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Dear Dr. Paroda,

On behalf of the External Review Panel, I am pleased to submit to you the Report of the First External Review of GFAR, which was conducted during the period from May to September 2000, under my chairmanship. The Panel is grateful to the Steering Committee for initiating the review process at an early stage in GFAR life cycle, and expresses its appreciation to both IFAD and IDRC/CIDA for their foresight in sponsoring the review. The Panel wishes also to record its appreciation to Mr. Fernando Chaparro and his team in the GFAR secretariat for their support and excellent collaboration.

The Panel is pleased to note that the review found GFAR to be well administered, and its output have increased considerably over the last two years, both in terms of quality and quantity, and that its stakeholders have indicated high satisfaction with the GFAR’s secretariat work and services.

This being the First External Review of GFAR since its inception, the Panel did not have the advantage of earlier reviews for general comparison and tracking of change. Therefore, the Panel took a pragmatic approach, covering both the secretariat and the stakeholders of GFAR, recognizing the need for GFAR to be able to respond to current challenges while setting a firm foundation for its future.

The Panel underlines GFAR successful transformation from two separate secretariats for NARS and GFAR into a single secretariat located in Rome. The Panel has identified a set of recommendations to improve its management and governance structure, and consolidate its activities. In this context, the Panel’s view that GFAR’s current activities and outputs need to be linked more closely to its stakeholders activities and the evolutionary process undergoing at the Regional, Sub-regional and National levels. This will require close interaction and collaboration between the stakeholders to GFAR’s mission through improved organizational, priority setting, and resource allocation arrangements.

The overall picture emerging from the Panel’s review is that GFAR has made considerable progress and has grown from a novel concept to a potentially leading instrument that can foster International Agricultural Research system in the years to come. The Panel recommends, therefore the continued strong support to GFAR by all its stakeholders.

Sincerely Yours,

Abbas Kesseba
Panel Chair
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AARINENA</td>
<td>Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Plant Production and Protection Division of FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAARI</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Associate Professional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI</td>
<td>Advanced Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASARECA</td>
<td>Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABI</td>
<td>Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Central Asia and the Caucasus Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Central Directors Committee of CGIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR</td>
<td>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRAD</td>
<td>Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement/International Cooperation Centre on Agrarian Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORAF/WECARD</td>
<td>Conseil des responsables de la recherche agronomique africains/West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>Centre Technique de Coopération Agricole et Rurale/Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation of the EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
<td>Donor Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAPAPA</td>
<td>Eastern and Central African Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFARD</td>
<td>European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFAR</td>
<td>Electronic Global Forum on Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIARD</td>
<td>European Initiative on Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESDAR</td>
<td>Environmentally Sustainable Development and Agricultural Research Unit of the World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARA</td>
<td>Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORAGRO</td>
<td>Forum for Agricultural Research in LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARS</td>
<td>Global Agricultural Research System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Global Forum on Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL</td>
<td>Library and Documentation Systems Division, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARC</td>
<td>International Agricultural Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>International Centers Week of the CGIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>International Development Research Centre of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAP</td>
<td>International Federation of Agricultural Producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>International Plant Genetic Resources Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>International Rice Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>International Service for National Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Less Developed Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM</td>
<td>Mid-Term Meeting of the CGIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARI</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCI</td>
<td>Cooperative Programme for Agricultural Research and Technology Transfer in Latin America and the Caribbean Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROLINNOVA</td>
<td>Promoting Local Innovation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/SRF</td>
<td>Regional/Sub-regional Fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIS</td>
<td>Regional Agricultural Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPA</td>
<td>Réseau d'expertise et des politiques agricoles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCAR</td>
<td>Southern African Centre for Cooperation in Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Swiss Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDRE</td>
<td>Extension, Education and Communication Service, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDRR</td>
<td>Research and Technology Development Service, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICTA</td>
<td>Integrated Agricultural Technology System in Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee of the CGIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAICENT</td>
<td>World Agricultural Information Centre, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANAN</td>
<td>West Asia and North Africa Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFACE

Introduction to the Review

This report represents the first external review of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), undertaken by a panel of experts1 commissioned by the GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC). The panel was requested to assess GFAR’s progress to date and make recommendations for future direction. The key recommendations are discussed in the Executive Summary, all are highlighted in bold in the main text and are listed in order of text appearance at the end of each section.

Background and Terms of Reference

GFAR was formally established in 1996. Initially there were two secretariats, both of which commenced operations in mid-1998, but as of June of this year the two have been merged into one single body. GFAR held its first plenary meeting2 in Dresden in May 2000. Prior to this meeting, the GFAR-SC and the Donor Support Group (DSG) had already agreed to commission an external assessment to review GFAR's work programme, its governance and organisational structure. The Terms of Reference for the review are attached to this report as Annex 1. It was recognised from the outset that the review would provide an assessment of work in progress and recommendations for the future. The time available to the Panel and the resulting work modalities neither warranted, nor provided the opportunity for collecting adequate evidence globally for a full evaluation. The review panel has nevertheless used the available evidence, and sought the views of many stakeholders. While endeavouring not to get too buried in the details of what is a dynamic enterprise, it made a point of ensuring that all comments were the result of reference to available evidence and not merely based on its own personal assessment.

Conduct of the Review - Approach and Method

This review is a rapid assessment, and its core work was undertaken over a period of four weeks. The panel members worked together in Rome for two weeks in June, and separately thereafter, while keeping in regular contact with GFAR stakeholders throughout the undertaking.

GFAR brings together participants from seven diverse stakeholder groups. Throughout the review, the team was conscious of the need to consult with key persons from all of these groups, and to ensure at least partial regional coverage as well. The review was divided into three parts, as follows:

(i) Review and analysis of documents. Panel members reviewed a vast amount of written material including papers prepared for, or emanating from, GFAR 2000, Dresden, as well as other documents going back over the last four years, and records of all meetings associated with GFAR and its Secretariats.3

(ii) Meeting with GFAR stakeholders. The reviewers met and discussed with a large number of GFAR stakeholders. One reviewer attended the GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting, in an observer capacity, and was therefore able to interact with some of the four hundred participants in attendance. The two other reviewers visited one regional

---

1 The Panel comprised Abbas Kesscha, Tim Dottridge and John Russell. The review was co-sponsored by IFAD and IDRC/CIDA
2 GFAR 2000, Dresden
3 See bibliography
and one sub-regional NARS forum, respectively: (a) the Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa (AARINENA), and (b) the West and Central Africa Council for Agricultural Research and Development (WECARD/CORAF). They also had discussions - either in person or by telephone - with a large number of other persons involved with GFAR.4

(iii) Questionnaire. Early in June, the reviewers dispatched a questionnaire to 160 persons representing a broad range of constituencies covering the global agricultural research system. The questionnaire solicited opinions on the areas in which GFAR had been active, and on the usefulness of its work, as well as suggestions for future direction. There were 80 respondents (50%). The results have contributed to many of the observations made throughout, and are discussed in Annex 5, which has a copy of the questionnaire attached as an Appendix.

During the two-week period of work in Rome, the panel members had discussions with several senior officials from FAO, IFAD, TAC and IPGRI. They also met the Secretary General of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP), the Chairman of the CGIAR Finance Committee and the representative of CIDA. Throughout the entire review process they were able to interact closely with the core team of the GFAR Secretariat: Fernando Chaparro and Christian Hoste, and their two APOs, Arnoud Braun and Oliver Oliveros. Two of the reviewers also met with Alain Derevier, former Executive Secretary of the GFAR Secretariat in Washington during the period June 1998 through July 2000 - prior to its merger with the NARS Secretariat in Rome. Most of the material reviewed is available on the website5 and a full list of the documentation is provided in the attached bibliography.

It is important to make a clear distinction between GFAR - a global process of consultation, information exchange and partnerships for development research, and the work of its now-merged Secretariat, which is to support this process of exchange and interaction. GFAR also hosts a triennial meeting of participants from each of its seven stakeholder groups. The meeting that led to the establishment of GFAR took place in Washington in 1996, presided over by the President of IFAD, whereas GFAR's first plenary meeting was held this year in Dresden, and attended by just over 400 participants. The GFAR external review - which is the subject of this report - refers to material and experience emanating from that GFAR 2000 meeting in Dresden but it is not an evaluation of the meeting itself. That is already being taken care of in various forms by the Secretariat, so as to learn lessons for the next Forum, scheduled for 2003, and to build on the recommendations and debate when deciding on the short- and longer-term work programmes for GFAR as a whole and for its Secretariat.

The review panel has endeavoured to fulfil the Terms of Reference to the best of its ability, going beyond them in many instances. In trying to synthesise a great deal of material, as well as different views of the stakeholder groups, the panel is certain to have missed some important information and not done justice to other sources, especially since there was much to read, learn and digest in too little time. Moreover, considering the diverse audience to which the report is addressed, it is unlikely to satisfy everyone. Panel members hope, nevertheless, to have contributed usefully and creatively to the debate as to where GFAR - and its Secretariat, in particular - should focus its future direction.

---

4 See list of persons interviewed, Annex 12.
5 GFAR documents can be easily accessed on the web at www.cgar.org
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Concept of GFAR. The Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) represents an innovative attempt to work towards a global system of agricultural research for development. Established in October 1996, GFAR seeks to bring together all interested parties in the discussion and implementation of a global agenda, based on national and regional perspectives. Its very existence marks a general recognition of the rapidly changing environment for agricultural research, requiring new ways of working and the involvement of additional stakeholders.

The GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting, held earlier this year, was attended by some four hundred representatives of the seven stakeholders constituencies involved: the national agricultural research systems (NARS) and their fora; international agricultural research centres (IARCs) and related CGIAR institutions; the donors; advanced research institutes (ARIs) of the developed countries; the private sector; non-government organisations; and farmer organisations. The participants discussed and endorsed a Plan of Action - the GFAR Business Plan - covering the next three-year period. The GFAR Secretariat has the task of facilitating the execution of this Plan by the stakeholders through their own work programmes, with the endorsement of the GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC).

