

**STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE OF THE  
GENERATIONAL CHALLENGE PROGRAMME (GCP)**

**MINUTES OF THE FIRST STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE OF THE  
GENERATION CHALLENGE PROGRAMME**

**29-30 NOVEMBER 2004**

**ROME, ITALY**

**GFAR SECRETARIAT**  
c/o Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome Italy

**WELCOME ADDRESS**

Dietrich Leihner, the Director of Research, Extension and Training Division of the FAO opened the two-day meeting with a welcome address. After formally welcoming the participants to FAO headquarters on behalf of the Director General of FAO, he reminded participants of the important role FAO plays as the United Nations agency charged with providing leadership and coordinating global efforts to improve food security and alleviate poverty. He noted that in pursuit of its mission, FAO collaborates with a number of groups and institutions, including the CGIAR and GFAR both intimately linked to the GENERATION Challenge Programme (GCP). He then briefly traced the genesis and history of the GCP, which he said, is well focused on the sustainable, efficient and safe utilization of genetic resources as well as being the only challenge programme that has established a strong partnership with a stakeholder group through the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR). He concluded by encouraging the committee to put in place a monitoring system that would help it record what went well, what went less well, and how to ensure future improvement as it pursued its mandate, and that FAO will follow the committee's activities, outputs and outcomes with keen interest.

**OPENING REMARKS**

As indicated in the meeting agenda (Annex 2), the welcome address was followed by opening remarks from Ola Smith, the Executive Secretary of GFAR, who reminded members of the committee of the goal of GFAR, as well as its vision and mission. He noted that given the mission of GFAR it was only natural for GFAR to accept the challenge of constituting the stakeholder committee for the GCP, which he hoped, will contribute to decision making processes that will guide the implementation of the GCP, through this unique mechanism of inter-stakeholder dialogue. He then expressed the gratitude of the GFAR family as a whole to members of the committee for accepting to serve on the committee and provide a selfless service for a common good.

He turned attention to the Terms of Reference of the committee as well as the meeting agenda noting in particular that the committee would have to develop a programme of work for 2005, and that a budget of about \$ 120,000 Euros will be made available to enable them carry out the planned activities. He concluded by expressing the hope that the committee's contribution will influence the work plan and activities of the group and teams implementing the GCP, through its inputs into the policy guidelines of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) of the GCP.

Ola Smith reported that, he had received regrets from some members of the Committee, who were unable to attend due to travel restrictions, medical conditions and prior commitments (see Annex 3 for the names of the committee members).

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

After a quick tour de table during which committee members briefly introduced themselves, the meeting agenda was adopted after the incorporation of an additional item " report from the committee chair" before the closing remarks by the director of the GCP.

## **BRIEFING ON THE GCP**

Three presentations were made by staff of the GCP secretariat to provide essential and background information about the GCP to committee members.

### **A) Presentation of Robert Ziegler, Director of the GCP**

With appropriate and pertinent statistics, the Director of the GCP demonstrated the need for a new Green Revolution, and new investments in agricultural research. He suggested that the CGIAR centres constitute a credible source for the science, technology and policy options required to adequately feed the global population and that Challenge Programmes (CP) constitute one of the essential tools. CPs according to him, would not only revitalize the CGIAR by building problem and opportunity driven institutional partnerships, and stimulating new partnerships with NARS and ARIS, but also would stimulate new investments in agricultural research.

He then went on to provide some more specific information on the GCP touching on the following aspects:

- 1) Main Objectives of the GCP
  - to capture and utilize plant genetic diversity for crop improvement
  - to focus science problems of extreme importance to the resource poor
  - to create and enable mechanisms for relevant product to reach end-users
- 2) GCP is organized into 5 sub-programmes with an emphasis on drought tolerance .  
The 5 sub programmes are:
  - Sub Programme -1 Genetic Diversity of Global Genetic Resources
  - Sub Programme -2 Comparative Genomics for Gene Discovery
  - Sub Programme -3 Trait Capture for Crop Improvement
  - Sub Programme -4 Genetic Resources, Genomic and Crop Information Systems
  - Sub Programme - 5 Capacity Building
- 3) The obligations, privileges, current composition (8 CG centres and 8 Advanced Research Institutions), potential new members (Australia, Canada, India and South Africa), as well as some explanation of the modus operandum of the consortium, including the participation of non-consortium members through competitive grants programs and commissioned research.
- 4) Major current donors (European Commission, UK (DFID)) of the CP, and on-going efforts and discussion for additional support from the private sector and Foundations.
- 5) Some major achievements:
  - development of a Medium Term Plan (2005-2007) and an annual work plan for 2004,
  - establishment of management and governance structures,
  - development and implementation of a competitive grants scheme,
  - informatics platform designed and under construction,
  - established an identity in the global scientific community, through a communications strategy,

