank Grothaus - UNCTAD and UNFSS
  • Andreas Springer-Heusze - GIZ
  • David Cuming - Sustainable Commodity Initiative /SCI/Agroinuro Global
  • Laura Ciacci - Slow Food
  • Nadia Scalabba - FAO (RNL)
  • Louis Bockel - FAO (ESA)
  • Anne Sophie Potiot – FAO (AGF)

11:00  Coffee break

Session 6: Developing a framework to “green” food value chains  
Moderator: Dominique Barjolle – FIBL

11:30  Presentation of proposal of new FAO framework to promote “greening of value chains”,
  integrating the group work results, Florence Tartanac – FAO

12:00  Questions and discussion

12:30  Lunch break

Session 7: Developing partnership and an agenda  
Moderator: Thomas Berner – FIBL

13:30  “World café” about developing an agenda to promote “the development of green food value chains”

15:40  Agreeing on next steps

16:00  Closing remarks
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