It was decided by the GFAR-SC to commission an external review of GFAR to assess progress to date and provide guidance for future direction, thus charting the way ahead over the coming decade. A Panel of experts reviewed the work-in-progress and provided a set of recommendations for consideration by the SC. The recommendations are discussed in full in the main report and the main findings of the panel are summarised in this text.

The review focused on the concept of GFAR; its organisational structure, governance and operating procedures; the roles of its stakeholders; approaches to developing a sustainable funding strategy; the Business Plan and priorities for future action. In an exercise of this nature, reviewers tend to focus mainly on the weaknesses identified and on suggestions for change. It must be stressed, therefore, that the Panel was impressed by how much has been accomplished by stakeholders and the Secretariat in working towards and refining the goals that lay behind the establishment of GFAR in 1996. A great deal has already been achieved, and many innovative ideas are emerging. The panel endorses the general lines of action and priorities that are being pursued, and considers that the next three years need to witness the consolidation and clearer definition of GFAR’s operating procedures, structure and governance. More importantly, the combined efforts of the stakeholders, assisted by the Secretariat, should be seen to deliver significant results in the field.

The Panel reaffirms that the stated principles of subsidiarity, participatory decision-making, complementarity of effort, adaptability, inclusiveness, openness, and deep commitment to a common purpose continue to be fundamental to all GFAR undertakings. It recommends that the mission statement wording ‘to mobilise the world scientific community’ be amended to read: ‘mobilise the stakeholders in agricultural research for development in their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources.

It was agreed at the Dresden 2000 meeting that the Dresden Declaration should be regarded as a basis for ongoing discussion between and among all stakeholder groups. Stakeholders were invited to comment on this Declaration, and the farmer organisations and NGOs also produced Declarations of their own. These need to be further reviewed by the GFAR-SC, so as to identify differences and diversity of opinion, highlight consensus and ensure that all stakeholders share the view that GFAR is a worthy forum where all can express their views, debate and resolve priority issues in the field of

---

While there are other important constituencies of critical concern to GFAR, such as policy-makers and civil society, the Panel reaffirms the decision of the GFAR-SC that no change will be made in the composition of the stakeholder constituencies for the present.
agricultural research for development. The Panel feels that this Vision Statement need only be revisited every nine years, or when changes occur requiring its amendment earlier than scheduled.

Whereas at present GFAR is a forum for discussing global ARD issues, in the long-term it may well evolve to become a platform for discussing all agricultural research in both developed and developing countries alike. Some of the responses to a questionnaire circulated by the panel during its review, indicated that this distinction between research in LDCs and developed countries will be less visible over time, as seems inevitable with the rapid pace of globalisation and pressing issues related to IPRs, GMOs, environmental international agreements and world trade. However, to help offset the increasing equity imbalance between North and South, the Panel considers that for the present GFAR should continue with its emphasis on agricultural research for development to serve the developing regions of the world.

The Role of the Stakeholders. One of GFAR's key strengths is that it provides a common meeting place in which all seven stakeholder constituencies can participate, and bring together their comparative advantages in the research and development process. A Forum of this kind is the ideal platform for addressing issues of global concern, where the participation of a broad and very diverse set of actors is required. Whereas the Forum itself meets formally only every three years, its stakeholders carry out their programmes continuously in pursuit of their agreed aims, facilitated by the GFAR Secretariat and under the aegis of the GFAR-SC.

In facilitating the work of GFAR, the Secretariat will need to continue providing strong support to the NARS regional and subregional fora, as this is where almost all collaborative research activities take place. In several cases at present, NARS are simply the NARIs of the country or region concerned, although they are now broadening their base to better utilize their collective experience and include representatives of universities, the private sector, extension services, NGOs, and farmer organisations. There is also a tendency for NARS members in these R/SR fora to be mainly crop-oriented, often with parallel fora for livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resources, which have to be integrated into the principal regional fora. The Panel strongly recommends that greater effort be made over the next three years to increase stakeholder participation in the NUS at national level and in their fora, and also to broaden the scope of agriculture and thus ensure that all the other sectors are fully integrated.

A key responsibility of the Secretariat is to assist stakeholders in further developing their constituencies. This is especially true for farmer organisations, in view of their relatively low voice in agricultural research decision making, and for NGOs – due to their large numbers and varied scope and goals. The Panel recommends, therefore, that both these stakeholder constituencies continue to receive special assistance so as to strengthen their representation in GFAR. The private sector also needs to be better integrated in GFAR activities. The Panel recommends that the Secretariat assist this sector by organising global/regional workshops on issues of improved public/private sector collaboration. The donors, as stakeholders, are already well coordinated through their Donor Support Group (DSG). It is evident, however, that some misunderstanding exists as to the respective roles of GFAR and the CGIAR. The Panel recommends that the Secretariat and the GFAR Chair meet formally with the Center Directors Committee each year. As for the ARIs, it is encouraging to note the good coordination of ARIs in Europe through the activities of EIARD and EFARD, as reflected in the way they assist R/SR fora. The Panel recommends that both the North American and Asia Pacific ARIs consolidate their support in like manner to Europe.

The key gathering at which all GFAR stakeholders come together is the triennial Plenary meeting, the first of which was held in Dresden earlier this year, in conjunction with the annual mid term meeting of the CGIAR. The Panel recommends that in future the plenary meeting be held independently of the CGI meetings, and that it be hosted by each of the five regional fora, in turn.

Organisational Structure and Governance. Appropriately, a modest organisational structure has been set up at the global level, to oversee GFAR activities. This structure comprises a secretariat; a steering committee (SC) that meets twice yearly to set policy and agree programmes; a management
team to assist with implementation; a donor support group (DSG) to coordinate funding support; and four facilitating agencies to assist its operations. There appears to be consensus that the Secretariat remain a small unit, whose principal role is to facilitate the implementation of GFAR’s Business Plan – to be carried out by the different stakeholders, both individually and in collaboration. It is of vital importance that the Secretariat manages to support the four principal activities comprising the Plan. One of the questionnaire respondents put the matter very succinctly: “... the Secretariat must have sufficient capacity to be able to undertake a catalytic, facilitation and knowledge management role across a very broad range of themes, commodities, disciplines and regions”. He also added a rider, cautioning that it should not become an implementing agency. Bearing this in mind and in the light of the Secretariat’s currently-envisioned responsibilities, the Panel is firmly of the view that the two-person professional team (there were three people initially, before the merging of the secretariats), assisted by two APOs, is insufficient for it to operate effectively.

The Panel thus recommends that the Secretariat be staffed for the medium-term by a team of four professionals comprising: (i) an Executive Secretary; (ii) an ICT specialist responsible for EGFAR and the RAIS support programme; (iii) a senior professional engaged in providing support to the NARS and their fora; (iv) a senior professional responsible for working with the other stakeholders. The four staff should possess an appropriate mix of expertise to complement each other. The recruitment of the ICT specialist is extremely urgent as, ideally, a first rate professional in this field should have been put on the staff team long ago to help in the critical task of setting up EGFAR. An endeavour of this magnitude needs an authoritative focal point to collaborate with heads of other national and international ICT systems and networks, and strengthen the development of the R/SR fora RAIS. The Panel considers that a critical opportunity has been missed in not recognising the importance of filling such a post earlier and hopes that a donor will come forward immediately to fill the breach. The Panel is also of the view that the RAIS programme is critically important and fully warrants the posting of APOs specialised in ICT to all fora requiring assistance in this field, once the proposed ICT specialist has been recruited and provides further training.

In the praiseworthy attempt to get GFAR speedily off the ground, inadequate attention was given to institutionalising appropriate operating procedures. The Panel now recommends revisiting, updating and completing the GFAR chart approved in 1998, given its crucial importance in terms of providing guidance and direction to the Secretariat, and the Secretariat’s accountability to the SC. As part of a new directive, this clarification should also include terms of reference for the Chair and Vice Chair, and a clear indication of their roles on the Management Team. It is encouraging to note that a draft directive has now been prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with their Management Team. The Panel recommends that the text receive early debate and ratification by the GFAR-SC.

Other recommendations on structure and modalities of operation include: that the present system of membership of the GFAR-SC be maintained for another three years; that all GFAR’s stakeholder representatives be willing to accept the responsibility to continue developing their constituencies - including taking on an oversight function; and that the GFAR-SC and DSG review and approve the proposed communications policy and improved modalities of operation.

With regard to the facilitating agencies - IFAD, FAO, ISNAR and the WB - the Panel recommends that their functions be spelled out more explicitly and that these four agencies now become ex-officio members of the GFAR-SC, so that they can brief SC members on, and discuss, their continuing roles. The new Legal Agreement for hosting the Secretariat - to be signed shortly - should establish FAO’s contribution more clearly, so as to avoid any future misunderstanding. In general, the Panel commends the work of the facilitating agencies, and recommends that they continue their support for the next three years.

Although the Panel’s terms of reference did not require them to review the performance of the regional/subregional fora, it is clear that the latter’s central role within GFAR requires review. In this context, two members of the Panel visited a regional and sub-regional forum (one each) and have made a number of suggestions in the report, for consideration by the R/SR fora. These include the
suggestion that all R/SR fora would likely benefit from having a full-time Executive Secretary and that, similar to the Secretariat and its governing committees, all fora would be wise to review their operating procedures and ensure maximum transparency. While the Panel has stressed the advantages of favouring research activities at sub-regional level in particular, it wishes to emphasise its concurrence with the policy that each region decides what roles should be played at what level, and also determines the best way to organise itself within its own forum.