- basic operating standards agreed or in negotiations on Phenotyping, Markers, Databases and web-services, LIMs,
- development of cluster computers and grid, and
- virtual work space and web-site development

Finally, the Director identified a number of issues, which the committee might want to discuss and address.

- How to get relevant inputs from farmers, consumers and the private sector
- Strategies for the utilization of expected intermediate products of the GCP
- Capacity building of NARS
- Policies on Intellectual Property Rights

### **B) Presentation on Capacity Building by Carmen De Vicente, leader of Sub-programme 5**

According to the leader of this sub-programme, the Sub Programme-5 is a cross-cutting programme implemented across all other sub-programmes with two main objectives.

- to better enable the CP members to carry out the cutting edge research agenda, and
- to empower national program scientists to participate in GCP activities

The rest of the presentation was focused on 6 key elements;

- first year work plan and activities, including a NARS needs assessment workshop.
- strategy for capacity building,
- outcomes of the Sub Programme during the GCP first annual meeting,
- changes in the structure of the Sub Programme, and
- strategy for enabling delivery (ED)

### **C) Presentation on Year-One Communications Strategy by Jennifer Nelson, GCP Communications Coordinator**

According to the Communications Coordinator, the major GCP communications objectives are:

- to facilitate the flow of information within the GCP,
- to create a recognised and clear public image,
- to inform target audiences about the mission of the CP and its progress,
- to disseminate research findings,
- to position the CP as a leader in research and development, and
- to contribute to fundraising efforts

Some of the achievements in 2004 were:

- development of a web-page for the GCP,
- development of a new logo, name, publication of a monthly newsletter, and
- development of a work plan for 2005

## **DIALOGUE AND DISCUSSION ON THE GCP**

An informative question and answer and discussion session followed the three presentations, and some of the key issues and questions raised by committee members were

- The current structure of the consortium and what rules and regulations govern membership issues?
- What are the priority crops on which the GCP plans to focus?
- Are their strategies in place for reaching end-users of the expected products?
- Were conventional plant breeders adequately consulted during the development of the GCP, and do they have a continuing role to play in its implementation?
- Does the GCP have a mechanism in place for phasing out the projects and programmes that fail to deliver?
- What is the GCP's position with regards to GMOs and transgenics?
- Was and will adequate attention be paid to global and national bio-safety regulations and policies as the GCP continues to be implemented?
- To which extent are legal issues (bio safety and IPR) addressed in the capacity-building programme?

Some of the responses provided by the GCP Director and his staff indicated that that the consortium currently has a membership of 8 CGIAR centres and 8 Advanced Research Institutions. Other interested parties can, however still be admitted into the consortium. It was also emphasised that although the Capacity Building Sub-programme (SP-5) targets both consortium and non-consortium members, non-consortium members can only participate in the GCP research activities in partnership with consortium members. With regard to GCP priority crops, apparently the GCP will focus its efforts on cereals (rice, maize and wheat), legumes (cowpeas, chickpeas, common bean and groundnuts), tropical roots and tubers (potatoes, cassava).