Developing a Sustainable Funding Strategy. The long-term goal here should be that the stakeholders fund all GFAR activities. This ideal is still a long way off, but should be kept in mind as a principle of shared ownership. For the moment, donor support will continue to be needed. The Secretariat may approach donors to ask for seed funds for specific areas, once these have been identified with the stakeholders. However, most, if not all, of such money would go directly to the stakeholders, as all are in agreement that the Secretariat should not become a funding/implementation agency, but remain a facilitating and matchmaking mechanism. It can also advise stakeholders on possible funding sources, as an “honest broker”; likewise, donors can be sensitised as to opportunities for participating in funding innovative research programmes.

The Secretariat requires funds for the four professional posts and for its operating costs. In the light of its discussions, and to provoke specific donor reaction, the Panel has suggested that these posts be funded by the CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and Italy (through its IFAD Trust Fund), and CIRAD, under existing or proposed agreements. APOs could be funded by other donors – just as the Netherlands are already doing. Similar arrangements are in place with the World Bank, IFAD, Italy and ISNAR. The Panel requests that these arrangements continue. In any event, the DSG will need to review their mechanisms for ensuring sustainable financial support to the Secretariat. The Panel proposes that this be done by the DSG developing a Sustainable Funding Strategy through an issues paper - to be tabled and discussed at their next meeting, and hopefully ratified and put in place by the meeting in May 2001.

The Global Agenda and Business Plan. The GFAR Business Plan has been developed around the global agenda’s four lines of action, agreed upon by the GFAR-SC and ratified at Dresden 2000. The Panel recommends that the Plan cover a six-year, medium-term timeframe, comprising two three-year segments, one of which rolls up ahead of each triennial plenary meeting, so that the completed three-year segment can be evaluated and assessed, and another three-year period added. The Plan should define the role each stakeholder will play in respect of the lines of action agreed upon, as well as the expected outputs and milestones to measure progress. The Plan will differ from the GFAR Secretariat’s Work Programme, which covers the same three-year periods and is designed to facilitate the Plan’s implementation, but will be prepared for three years at a time, only. The four lines of action, which are fully supported by the Panel, as they reflect priorities emanating from the R/SR fora or suggestions from other stakeholders that have been fully debated in the GFAR-SC, are as follows: setting a global vision; strengthening the NARS and their fora; improving knowledge and information systems; and, developing innovative research partnership mechanisms among the stakeholders around four main thematic research areas. These four thematic areas are genetic resource management and biotechnology; natural resource management and agroecology; commodity chains and underutilised plant species; policy management and institutional development.

The importance of strengthening R/SR fora has already been discussed as also the critical need to appoint an ICT specialist professional to the GFAR Secretariat. The whole ICT area is one where GFAR can add immense value, if correctly equipped to do so through EGFAR and through support to the RAIS. All NARS urgently need to be updated on the latest advances in ICT. It was clear from the visit to WECARD/CORAF that this is an essential exercise if we are to avoid creating a second-class category of GFAR members, ill-equipped to interact with their colleagues. The panel strongly recommends that donors continue to support the development of EGFAR and the RAIS to prevent such an eventuality occurring, and ensure that all NARS are in a position to fully participate in their fora and in international ARD networks, using the new ICT technologies.
Thematic proposals. With regard to the latter, the report contains recommended criteria for priority-setting and for the selection of cases on which the Secretariat should concentrate its efforts (para 3.26). The panel recommends that the Secretariat facilitate start-up of all thematic research proposals but merely keep a watching brief thereafter, monitoring successful partnerships through an agreed reporting system. It should not get directly involved again unless specifically requested to do so by the sub regional fora, or when issues emerge that need airing at the global level by commissioning a special study or hosting an appropriate workshop. The Secretariat has a particular role to play in assisting the global programmes identified under the Global Framework Programme. Such programmes should build on existing achievements and be based on ongoing activities. The Panel was impressed by the content of the thematic papers presented in Dresden, and by the efforts made by all R/SR fora and other stakeholders in tabling some 56 case studies of success stories and 46 proposed innovative partnerships - worthy of being analysed and reviewed next year, as is proposed under a technical assistance grant provided by IFAD.

In the above context, some of the Panel’s priority recommendations are as follows: GFAR should set up a review of genetic resource management and IPR issues in developing countries, and help strengthen regional and sub-regional fora so that they can support NARS in these areas. The Secretariat would assist its stakeholders in developing global programmes on a few commodity chains, based on the priorities expressed by the NARS regional fora; the sustainable promotion of some of the underutilised plant species is needed in order to contribute to economic development, people's well-being, and the maintenance of genetic diversity and associated local knowledge. The Panel is especially concerned that relatively little policy management or analysis research is being carried out. It is vital that policy-makers become more sensitised to the high potential benefits likely to accrue from good research. The Panel thus recommends that the DSG give greater support to regional networks undertaking research on policy-related issues, and to relevant ARIs and IARCs so that they can better assist NARS in developing their own capacity to carry out such research - particularly by building up local university or government departments.

The whole institutional development agenda for ARD is a critical one. The Panel wishes to emphasise two additional, high potential research areas that need priority attention. First of all, and of critical importance to both farmer organisations and NGOs - as stated in their Declaration at Dresden - the Panel strongly recommends that more research be undertaken on how to effectively institutionalise truly participatory research/extension farmer linkages that makes research and extension programmes directly responsive to farmer demand. Any such proposals have to include the review of appropriate incentives to really transform present R&D systems into fully participatory farmer-demand-led initiatives, as the lack of such incentives continues to inhibit any meaningful change.

The Panel recommends that urgent attention be given to reviewing innovative ways of integrating national research programmes into sub regional research efforts in specific fields - just as is being attempted in PROCISUR and PROCIANDINO, and in the SADC Genebank initiative; and what was a key feature of the Nile Valley Research programme in the WANA region. There are enormous cost-saving potential and synergistic benefits to be gained from institutionalising shared sub-regional or even region-wide programmes between nations/states. This is one of the prime objectives underlying the whole rationale of establishing regional and sub-regional fora. Integrated research programmes of this nature need to be much more widely reviewed and their successes replicated.

The Panel feels that developments since the establishment of GFAR in 1996 confirm the validity of the GFAR concept. Although it is early yet for GFAR to prove its potential, the Panel endorses, in general, the scope and calibre of the work carried out by the now-merged secretariats and feels that GFAR stakeholders should continue to give it their full support and allow it to evolve.
Section 1. GFAR: BACKGROUND AND CONCEPT

A. Origin and purpose

1.01 The Global Forum on Agricultural Research, (GFAR), was established in October 1996 at a special session of the regular annual meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), held in Washington, as part of their International Centres Week (ICW96). GFAR is a collective endeavour. Its purpose is to facilitate exchange of information, access to knowledge, cooperation, and research partnerships among a broad spectrum of stakeholders involved in agricultural research and sustainable development. It is important to point out that the GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting was the first time that all actors had come together to engage in constructive dialogue and to recognise what each one can contribute towards enhancing the effectiveness of international agricultural research. GFAR’s main purpose, therefore, is to mobilise all available international agricultural research resources to achieve agricultural development through a global agricultural-research-for-development system aimed at reducing poverty, achieving food security and ensuring sustainable natural resource management. Right from the start, GFAR placed particular emphasis on strengthening the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) of developing countries. These NARS have a fundamental role to play in the process, particularly through their emerging regional and sub-regional research fora.

1.02 GFAR now comprises seven groups of stakeholders: the regional and sub-regional fora of the developing country NARS, the private sector, non-governmental organisations, farmer organisations, advanced research institutes (ARIs) of North America, Europe and Asia-Pacific, the international agricultural research centres (IARCs) (mostly part of the CGIAR), and donors.

1.03 There was a confluence of events in the mid-90s context of the renewal of the CGIAR, which gave impetus to the creation of GFAR as a step towards a more open and integrated global agricultural research system. Principal among these was the fact that the private sector was playing an increasingly significant role in agricultural research. That it was making important discoveries in the application of science to agriculture and that partnerships between the public and private sectors were thought to hold great potential for contributing to agricultural development. This is particularly important as it has been estimated by ISNAR that the CGIAR commands only 4% of the total resources directed to agricultural research in the developing world. The GFAR mechanism was set up to provide opportunities for interaction among its seven stakeholders in respect of better prioritizing and utilising the remaining 96% of these resources (and indeed in contributing to the 4% through innovative partnerships between other stakeholders and CGIAR IARCs). Action was also required to meet developing country demands for a stronger and more equal say in setting global and regional agricultural research priorities and agenda. This was clearly expressed through a series of regional and inter-regional meetings supported by IFAD in 1995 and 1996 (Bibl. no. 85). There was also increasing recognition of the fact that agricultural research would be more effective through closer collaboration with an expanding range of players, including non-governmental and farmer organisations, as well as private-sector enterprise.

1.04 The thinking behind the launch of GFAR took into account other major features of the external context in addition to the advancing role of the private sector - the rapid pace and expanding agenda of globalisation and trade liberalisation, the decline in the level of public agricultural research funding, both from domestic and external (ODA) sources, the rapid
advances in science for agriculture, the changing structure of research organisation, and the developments in information and communication technologies.

1.05 These factors, and the need for dialogue and collaboration, are even more pronounced in 2000 than they were in 1996. GFAR is unique in its potential to draw together participants from many different perspectives and stakeholder groups - no other forum exists that can do so across the wide range of issues facing agricultural research. It is important for GFAR to build on its convening powers, and to strengthen its role as a neutral forum where all interested parties can exchange views and prepare the ground for collaboration and partnership. Also well known, at least by the group to whom this report is directed, are the critical needs that must be met by better and more effective agricultural research over the next 25 years. This issue was well-articulated in presentations by Dr. Ismail Serageldin and Dr. Martin Piiieiro at the GFAR meeting in Dresden (Bibl. no. 9).

1.06 The Panel is of the view that GFAR represents a worthwhile enterprise and a novel attempt to include all interested parties in the discussion and implementation of a global agenda based on national and regional perspectives. The original vision and goals of GFAR are still valid, and in general the Panel endorses both the scope and calibre of the work undertaken by its now-merged Secretariats. The GFAR experience has been fully active only since 1998, when the two Secretariats were set up – the GFAR Secretariat in June of that year and the NARS Secretariat in August. However, the NARS regional/sub regional fora had already been strengthened during 1995/6 to better undertake their regional coordinating roles, and are now in the fourth year of their development under the umbrella of GFAR.

“GFAR can serve as a larger forum on agricultural research. Its advantage is its open architecture system, where participants come from various sectors of the farming and fishing communities and agro-based industry; it does not impose restrictions on the type of participants nor the commodity focus. Perhaps the most important feature of GFAR is the strength of the NARS participation; the feeling that the forum is their forum” (comments by a NARS respondent to the questionnaire).

1.07 The GFAR enterprise is a relatively new one and therefore it is too early to evaluate its impact on the agricultural research system. Nevertheless, most of the stakeholders are positive about the process and its considerable potential. Existing evidence confirms this, and the Panel recommends that the process be encouraged to evolve under the leadership of the diverse stakeholders. The Secretariat is invited to review and take note of the experience of other global multi-stakeholder mechanisms - for example, that related to health research – and draw lessons learned to the attention of the GFAR-SC.

B. GFAR: Mission and Goals

1.08 At the meeting that launched GFAR, a Declaration and a Plan of Action (now termed the Business Plan) for Global Partnership in Agricultural Research was drawn up, setting out the principles and main directions for GFAR Action. The Declaration (Annex 5 and Bibl. no.7) indicated that collaboration and research partnerships should be governed by the principles of subsidiarity, participatory decision-making, complementarity of effort, adaptability, openness, and deep commitment to a common purpose. At present, GFAR’s mission is stated as being:

_to mobilise the world scientific community in their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources._
In order to address the broad community of stakeholders involved in GFAR, and the importance of linking with farmers and their organisations, the Panel recommends that the GFAR mission statement be amended to read:

- to stabilise the stakeholders in agricultural research for development in their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources. (Underlining indicates the proposed change).

1.09 GFAR's specific objectives1 are to:

- Facilitate the exchange of information and knowledge, pertaining to crops, livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resource management research;
- Strengthen national agricultural research systems and their sub-regional and regional fora;
- Foster cost-effective, collaborative partnerships among the stakeholders of agricultural research and sustainable development;
- Promote the integration of NARS and enhance their capacity to produce and transfer technology that responds to users' needs, in a highly participatory manner with all beneficiaries;
- Facilitate the participation of all stakeholders in formulating a truly global framework for development-oriented agricultural research;
- Increase awareness among policy-makers and donors of the need for long-term commitment to, and investment in, agricultural research.

1.10 The Panel will be commenting in more detail on activities undertaken towards fulfilling each of these objectives (see Section 3, concerning the GFAR Business Plan). At this point, the Panel reaffirms that GFAR's objectives should continue to form the basis for its work and that the stated principles of subsidiarity, participatory decision-making, complementarity of effort, adaptability, openness, and deep commitment to a common purpose, proposed in 1996, continue to be fundamental to all GFAR undertakings. The Panel also recommends commitment to the principle of inclusiveness, through which all potential actors and their interests and concerns become involved. This will require extensive effort on the part of GFAR stakeholders to reach out to their different constituencies.

1.11 Following its launch in 1996, GFAR explored four major themes considered to provide an appropriate platform for collaboration: biotechnology, genetic resource conservation and utilisation, ecoregional research, and public policy and institutional strengthening. (see Bibliography: “The CGIAR at 25: Into the Future”, (Bibl. no. 86) International Centers Week, 1996. Summary of Proceedings and Decisions, CGIAR, January 1997). These themes, and one addition - commodity chains - have been maintained as priorities for GFAR action. The Panel fully endorses the priorities set out in the four major research thematic areas and their place in the draft GFAR Business Plan (Plan of Action) developed at GFAR 2000, Dresden (see paras 3.01-4 and Annex 6).

C. Developing a Global Vision

1.12 A number of GFAR stakeholders decided that one of the foundations of a global framework for future action was a Global Vision for Agricultural Research. The Vision consists of a statement characterising the desired future state of international agricultural research for development. It defines key changes taking place within the environment which can create new opportunities for strategic action and their relevant challenges and constraints which can influence the process. The Vision needs to be shared among the seven

1 Derived from the 1996 Plan of Action for Global Partnership in Agricultural Research (Bibl. no. 86)
stakeholders, and consequently its preparation involved consultation at various levels to ensure its relevance to all. The development of such a vision started with a consultation attended by more than 50 members of GFAR during the CGIAR Mid-term Meeting in Beijing in May 1999. Based on this consultation and building on vision statements prepared by different regional fora and other stakeholder groups, a first draft of a Global Vision was prepared and circulated. The draft went through several iterations in a consultative process that was carried out over the twelve months preceding the GFAR-2000 meeting.

1.13 A draft text entitled “Dresden Declaration: Towards a Global System for Agricultural Research for Development” was proposed to participants at GFAR-2000, and was the subject of discussion in small groups (a maximum of 12 participants at each roundtable) with a mix of stakeholder representation in each group. Many of those who participated in the GFAR-2000 meeting reported that this was the best part of the meeting and represented what GFAR could do best - bring together a mix of stakeholders to examine their different perspectives on agricultural research for development and explore areas of agreement and/or discord. Forty-seven respondents (64%) to the panel’s questionnaire thought that building a Global or Regional Vision, and a Strategic Agenda as a policy framework for GFAR’s activities was “very important” and a further 20 (27%) thought it “important”. The strongest endorsement came from those in ARIs, NARS or IARCs.

1.14 It was realised that even more important than arriving at a common statement was the process that enabled all stakeholders to exchange views and thinking on strategic issues – felt to be at the heart of the GFAR experience (see para 1.17). The panel supports the following statement from the report of the GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting: "It was agreed that the Dresden Declaration should be regarded as a basis for ongoing discussion between and among all stakeholder groups. Stakeholders have been invited to comment on the Declaration. It was considered that these differences of opinion do not preclude the enormous potential for cooperation between stakeholders, and the positive attitude of all to see GFAR as a place where controversial issues can be discussed and analysed."

This Vision Statement is to be revisited every nine years or when changes take place in the environment or new developments occur that influence the process.

D. The scope of the Global Forum

1.15 Given its characteristics as a forum for discussion of global issues relating to agricultural research for development, GFAR may, in the long-term, evolve to become a forum for discussing all agricultural research and development, without restriction in terms of the countries expected to benefit. Some persons interviewed indicated that the distinction between research for agriculture in developing countries and that in industrialised countries will less evident over time - due to the globalisation process and the increasing numbers of legally-binding international agreements in this field, especially Rio’s Agenda 21 and the Conventions on Biodiversity, Climate Change, Desertification, WTO, trade and phytosanitary regulations. It is interesting to note that at the most recent FORAGRO meeting, both USDA and the Canadian Ministry of Agriculture had active delegates present, whereas USAID, CIDA and IDRC were not represented at all. For the immediate future, however, the Panel recommends that GFAR emphasis should continue to be on Agricultural Research for Development in the developing regions of the world, usually defined as those regions and countries eligible for Official Development Assistance (ODA) as recognised by the Development Assistance Committee of OECD, both in order to level the playing field between the North and South and to help strengthen the weaker NARS.

1.16 The panel further recommends that every effort be made to ensure that the broad scope of GFAR’s area of interest effectively extends beyond crop research, to include livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resource management, and thus becomes a reality. Sometimes there is poor collaboration between each of these sub-sector
networks, but excellent opportunities exist to bring them together when they exist in a well-developed manner, such as in the Asia region, where APAARI has been exploring establishing an Pacific Regional Forum to bring in the Asian Livestock, Forestry and Fisheries fora as a way of bringing all the natural resource sector together (Bibl. no. 91). All the sub-sectors come together on an equal basis, and this is something that should be borne in mind — particularly by members of the crop sub-sector, who tend to try to be the dominant group.

E. The role of GFAR in building consensus

1.17 When there are seven stakeholder groups, often with very different perspectives, the advantage of a process like that of GFAR is to bring them together to discuss areas of consensus or discord. This is the very essence of a Forum, where issues can be debated, differences recognised, and dialogue engaged in. Stakeholders may even end up achieving a greater degree of real consensus, without feeling that they had been obliged to compromise more than desired. The panel recommends, therefore, that GFAR (and its Secretariat) acknowledge and clarify diversity rather than try to force consensus. For GFAR meetings, or even stakeholder debates, the Secretariat should help stakeholders, when requested, to set the agenda and prepare issue papers (or do so on their behalf), with the aim of creating greater awareness and an informed basis for discussion and debate. Debate should highlight areas of consensus or discord. Where there is a convergence of views, it may be possible for stakeholders to identify areas for working together in research partnership; where there is discord, on the other hand, this may encourage continued reflection and discussion. The Secretariat should play a neutral facilitating role in allowing stakeholders to meet, discuss differences and, where possible, resolve them.

F. The nature of GFAR and the role of its Secretariat

1.18 During its work, the panel was reminded many times of the important distinction to be made between GFAR as a global process of consultation, information exchange and partnerships for development research, and the work of the GFAR Secretariat, which is to support this process of exchange and interaction. Almost all those interviewed (including respondents to the questionnaire), emphasised the role of the forum in promoting dialogue and exchange of information and experience. Many referred to the usefulness of the first real GFAR meeting in Dresden, and the range of actors that it brought together.