Responses were provided to the other questions, and following further discussions the committee endorsed the following summary as the outputs of this first day of information exchange:

- **Balanced project portfolio:** GCP should strive for a balanced approach in designing its programme of research. The portfolio of projects presented appears to lean too much towards hard to crack nuts such as drought resistance, QTLs (quantitative trait loci), and less towards easier tasks such as insect resistance. Need a good blend of both, so that quick outputs and outcomes will sustain interest in and support for the GCP to enable it tackle the harder task on a long-term basis. Dr. Anthony Hall was requested to prepare a short think piece on this for further discussion the following day
- **The Consortium issue:** Committee members discussed the apparent closed nature of the consortium and would like to see a more open arrangement
- **Communications Strategy of the GCP:** Committee was invited to provide input into how the GCP could improve its communication and information sharing strategy in order to improve its effectiveness
- **GMOs and the transgenic debate:** The potential to see the GCP dragged into the GMO debate is great. The Committee may want to offer advice on how the GCP, its governance mechanism and perhaps the committee itself could contribute to the

debate in a way that would not harm the GCP (Provide recommendation to the PSC on ways to clarify the GCP stand on the GMO issue and what position the GCP should take, and communicate effectively to the public)

- **Bio-safety regulations and policies:** The GCP may want to tackle this issue in a more in-depth manner especially in the light of the bio-safety protocol and establish linkages to the Bio-safety clearinghouse. This issue is also closely related to the training programme. The GCP needs to ensure that the training modules do not concentrate only on technical issues to the detriment of broader policy issues including regulatory issues. Ms. Anne Chetaille was requested to prepare a think piece on this issue for further discussion
- **The role of conventional breeders:** A “cri du coeur” that conventional breeders be included in the radar and activities of the GCP. These are the “technicians” that will ensure that the outputs and products are relevant and of use to target beneficiaries or end-users
- **Product delivery mechanism:** Given the importance of ensuring that expected products and outputs need to be delivered to users, the GCP needs to examine the issue and come up with a strategy to ensure delivery to users. How far should the GCP go with the product delivery issue? Should it invest in product generation without an appropriate delivery system, and should it try to go it alone or team up with other competent institutions to ensure the delivery
- **Working with the private sector:** The committee may want to examine this issue and make recommendation as to what could be done to encourage private industries to become fully opened to the idea of sharing technologies without stringent conditions
- How does the GCP plan to strengthen its **relationship with NARS** (National Agricultural Research Systems) within and outside the consortium
- **IPR issues:** Concern is strong with regards to IPR (International Property Rights) issues. The same level of concern should be shown with regards to property rights of farmers and indigenous peoples who may contribute significantly to the genetic resources on which the GCP plans to work
- **Communications issues:** The Committee may want to examine the issue of how to ensure information exchange and knowledge sharing on activities of interest to the GCP, and being carried out elsewhere on a national, regional or global basis in order to minimise duplication and improve efficiency
- **Role of National Governments:** How do we convince Governments and others about the role the former has to play in terms of providing required infrastructure and an enabling policy environment in order to promote the full utilization of the products of the GCP
- **Capacity building issue:** Concerns were expressed with regards to the language dimension. What languages will be used in GCP training and documents?

- **Committee Terms of Reference:** The committee spent the rest of the afternoon before adjourning at 16h30, to discuss and debate its terms of reference, and agreed to revisit the issue the following day.

## **DAY-TWO**

### **SELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

The first order of business on the second day was the selection of both the chair and vice-chair of the committee. At the end of a short period of deliberation, Victor Villalob and Anne Chetaille were selected by committee members to serve for a period of one year, as the Chair and Vice-Chair respectively. The chair then took over the management of the meeting after thanking the committee for the confidence placed in him and pledged to effectively lead and guide the Committee as it addresses its mandate.

### **DISCUSSION ON TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Discussion on the committee terms of reference started the previous day was resumed, and after further deliberations, the committee adopted and approved its terms of reference as presented in the first day.

### **DISCUSSION ON GCP**

The committee continued further discussion on the GCP, using the outputs of the first day summarised into a 13-point document presented earlier as the basis of further discussion. Each item of the document was further discussed and modified to reflect the output of this second day of discussion. The committee also identified 4 of the issues to constitute the central part of its work plan for 2005.