1.19 GFAR activities are, first and foremost, those undertaken by its stakeholders, and are not limited to the work carried out by the Secretariat. In discussing GFAR, the Panel noted some confusion between the activities undertaken by the seven stakeholders (constituting the Global Forum), and those of the Secretariat, which provides support and facilitation to the GFAR process. This distinction is an important one and one that should be maintained. In particular, the Panel recommends that the Secretariat take care to differentiate between its own activities and those of the stakeholders, and ensure that such differentiation is maintained in its reporting.

1.20 In the Panel’s view, GFAR (comprising the stakeholder groups as a whole) needs to have an Agenda, a Programme Structure, a Line of Action and Thematic Areas, constituted within a Business Plan. This provides the framework for action, and charts the course of action for most of the elements that received some endorsement at GFAR 2000. It is the role and responsibility of the Secretariat to facilitate the implementation of the business plan. Therefore, in most cases, the Secretariat work programme will have to be highly selective and should not be involved in all collaborative activities undertaken by stakeholders. The challenge for the Secretariat is to be seen as a facilitator and not overly proactive. However, particularly in the early years of GFAR, when the representatives of stakeholder
groups were still feeling their way, it has sometimes been necessary for the GFAR Secretariat to take the initiative. The Panel has made recommendations for further consideration by the GFAR-SC, regarding the activities its secretariat should be engaged in, and these are discussed in Section 2 below.

1.21 The Panel recommends that, in future, the Secretariat Work Programme should clearly indicate what the Secretariat is expected to deliver (log frame, milestones, and monitorable targets, etc.) under each item. This Work Programme will, of necessity, be more focused than the larger, overall programme of work outlined in GFAR's Business Plan. With regard to the implementation of the Business Plan, it is encouraging to note that several stakeholder constituencies have now formed working groups, which facilitate action and liaison with the Secretariat (new GFAR Chart, Annex 2).

PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARISED BELOW

1.06 The original vision and goals of GFAR are still valid, and in general the Panel endorses both the scope and calibre of the work undertaken by its now-merged Secretariats.

1.07 The Panel recommends that the process be encouraged to evolve under the leadership of the diverse stakeholders.

1.08 The panel recommends that the mission statement be amended to read: *to mobilise the stakeholders in agricultural research for development in their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources.* (Underlining indicates the proposed change).

1.10 The panel reaffirms that GFAR's objectives should continue to form the basis for its work and that the stated principles of subsidiarity, participatory decision-making, complementarity of effort, adaptability, openness, and deep commitment to a common purpose, proposed in 1996, continue to be fundamental to all GFAR undertakings. The Panel also recommends commitment to the principle of inclusiveness, through which all potential actors' interests and concerns become involved.

1.11 The panel fully endorses these priorities, set out in the four major research thematic areas and their place in the draft GFAR Business Plan (Plan of Action) developed at Dresden-2000 (see paras 3.01-4 and Annex 6).

1.14 Dresden meeting: "It was agreed that the Dresden Declaration should be regarded as a basis for ongoing discussion between and among all stakeholder groups. Stakeholders have been invited to comment on the Declaration. It was considered that these differences of opinion do not preclude the enormous potential for cooperation between stakeholders and the positive attitude of all to see GFAR as a place where controversial issues can be discussed and analysed."

1.15 The Panel recommends that GFAR emphasis should continue to be on Agricultural Research for Development.

1.16 The panel further recommends that every effort be made to ensure that the broad scope of GFAR's area of interest effectively extends beyond crop research, to include livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resource management, and thus becomes a reality.
1.17 The panel recommends, therefore, that GFAR (and its Secretariat) acknowledge and clarify diversity rather than try to force consensus. For GFAR meetings, or even stakeholder debates, the Secretariat should help stakeholders, when requested, to set the agenda and prepare issue papers (or do so on their behalf), with the aim of creating greater awareness and an informed basis for discussion and debate. Debate should highlight areas of consensus or discord.

1.19 The panel recommends that the Secretariat take care to differentiate between its own activities and those of the stakeholders, and ensure that such differentiation is maintained in its reporting.

1.21 The Panel recommends that, in future, the Secretariat Work Programme should clearly indicate what the Secretariat is expected to deliver (log frame, milestones, and monitorable targets, etc.) under each item. This Work Programme will, of necessity, be more focused than the larger, overall programme of work outlined in GFAR’s Business Plan.

Section 2. GFAR’s Organisational Structure

A. The Seven Stakeholders of GFAR and its General Organisational Structure

2.01 One of GFAR’s key strengths is that it provides a meeting place where all seven stakeholders can interact, and where the respective comparative advantage of each can be brought together in the research and development process. Whereas the Forum itself meets only once every three years, its stakeholders carry out a programme that is continuously in pursuit of their agreed aims, facilitated by a central secretariat, and under the aegis of a steering committee. The seven stakeholders comprise: the NARS\(^6\) and their fora; the IARCs (mostly belonging to the CGIAR); the donors (both multi and bilateral, and also foundations); the advanced research institutes (ARI)s of the developed countries; the private sector; non-government organizations; and farmer organizations. While policy makers and Civil Society are other key constituencies with whom GFAR stakeholders have to interact, the Panel re-affirms the decision of the GFAR-SC that for the next three years no change should be made in the composition of the Stakeholder constituencies. Moreover the GFAR Secretariat should remain neutral, and the debates reviewing the diverse views of different stakeholders should remain a key feature of GFAR consultations. Annex 3 contains a short description of each of the seven stakeholders, and recommendations on how to strengthen their participation in GFAR, which is briefly elaborated in the next four paragraphs.

2.02 A key responsibility of the GFAR Secretariat is to assist stakeholders to further develop their constituencies. This is especially true for farmer organisations, in view of their relative lack of a strong voice in agricultural research decision-making, and the need to redress this to make research much more demand-led, and also for NGOs in view of their large numbers and varied scope and goals, (see Annex 3 paras 9-11). The Panel recommends that special assistance continue to be given to farmer organisations and NGOs to strengthen their representation as key stakeholders in GFAR. To encourage their further enthusiastic participation in GFAR, the Panel also recommends that the GFAR-SC further review and debate the points raised in the NGOs’ and farmer organisations’ Declarations from GFAR 2000, Dresden.

\(^6\) The Panel always refers to NARS in their broadest sense, including representatives of NARIs, extension services, universities, NGOs, farmer organisations, and the private sector. Likewise, it sees ‘agriculture’ as encompassing crops, livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resources.
2.03 Ideally, the GFAR structure should be built on a strong NARS foundation, which, in turn, would be broadly based on the active involvement of the NARIs, Universities, NGOs, farmer organisations and the private sector, and whose structure would itself reflect representation building up from the grass roots level, through district, region or province, to the national level. One of GFAR’s prime objectives is to help build strong NARS which do not yet exist in most developing countries, but which GFAR will help to establish through the activities of its stakeholders, rather than through its Secretariat. The NARS and their fora are key stakeholders in GFAR, as almost all of the activities of GFAR will take place at regional, subregional, national or local level. For the next five years, the Panel reaffirms that major emphasis (by all GFAR stakeholders and the Secretariat) must continue to be placed on further strengthening the NARS and their regional/sub regional fora, as was envisaged at the first GFAR meeting in October 1996. This is underway, but in need of further impetus (see paras 3.04-3.15).

2.04 The private sector comprises another stakeholder whose role in GFAR is still evolving. More public sector research, together with increased research from the private sector and better interaction between the two, would also be anticipated. Better harnessing of Private Sector research, (Annex 3 paras 7-8), to work (where feasible) in concert with the public sector is an important GFAR goal that has to be implemented at the global level, as well as at regional, sub regional and national levels, where all the stakeholders have roles to play. In this context, the Panel recommends that the Secretariat assist the private sector by organising a workshop (jointly with them and other concerned stakeholders) on issues of improved public/private sector collaboration; and follows this up with holding regional workshops on this issue over the next three years, in a timetable drawn up with the concurrence of each region and in line with the priority each region gives to harnessing better public/private sector participation.

2.05 The Donors as stakeholders (Annex 3 para 6) are already well coordinated through the Donor Support Group. However, regarding the CGIAR stakeholder constituency, (Annex 3 para 3) it is evident that there is some misunderstanding in some quarters on the relative roles of GFAR and the CGIAR, and the Panel recommends that the GFAR Secretariat and the GFAR Chair meet formally each year with the Center Directors Committee, CDC. Regarding the ARIs, (Annex 3 paras 4-5), who have three representatives on the Board selected by continental area, it is encouraging to note the good coordination in Europe through the activities of EIARD and EFARD reflected in the way they assist R/SR fora. The Panel recommends that both the North American and the Asia Pacific ARIs consolidate their support in like manner to Europe, as they each have a representative on the GFAR-SC.

2.06 In order for GFAR to achieve its objectives, a very light organizational structure has been established at the global level, comprising: the Secretariat; the GFAR-SC; the informal GFAR Management Team; the GFAR donor support group (DSG); and the four GFAR ‘facilitating agencies’ (IFAD, FAO, the World Bank (WB) and ISNAR). The report will now review each of these institutional entities, and make recommendations for improvement.

B. The GFAR Secretariat

The GFAR and NARS Secretariats

2.07 In discussing the performance of the two Secretariats over their two-year life span (1998-2000), it should be noted that much of the first year, 1998-9, was spent on organisational issues, including the design of an appropriate and generally well-supported work plan. Thus, when activities commenced in the second year (1999-2000), the two
secretariats were already sharing the agenda and jointly organising the first fully-fledged GFAR triennial conference, held in Dresden in May 2000. Indeed, right from the outset the two secretariats shared the agenda in a pragmatic and changing manner, based on what proved to be most expedient at the time. This, no doubt, contributed to the early decision reached by the GFAR-SC to merge the two Secretariats. The Panel wishes to place on record the impressive breadth and calibre of the outputs of the Secretariats, well-illustrated by the success of the Dresden meeting, and by subsequent follow-up actions.

2.08 The GFAR Secretariat was formally established in June of 1998, located in the Environmentally Sustainable Development and Agricultural Research (ESDAR) unit of the World Bank. The Executive Secretary took up his post in August 1998, and began an energetic programme to implement the Secretariat’s mandate, which was principally to organise the triennial meeting of GFAR, the twice-yearly meetings of the Steering Committee and to develop the global research agenda, commissioning papers and organising consultations on priority issues. An additional task was that of launching the Electronic Global Forum on Agricultural Research (EGFAR), the global agricultural research information platform and gateway, and liaising with the NARS Secretariat on improving representation from the different stakeholders. Throughout its life under the aegis of the World Bank, the Secretariat was staffed by only one person, drawing on consultant support when required, as was the case in the setting up of EGFAR. However, less than a year later - by the MTM 1999 - the decision was taken to consider merging the two secretariats. This was ratified at ICW 1999, and agreement reached on a gradual transition. The merged secretariat would be housed at FAO headquarters in Rome, which was already hosting the NARS Secretariat.

2.09 The NARS Secretariat was established in August 1998, hosted by FAO. It greatly benefited from the fact that the former chairman of the NARS-SC, set up in August 1996, became its first Executive Secretary, and the International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) seconded one of its experienced staff to occupy the other senior professional position. The prime role of the NARS Secretariat was to support regional and sub regional fora, thereby strengthening both, as well as their member-NARS. Its second key role was to promote innovative partnership mechanisms between stakeholders for the purpose of improved collaboration in agricultural research. The Secretariat also had to arrange meetings of the NARS-SC at ICWs and MTMs. Almost all of its other activities were in support of its prime role of strengthening NARS. This task has been carried out through: information exchange and training; developing action-oriented case-studies of partnerships and strategic alliances; improving information/knowledge systems; brokering partnerships - especially with regard to agricultural production on commodities outside the CGIAR mandate; improving technical aspects such as biotechnology and biosafety; and fostering the involvement of NGOs, farmer organisations and the private sector.

2.10 The institutional responsibilities of both Secretariats were to organise the six-monthly meetings of the GFAR and NARS SCs, as well as that of the GFAR DSG held during the period of CGIAR’s ICW and MTMs, and also the GFAR 2000 (triennial) meeting in Dresden. This they did very successfully for the ICW 98 and 99 and the MTM 99, aided by the then GFAR Secretariat's close proximity to the CGIAR Secretariat (also hosted by the World Bank) which organises the MTM and ICW meetings. With regard to the first plenary meeting of GFAR held in Dresden in May 2000 and coinciding with the CGIAR’s MTM 2000, the merger of the two secretariats had already been decided upon and both shared the responsibility for organising GFAR 2000, which was generally acclaimed to have been very successful. The calibre of the keynote papers commissioned for each topic were also commended, although many criticised the tendency to have a second paper on each, also commissioned by the organisers, as this cut into the time available for discussion or for more independent papers from participants from the different stakeholder constituencies. While there are benefits to be gained from holding GFAR-SC meetings with MTMs and ICWs, the
Panel recommends that, in future, the triennial GFAR meeting be held independently of the CGIAR meetings, and that it be hosted by each of the regional fora, in turn. However, this recommendation needs to give careful consideration to the additional costs associated with hosting such meetings, as well as the time demands on its participants, many of whom attend the CG meetings also.

2.11 Structure and Staffing. There appears to be consensus that the GFAR Secretariat should remain a small unit, whose principal role is to facilitate the implementation of GFAR’s Business Plan. This task will be carried out principally by the stakeholders themselves. In this context, the Secretariat must have the ability to support the four principal activities contained in the plan, namely: developing a Vision and a global Business Plan; building innovative partnerships for R&D; strengthening sub-regional and regional fora; developing a knowledge system and mechanisms for sharing experiences - and, when requested, drawing up state-of-the-art issue papers and organising global dialogue on the current four principal themes: Management of Plant Genetic Resources and Biotechnology; National Resource Management and Eco-regional Research; Commodity Chains and Underutilised Plant Species, and Policy Management and Institutional Strengthening.

One questionnaire respondent from an IARC succinctly stated:

“In addition to the overriding importance of enhancing public awareness, GFAR has an invaluable role to play as an "honest broker", bringing together various constituencies around various research themes, and/or commodities of global importance...GFAR should not become an implementing agency or get itself in the position where various stakeholders begin to think of it as a donor agency. However, it does need enough capacity to be able to effectively undertake a catalytic, facilitation and knowledge management role across a very broad range of themes, commodities, disciplines and regions.”

2.12 Bearing this in mind, and in the light of currently envisaged responsibilities, the Panel is of the view that the GFAR Secretariat team of three professionals (now reduced to two, after the merger of the two Secretariats), assisted by two APOs, is insufficient for it to operate effectively. This is particularly true in the light of the Panel’s recommendation to appoint a first-rate professional ICT specialist as a major priority, not just to backstop EGFAR but to ensure that the group interacts effectively with all major global agricultural and natural resource networks, and provides leadership in developing the RAIS in each of the R/SR fora. The Panel recommends that the GFAR Secretariat be staffed for the medium-term by a team of four professionals comprising: (i) an Executive Secretary; (ii) an ICT specialist responsible for EGFAR and the RAIS support programme; (iii) a senior professional engaged in providing support to the NARS on a full-time basis, especially through their fora; and (iv) another senior professional (preferably with a background in agricultural economics and policy analysis) whose particular responsibility is that of working with the other constituencies. In any event, the four staff should work as a team and possess an appropriate mix of expertise to complement each other. While the ICT specialist should first and foremost be just that, preference should be given to a candidate with a scientific research background.

2.13 The Panel has also reviewed favourably the practice of having young professionals/APOs in the Secretariat, and recommends that donors provide such assistance to the regional and sub-regional fora also. The Panel is of the view that the ICT/EGFAR/RAIS programme is critically important and fully warrants the posting of a young professional, specialised in ICT, to all fora requiring assistance in this field. It also proposes that his/her first three months should be spent in training with the ICT specialist (and on GFAR approaches generally) at the Secretariat in Rome.
2.14 **Modalities of Operation.** It is vital that the majority - if not all - of the GFAR members reach a broad agreement regarding the activities to be undertaken in the name of GFAR. With this in mind, the Panel proposes some operational modalities for the GFAR-SC and Secretariat consideration:

a) The Secretariat should get involved in activities only where there is a clearly-demonstrated niche for involvement at GFAR level, and where it can demonstrate an expectation of added value. The GFAR-SC should work with the Secretariat to define criteria for its direct involvement and make use of these criteria in its consideration of the Secretariat's work programme.

b) Where the Secretariat has a clear niche for facilitating a priority global agricultural research activity, donors should be willing to provide adequate funding for this area of operations.

c) The GFAR niche - with particular reference to partnerships - is defined as follows:

1. It is the responsibility of stakeholders - particularly the NARS sub-regional and regional fora, as they become more broad-based - to identify opportunities for partnerships and their potential;

2. The Secretariat can play a role in facilitating partnerships, by providing opportunities for stakeholders to discuss and consult each other and by removing barriers (sometimes of perception) to stakeholders working together. The Secretariat does not normally have research capacity or expertise in most of the areas to be covered, nor should it be expected to have. In terms of choice of area, both the stakeholders and the GFAR-SC must guide the Secretariat on where to focus its efforts. In some cases, it may use a stakeholder ad hoc committee to get guidance on particular issues. The GFAR-SC and the Management Team must help and provide coverage in judgement on involvement in controversial areas;

3. The Secretariat should also play a role in facilitating, at the global level, the discussion of issues that have been raised at the national or regional level, or within a particular stakeholder group, where this is deemed appropriate. The GFAR-SC should encourage stakeholder constituencies to bring up concerns and issues for the attention of the larger group of which GFAR is composed. GFAR has a particular role to play in enriching and influencing international debate on specific issues.

4. GFAR represents a platform where innovations can be identified, discussed, planned and reported on, particularly in terms of creative modalities for partnership or research funding. In general, it provides the opportunity for sharing information and ideas with respect to experiences on good practice, successes and failures. The Secretariat should monitor partnerships, and learn from evaluations undertaken by stakeholders, so that the emerging lessons can be provided in the form of advice in the formulation of future partnerships; and,

5. The Secretariat does not finance research. It can provide advice to stakeholders in identifying potential sources of funding for research, and may act as a broker, but it should be careful not to raise expectations that funding can be guaranteed. It may provide modest seed-money to stakeholders in the process of identifying

---

9 See Section 3, para 3.30 for an example on Genetic Resources for Agriculture.
and elaborating global partnerships, but these funds are usually generated at regional or sub-regional level, for partnerships at those levels.

2.15 **Communication Policy.** In a multi-stakeholder endeavour such as GFAR, it is essential to provide relevant and appropriate information to all stakeholders on the activities of the Secretariat, and of stakeholder groups - relevant in the sense of providing information on what they want to know, appropriate in the sense of desired quantity and format. Provision of information should include a proper basis for consultation, involvement and buy-in by stakeholders (and, of course, of oversight by the GFAR-SC members). There is a key role here for EGFAR and its 'gateway function' (see para 3.23 below). There is also an important place for direct communication from the Secretariat.

2.16 A number of persons informed the panel that they found the present communication policy led to their receiving too much material - usually in the form of long e-mails and electronic documents - and that this surpassed their ability to respond to, and sometimes even to keep up with, the material they were receiving. In some cases, they did not feel the need to receive such detailed information and would have preferred fewer and more summary communications.