The following represents the final outputs of the committee's deliberation on various aspects of the GCP:

#### **1. Balanced project portfolio:**

*There is a preponderance of drought-related projects in the GCP portfolio. The Stakeholders Committee notes that this is a very difficult research area that may not permit practical successes to be achieved within the near term. The GCP should insure itself against this potential problem by initiating some additional projects with the potential to produce practical successes in the short term, such as those dealing with pest and disease resistance. New projects should be considered on their merits irrespective of whether they contribute to adaptation to drought. Practical successes would be appreciated by NARS plant breeders and donors, thereby increasing their confidence in and support for the GCP.*

#### **2. The Consortium issue:**

*Committee members discussed the fixed nature of the consortium and would like to see a more open arrangement for access to participation in the GCP activities*

The Committee suggested the need to identify a committee member to lead this initiative

#### **3. GMOs and the transgenic debate:**

The potential to see the GCP dragged into the GMO debate is great.

*Therefore, the Committee requests that the GCP present a clear statement on the use of transgenics (including compliance with national and international bio-safety regulations) and a plan for communicating its position to stakeholders*

**4. Communications strategy of the GCP:**

*The Committee supports the communications strategy and efforts and believes it is on the right track. The Committee agrees to provide input to the evolving strategy to improve its effectiveness.*

The Committee also suggested the need to identify a committee member to lead this initiative

**5. Policies and capacity building:**

*The GCP needs to ensure that the training modules do not concentrate only on technical but should include policy, legal, and regulatory issues. The Stakeholder Committee therefore supports the capacity building work-plan of Consortium scientists on legal issues related to bio-safety and intellectual property rights. The Stakeholders Committee suggests that these activities should be ongoing for the rest of the programme and be extended to NARS scientists. The Committee emphasizes the need to establish linkages with the bio-safety Clearinghouse of the Cartagena Protocol to inform on ongoing capacity building activities under the GCP.*

**6. The role of conventional breeders:**

*The Stakeholders Committee expresses a plea that plant breeders be fully included in the radar screen of the activities of the GCP. These are the people who will ensure that the outputs and products are used to benefit farmers and consumers*

**7. Product delivery mechanism:**

*Given the importance of ensuring that expected products and outputs need to be delivered to users, the GCP needs to examine the issue and come up with a strategy to ensure delivery to users. How far should the GCP go with the product delivery issue? Should it invest in product generation without its own programme-grown delivery system or should it also team up with other competent institutions to ensure the delivery?*

The Committee suggested the need to identify a committee member to lead this initiative

**8. Working with the private sector:**

The committee will explore this issue and provide input into the GCP's involvement with the private sector. The Committee also suggested the need to identify a person to lead this initiative

**9. Developing strong relationships with NARS:**

*The Committee requests that the GCP provide regular feedback on its linkages, in particular its efforts to share information, with NARS, either directly or through their regional and sub-regional organizations.*

**10. IPR with respect to farmers and indigenous people:**

*The Committee encourages the GCP to pay particular attention to the provisions in its consortium agreement on the IPR of farmers and indigenous people*

**11. Languages:**

*The Committee strongly suggests that major documents of the CP should be made available in English, French, and Spanish. The Committee requests that courses be taught in the language of the relevant target region and the training materials available in English, French, and Spanish.*

**COMMITTEE PROGRAM OF WORK FOR 2005**

**Activities:**

The Committee agreed to work on the 4 components presented in table 1 below, and the following deadlines were set.

- First draft of the outputs by April 2005, before the PSC April meeting
- Final draft by September 2005, to be discussed and finalised before the October PSC meeting
- The committee will hold two meetings in 2005. The first one will be hosted by Omar J. Fuentes, on behalf of AgroChile. The second one will be held in October at a venue yet to be decided on.

**Work methods**

A distribution list has been set-up for the stakeholders committee ([GFAR-GCP-L@mailserv.fao.org](mailto:GFAR-GCP-L@mailserv.fao.org)). On the following work components that have been identified, lead members will make suggestions *as soon as possible* on the way to proceed. According to the GFAR secretariat, funds will be made available if necessary for external consultancy, etc.