2.17 Information overload may be a fact-of-life. The concern, however, in a stakeholder process, is that it can actually lead to the opposite of buy-in – in the sense that stakeholders feel they have lost control of the process they themselves are supposed to be leading. Whereas this sensation may have been at its strongest in the run-up to the GFAR 2000, Dresden conference, when an enormous amount of documentation was circulated for comment, the panel feels it does warrant the Secretariat's attention. Among other options, the Secretariat should identify, with the stakeholders, those who would prefer to receive regular information by e-mail, and those who wish to receive only quarterly updates, with the possibility of consulting the website. One solution, for instance, might be for the Secretariat to publish a quarterly newsletter on the main developments in which it is involved. Although an electronic version has already been proposed as part of EGFAR, the Secretariat should look at the cost of producing and mailing a hard copy to those who would prefer it. The newsletter should summarise main activities and also draw attention to new key documents that have been added to its website. **The Panel recommends that Communication policy be reviewed both with the GFAR-SC and the DSG, to decide on the best means of keeping everyone adequately and appropriately informed.**

C. **Governance**

2.18 The governance of the two Secretariats was entrusted to two Steering Committees (SCs) - the GFAR SC and the NARS SC. With respect to the latter, the Panel fully supports that the NARS-SC has now been converted into a sub-committee of the GFAR-SC, following the merger of the two secretariats, as it is essential that the NARS and their fora still have their own say in GFAR. The GFAR Donor Support Group (DSG) was established to bring together members of the international donor community, and is chaired by IFAD. Some special responsibilities were also given to the four facilitating agencies: FAO, IFAD, WB and ISNAR. Until now, the Secretariats have generally dealt with each of these four facilitating agencies on a one-to-one basis, in keeping with the terms of formal legal agreements or Memoranda of Understanding established with each. **The Panel recommends that the functions of the facilitating agencies be spelled out more explicitly and further recommends that the facilitating agencies now become ex-officio members**\(^{10}\) **of the GFAR-SC; (as two are already stakeholder representatives, this means just two more in an ex-officio capacity).** By their presence, the facilitating agencies can brief SC members

\(^{10}\) Ex officio members of the GFAR-SC, with voice but no vote.
on, and discuss, their continuing roles, and keep abreast of SC members’ views. It also avoids the need to set up another committee for them.

The GFAR Steering Committee

2.19 Membership and representation. The GFAR-SC was formally set up in May 1997 in Cairo, and the seven stakeholders were confirmed as constituents. Each of the four regional fora was given one representative (a fifth - CAC - has since been added). The ARIs were given three representatives, one each from Europe, North America and Asia-Pacific; and the other five stakeholders - donors, CGIAR, farmer organisations, NGOs and the private sector - were given one representative each. This constituency nominates each representative for a three-year period, with one alternate. It was agreed that there should be a transparent nominating process within each constituency and that the representative must guarantee that he/she will consult his/her constituents before each meeting and report back to them afterwards. A three-year period was given to legitimize the representational process within each constituency, and it was agreed not to alter the committee’s membership structure before the next GFAR triennial assembly, scheduled to take place three years later in Dresden (GFAR 2000, Dresden). While the Panel is of the view that, eventually, the entire membership should be regionally based, it is too early to make this change at present, particularly as the NARS and their fora are only now gradually broadening their own national systems beyond the NARIs. Likewise, there are still representational issues for NGOs, the private sector and farmer organisations, as well as that of ARIs in North America and Asia-Pacific. Progress has been very slow here, and mechanisms for consulting the organisations represented are frequently inadequate (or else not used effectively!). The Panel recommends that the present system of membership be maintained for another three years. During this time, a concerted effort will be made to remedy the present situation regarding setting targets to be reached progressively at the next two GFAR meetings - in October and in May. Following the GFAR May 2002 meeting, a review paper should be prepared and presented for debate at GFAR’s October 2002 meeting. This will facilitate tabling a resolution for consideration by the Global Forum in 2003.

2.20 The Panel also recommends that all persons selected by their stakeholder constituents to sit on the GFAR-SC, be willing to accept the responsibility to continue developing their group (constituency). They should also ensure that adequate information is fed back to all interested members of their groups (through modalities that are considered most convenient, including judicious use of e-mail at appropriate times). Furthermore, they should bring forward from their group issues of importance that need to be brought to the attention of the GFAR-SC. Each GFAR-SC member will also carry out an ‘oversight’ function on GFAR, on behalf of his constituency.

2.21 GFAR Chart. Given the urgent agenda items requiring the Steering Committee’s full attention during its initial years, less attention was given to the definition of the various roles within the GFAR-SC, such as that of Chair and Vice-Chair. However, the Panel now recommends revisiting, updating and completing the GFAR chart approved in 1998; given its crucial importance in terms of providing guidance and direction to the Secretariat, and the Secretariat’s accountability to the Committee. This clarification should also include the role of the Chair and Vice Chair, with specific terms of reference for each, including their roles in the GFAR Management Team, indicating the method and duration of the appointments, as well as that of all the other committee members and their alternates. The GFAR-SC should also be empowered to constitute subcommittees as and when it so desires. It is encouraging to note that the new GFAR...
Chart has already been prepared for discussion at the October GFAR-SC meeting, and the draft is included herewith in Annex 2.

The GFAR Management Team

2.22 While all policy matters are decided at the twice-yearly GFAR-SC meetings, the Chairman and Vice Chairman with the professional staff of the GFAR Secretariat have formed an informal Management Team to assist in the implementation of GFAR activities, and the Work Programme of the GFAR Secretariat. While these meetings have been minuted and have greatly assisted operational and forward planning activities, the Panel recommends that the responsibilities of the Management Team be formulated with very specific terms of reference, as is proposed in para 2.21 above, and now set out in Annex 2.

The GFAR Donor Support Group

2.23 The Donor Support Group (DSG) was set up in 1998 by a group of donors, chaired by IFAD, to help consolidate and guide the emerging Global Agricultural Research System (GARS), to better harness donor support for GFAR and to organise its representation in the GFAR-SC. The panel reaffirms the view that the DSG should remain voluntary. and be open to all donors actively supporting agricultural research activities of a regional or global nature. Pledging in the DSG should be limited to the three-year work programmes of the GFAR Secretariat and its NARS Subcommittee. All GFAR’s research activities will continue to be funded in a decentralised manner, through fostering linkage mechanisms for collaborative partnerships between stakeholders. The GFAR Secretariat should facilitate the process by being an “honest broker” in those areas in which it has the comparative advantage to assist.

2.24 In order to advance GFAR’s institutionalisation process, it is important to develop a ‘Funding Strategy’. This idea has been discussed already in the GFAR-DSG. As part of the process, IFAD should play a more proactive role, in consultation with its partners in the donor community, in helping the secretariat develop a sustainable funding strategy for GFAR (this involves adequacy, sustainability and predictability for planning purposes). In order for a three-year work programme to be viable, as recommended in the previous para, it is very important for the donor community to be able to pledge support for the work programme’s time horizon. This is also a necessary requirement for FAO (which is hosting the GFAR Secretariat), since the organization cannot secure the functioning of the secretariat if the relevant funds are not available. Thus a funding strategy is required that corresponds to a programming cycle of a three-year work programme. The Panel recommends that the development of this funding strategy be seen as a priority activity for the DSG, to be discussed and put in train at their next meeting.

The Facilitating Agencies and the Hosting Organisation

2.25 The facilitating agencies are IFAD, The World Bank (WB), ISNAR, and FAO – which is now also playing the role of host to the GFAR Secretariat. Each of these agencies has played an effective role in the creation and establishment of GFAR over the years. IFAD has pioneered the GFAR concept right from the start and continued over the years to harness its evolution while mobilising donor support. The efforts and resources mobilised by IFAD are commendable, particularly as the Fund not only provided contributions from its own resources, but it also facilitated generous contributions from its Italian Government Trust Fund resources. The WB has also been very supportive to GFAR and has continued to fund the secretariat since its inception. ISNAR, with its prime mandate of supporting NARS, has played a key role in supporting the NARS secretariat right from its inception through to end-July 2000, by seconding one of its staff. FAO has played a key role in providing office space and facilities to house the NARS Secretariat, initially, and subsequently in making available these facilities for use by the now-merged Secretariat of GFAR.
2.26 The role played by the facilitating agencies was crucial to the successful establishment of GFAR. However, it is now even more important for these facilitating agencies to help GFAR during the coming years, to become a more sustainable institutional mechanism. IFAD, which played a key role in establishing the DSG and has served as chair since its inception, is needed now even more than before, to continue this important role. The Panel recommends that IFAD's role be strengthened to broaden the donor support base, and to increase and continue donors' financial contributions to GFAR. As IFAD will become an ex-officio member of the SC (if the recommendation regarding the facilitating agencies is accepted - see para 2.18), it will also be able to perform an oversight function on behalf of the donors, to ensure the effectiveness and value-added of the activities of the GFAR Secretariat, and to report to the DSG on the activities undertaken during the periods between DSG meetings. The Panel does not envisage the need for an Oversight Committee at this stage, but this might evolve from further experience of expanding activities within the GFAR Business Plan. Indeed, the Panel recommends that all stakeholder representatives in the SC carry out 'Oversight' activities for their constituency in the same way as IFAD will do for the donors.

2.27 The WB has been funding the GFAR Secretariat since its inception and is expected to continue to do so at the same level, now that the GFAR secretariat has been transferred to FAO. It will continue its role, through the DSG, of encouraging others to join in and make additional contributions as well. Moreover, ISNAR has been exposed to serious financial constraints that have forced its management to terminate its funding contributions to several activities, including its support to the NARS Secretariat. However, in order to demonstrate its commitment to GFAR, ISNAR has provided a financial - rather than in-kind - contribution albeit at a greatly reduced level, reflecting its present difficult financial situation.