**Table 1: GFAR ShC 2005 Program of Work**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Description/Action</b>	<b>Lead Member</b>
Consortium Issue	The committee will undertake a study and evaluation of the consortium agreement especially with regards to membership issues and privileges	Anne Chetaille
Communications	Given the importance of communications within and outside the consortium, the committee will examine the current communications strategy with a view to providing inputs to that strategy.	Raul Montemayor
Output delivery	The committee will provide input to the development of plans and strategies for the delivery of outputs and products of the program to users, especially farmers and consumers. For example, how far should the GCP go with the product delivery issue? Should it invest in product generation without its own programme-grown delivery system, or should it team up with other competent institutions to ensure the delivery?	Philip Kiriro
Private Sector involvement	The Committee will examine issues surrounding collaboration with the private sector both as a supplier of technologies and as a partner in product delivery mechanisms	Victor Villalob

**Reports**

Minutes of the meeting made by the GFAR secretariat will be circulated on the distribution list for comments, and will be presented by the Chair to the Programme Steering Committee of the GCP. They will then subsequently be made available to the public on GFAR Website.

**CHAIRS REPORT AND CLOSING REMARKS**

In his closing remarks, the Chair thanked Committee members for the effective participation and for the confidence placed in him to chair the committee, and coordinate its activities over the next period of one year. He also thanked the GFAR Secretariat and its Executive Secretary for providing all that was necessary for a fruitful and intellectually stimulating meeting. Finally he expressed the committee's gratitude to the GCP team and its Director, for the excellent briefing and information provided on the GCP.

**CLOSING REMARKS FORM THE DIRECTOR OF THE GCP**

On behalf of the PSC, the CP Director, Robert Zeigler, thanked Committee members for accepting this challenging task. He also thanked the GFAR secretariat and FAO for providing excellent logistical support for the meeting. He made a particular mention of the efforts the GFAR Secretariat put into mobilizing GFAR stakeholders to contribute to the implementation of the CP.

**The meeting was adjourned at 14h30**

## ANNEX 1

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Organization/ Stakeholder Group	E-mail
Montemayor, Raul	Federation of Free Farmers, Philippine; Farmers' Organizations Representative	<a href="mailto:freefarm@mozcom.com">freefarm@mozcom.com</a>
Kiriro, Philip	East African Farmers Federation (EAFF), Kenya; Farmers' Organizations Representative	<a href="mailto:info@eaffu.org">info@eaffu.org</a>
Chetaille, Anne	Groupe de recherch� et d'�changes technologiques (GRET), France, EFARD Representative	<a href="mailto:chetaille@gret.org">chetaille@gret.org</a>
Fuentes, Omar J.	Agro-Chile; Chile NGO Representative	<a href="mailto:agrochileag@123.cl">agrochileag@123.cl</a>
Victor Villalob	Secretar�a de Agricultura, Mexico; FORAGRO Representative	<a href="mailto:vvilla@sagarpa.gob.mx">vvilla@sagarpa.gob.mx</a>
Hall, Anthony	University of California Riverside, USA; NAFAR Representative	<a href="mailto:anthony.hall@ucr.edu">anthony.hall@ucr.edu</a>
Aleksidze, Guram	Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Georgia; CACAARI Representative	<a href="mailto:guram_aleksidze@yahoo.com">guram_aleksidze@yahoo.com</a>
Nkhoma, Charles	Plant Genetic Resources Centre (SPGRC), Zambia; FARA Representative	<a href="mailto:spgrc@pop3.zamnet.zm">spgrc@pop3.zamnet.zm</a>
Zeigler, Robert	Generation Challenge Program	<a href="mailto:r.zeigler@cgiar.org">r.zeigler@cgiar.org</a>
De Vicente, Carmen	Generation Challenge Program	<a href="mailto:c.devicente@cgiar.org">c.devicente@cgiar.org</a>
Nelson, Jennifer	Generation Challenge Program	<a href="mailto:j.nelson@cgiar.org">j.nelson@cgiar.org</a>
Leihner, Dietrich	FAO	<a href="mailto:dietrich.leihner@fao.org">dietrich.leihner@fao.org</a>
Smith, Ola	GFAR Secretariat	<a href="mailto:ola.smith@fao.org">ola.smith@fao.org</a>
Abdi, Nur	GFAR Secretariat	<a href="mailto:nur.abdi@fao.org">nur.abdi@fao.org</a>

## ANNEX 2 PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Hour	Agenda Items: Monday 29 <sup>th</sup> November	Room
09h00	<i>Welcome Address</i> : by Dr, Dietrich Leihner, Director of Research, Extension and Training Division (SDR) of Sustainable Development Department, FAO	<b>Mexico</b> (D211)
09h15	<i>Opening Remarks</i> : by Dr Ola Smith, Executive Secretary of GFAR	
09h30	Presentation of members of the Stakeholder Committee	
10h00	Adoption of the agenda	
<i>10h05</i>	<i>Coffee break and Group Photograph</i>	
10h30	Presentation on the GENERATION Challenge Programme- a general overview: by Dr Robert Ziegler, Director of GCP	
11h15	Presentation on GCP Sub programme 5: Capacity Building: by Carmen de Vicente, leader of Sub programme 5	
11h45	Presentation on GCP Communication Strategies by: Jennifer Nelson, GCP Communications Coordinator	
<i>12h00</i>	<i>Lunch break</i>	
14h00	Dialogue and discussion on the GCP	
15h30	Coffee break	
16h00	Roles and mandate of the committee	
<i>17h00</i>	<i>Cocktails</i>	

<b>Hour</b>	<b>Agenda Items: Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> November</b>	<b>Room</b>
09h00	Committee deliberation on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Selection of Chair</li><li>• The GENERATION Challenge Programme.</li><li>• Committee Terms of Reference (TORs)</li></ul>	<b>Mexico</b> (D211)
<i>10h30</i>	<i>Coffee break</i>	
10h50	Development of committee programme of work	
12h15	Lunch break	
14h00	Finalization of programme of work	
15h00	Concluding Remarks: by Dr Robert Ziegler, Director of GCP	

## ANNEX 3

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Name	Organization/ Stakeholder Group	E-mail
Raul Montemayor	Federation of Free Farmers, Philippine; <b>Farmers' Organizations Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:freefarm@mozcom.com">freefarm@mozcom.com</a>
Philip Kiriro	East African Farmers Federation (EAFF), Kenya; <b>Farmers' Organizations Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:info@eaffu.org">info@eaffu.org</a>
Esa Harmala	Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners, Finland <b>Farmers' Organizations Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:esa.harmala@mtk.fi">esa.harmala@mtk.fi</a>
Mamadou Goita	A.CO.R.D. - Agence de Coopération et de Recherches pour le Développement, Mali <b>NGO Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:acord.sahel1@afribone.net.ml">acord.sahel1@afribone.net.ml</a>
Omar J. Fuentes	Agro-Chile; Chile <b>NGO Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:agrochileag@123.cl">agrochileag@123.cl</a>
Anne Chetaille	Groupe de recherché et d'échanges technologiques (GRET), France, <b>EFARD Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:chetaille@gret.org">chetaille@gret.org</a>
Victor Villalob	Secretaría de Agricultura, Mexico; FORAGRO Representative	<a href="mailto:vvilla@sagarpa.gob.mx">vvilla@sagarpa.gob.mx</a>
Anthony Hall	University of California Riverside, USA; <b>NAFAR Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:anthony.hall@ucr.edu">anthony.hall@ucr.edu</a>
Guram Aleksidze	Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Georgia; <b>CACAARI Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:guram_aleksidze@yahoo.com">guram_aleksidze@yahoo.com</a>
Charles Nkhoma	Plant Genetic Resources Centre (SPGRC), Zambia; <b>FARA Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:spgrc@pop3.zamnet.zm">spgrc@pop3.zamnet.zm</a>
Hamid Narjissee	Institut National de Recherche Agronomique (INRA), Morocco <b>AARINENA Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:hnarjissee@yahoo.com">hnarjissee@yahoo.com</a>
Iwamoto Mutsuo	JIRCAS - Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences, Japan <b>APAARI Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:iwamoto@jircas.affrc.go.jp">iwamoto@jircas.affrc.go.jp</a>
Arvin Kapur	Nunhems Seeds PVT.LTD. India <b>Private Sector Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:nunhems.gurgaon@nunhems.com">nunhems.gurgaon@nunhems.com</a>
Manuel Ruiz	SPDA - Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental, Peru <b>Private Sector Representative</b>	<a href="mailto:mruiz@spda.org.pe">mruiz@spda.org.pe</a>