2.28 FAO has provided support both in-kind and in cash, to the functioning of the NARS secretariat during the past two years. It is hoped that with the increased responsibilities of the GFAR secretariat, now located in FAO, this support can be increased in the near future and be reflected in the new Letter of Agreement presently under negotiation between GFAR and the host organisation. In the light of the process underway to strengthen GFAR, FAO is now considering the inclusion of the GFAR Secretariat in its Mid Term Plan (MTP) for the period 2002-2007. This will facilitate a budget contribution by FAO to GFAR, which had not been possible until now. The Panel endorses FAO's inclusion of the GFAR Secretariat in the Mid-Term Plan, since it may facilitate the contribution in staff (person-year) which it recommends in para 2.34 below. This could become an important part of the sustainable funding strategy mentioned above.

2.29 The initial agreement signed between FAO and the Chairman of the GFAR-SC did not contain the necessary details regarding the support to be provided by FAO, which is essential for the functioning of the Secretariat within the Organization. However, at the time of the Panel review, interaction with FAO Senior Management was ongoing and attention was drawn to the need to prepare a new agreement taking into account the emerging experiences over the last two years and the new realities related to the merger of the two secretariats under the single GFAR umbrella. By the time the Panel began drafting this report, negotiations were already underway. One of the important questions to take into consideration is how to integrate those persons to be seconded (supported by the stakeholders) to the GFAR secretariat, since this is one of the ways through which GFAR operates. It is of the utmost importance to finalise these negotiations as soon as possible, reflecting the above considerations.

2.30 The Panel considers that the facilitating agencies have a unique role to play in GFAR, in promoting the establishment of links between their portfolio of activities in support of agricultural research and those related to strengthening NARS, the RF and SRF, using the
GFAR Secretariat as a facilitating instrument to identify opportunities for brokering links. All four Agencies are undertaking several activities in support of agricultural research for development, which should take into account the need to broaden NARS membership to include GFAR’s seven constituencies within the NARS structure, and to deepen their context by integrating the agricultural research agenda on crops and livestock with those of forestry, fisheries and natural resource management. These goals are achievable within the framework of the investment programmes designed by multilateral donors such as IFAD and the WB. FAO and ISNAR can play a significant role, with the assistance of GFAR, in preparing the necessary groundwork for the design teams to integrate these activities into the investment programmes of both IFAD and the WB. RF/SRF/NARS should also play an important role in facilitating the interface between the evolution of the NARIS and the NARS model, which would help in establishing closer links between research programmes and investment development projects.

2.31 The GFAR Secretariat has been linked to the Agricultural Research Division of FAO’s Department of Sustainable Development since the establishment of the NARS Secretariat in 1998. Through the FAO/GFAR Working Group, the NARS/GFAR Secretariat has developed several joint activities with SDRR, SDRE, GIL WAICENT, AGP, and SIFAR. Nevertheless, the potential for developing stronger synergy and complementarity between GFAR activities and FAO programmes has only just begun to be explored. More attention should be devoted to extending the collaboration to FAO’s Forestry, Fisheries and Economic and Social Policy Departments. The Panel is of the opinion that the GFAR secretariat should be more forthcoming in forging relationships with the different research units within FAO. The Panel felt that since the Secretariat is located in FAO headquarters in Rome, there may well be several GFAR-relevant opportunities which have yet to be harnessed.

2.32 The Panel commends the work of the facilitating agencies as well as the host institution and recommends that they continue their support for the next three years. The new Legal Agreement for hosting the GFAR Secretariat should establish FAO’s contribution - in cash and in-kind - more clearly, so as to avoid any future misunderstanding. The Panel hopes that future discussions with ISNAR may result in an increase in its in cash and in-kind contribution, and strengthen working relationships. This would be of benefit to ISNAR and GFAR alike and should contribute significantly to the goals of both.

D. Funding and Sustainability: Providing a supportive environment for the Secretariat and funding stakeholder activities

2.33 The long-term goal should be to have GFAR activities funded by the stakeholders. This could probably be done through each NARS contributing to its sub-regional or regional forum. Otherwise, the sub-regional fora (in cases where these exist) could fund regional fora, and the latter contribute to the Global Forum. This ideal is still a long way off, but it is important to bear in mind as a principle of shared ownership.

2.34 There is strong consensus that the GFAR Secretariat should probably not comprise more than four professional staff – if even that. For the time being, however, the panel feels that a full complement of four is necessary (see para. 2.12). This staffing structure would consist of an Executive Secretary, a professional with special responsibility for the NARS regional fora, a professional with special responsibility to work with other constituencies, and

---

12 See discussion in para 2.19 on the hypothesis that future representation will evolve to being entirely on a regional basis.
a professional with special competence in the area of ICTs (although improved use of new ICT technology should permeate all GFAR activities). These staff would be assisted by two or three secretaries. As one option, it is hoped that these four GFAR Secretariat posts can be funded (in cash or in kind) according to the panel's recommendation:

- that the CGIAR fund one professional, either through direct contribution, or by each IARC contributing $10k to fund the one post for strengthening the GFAR constituencies;
- that FAO fund one ITC professional, who would develop the EGFAR working closely with its WAICENT and at least one secretary;
- that Italy and IFAD continue to provide funding for the post of Executive Secretary as well as operational funds to enable the Secretariat to meet the requirements of its programme of work; and
- that the fourth position be filled by the secondment of a senior officer from an ARI or any other GFAR stakeholders, following the example of CIRAD, France, as of 1 August 2000. Moreover, RF/SRF and NARS, like the other constituencies, could, in due course, consider the secondment of staff for certain periods and for specific tasks, according to GFAR priorities.

Continued financial support for operations is also anticipated from the World Bank (see para 2.27) and ISNAR. In any event, what is essential is that the donors as a group, through the DSG, arrive at a coherent and sustainable funding strategy to keep the secretariat fully staffed professionally, and operationally effective.

2.35 The GFAR Secretariat may approach donors to request seed funds for specific programme areas identified in agreement with stakeholders, once it is clear that some see this as a priority. This will often mean that most of such money would go directly to the stakeholders concerned, as the GFAR Secretariat was never intended to provide an implementation mechanism, and the vast majority of all funding for operational research will be requested directly by the stakeholder partners involved.

2.36 The Secretariat can also provide advice to stakeholders as to possible sources of funding, and could play a broker role, but it will not usually be in a position to make scientific judgement about the soundness or priority of a funding proposal. Donors who are not currently funding a specific regional activity can be sensitised by the GFAR Secretariat to create awareness of the existing opportunities in a specific region. It is clear that a small but effective GFAR Secretariat is crucial at this time to better foster and facilitate the aims and objectives of GFAR.

**PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARISED BELOW**

2.01 The Panel reaffirms the decision of the GFAR-SC that for the next three years no change should be made in the composition of the stakeholder constituencies.

2.02 The Panel recommends that special assistance continue to be given to farmer organisations and NGOs to strengthen their representation as key stakeholders in GFAR.

2.02 The Panel also recommends that the GFAR-SC further review and debate the points raised in the NGOs' and farmer organisations' Declarations from Dresden 2000.
2.03 The Panel reaffirms that major emphasis (by all GFAR stakeholders and its Secretariat) must continue to be placed on further strengthening the NARS and their regional/sub regional fora, 

2.04 The Panel recommends that the Secretariat assist the private sector by organising a workshop (jointly with them and other concerned stakeholders) on issues of improved public/private sector collaboration; and follows this up with holding regional workshops on this issue over the next three years, in a timetable drawn up with the concurrence of each region and in line with the priority each region gives to harnessing better public/private sector participation.

2.05 The Panel recommends that the GFAR Secretariat and the GFAR Chair meet formally each year with the Center Directors Committee (CDC).

2.05 The Panel recommends that both the North American and the Asia Pacific ARIs consolidate their support in like manner to Europe, as they each have a representative on the GFAR-SC.

2.10 The Panel recommends that, in future, the triennial GFAR meeting be held independently of the CGIAR meetings, and that it be hosted by each of the regional fora, in turn. However, this recommendation needs to give careful consideration to the additional costs associated with hosting such meetings, as well as the time demands on its participants, many of whom attend the CGIAR meetings also.

2.12 The Panel recommends that the GFAR Secretariat be staffed for the medium-term by a team of four professionals comprising: (i) an Executive Secretary, (ii) an ICT specialist responsible for EGFAR and the RAIs support programme, (iii) a senior professional engaged in providing support to the NARS on a full-time basis, especially through their fora; and (iv) another senior professional (preferably with a background in agricultural economics and policy analysis) whose particular responsibility is that of working with the other constituencies. In any event, the four staff should work as a team and possess an appropriate mix of expertise to complement each other.

2.13 The Panel is of the view that the ICT/EGFAR/RAIs programme is critically important and fully warrants the posting of a young professional, specialised in ICT, to all fora requiring assistance in this field.

2.17 The Panel recommends that communication policy be reviewed, both with the GFAR-SC and the DSG, to decide on the best means of keeping everyone adequately and appropriately informed.

2.18 The Panel recommends that the functions of the facilitating agencies be spelled out more explicitly and further recommends that the facilitating agencies now become ex-officio members of the GFAR-SC; (as two are already stakeholder representatives, this means just two more in an ex-officio capacity).

2.19 The Panel recommends that the present system of membership be maintained for another three years. During this time, a concerted effort will be made to remedy the present situation regarding setting targets to be reached progressively at the next two GFAR meetings – in October and in May.
2.20 The Panel also recommends that all persons selected by their stakeholder constituents to sit on the SC be willing to accept the responsibility to continue developing their group (constituency). They should also ensure that adequate information is fed back to all interested members of their groups (through modalities that are considered most convenient, including judicious use of e-mail at appropriate times). Furthermore, they should bring forward from their group issues of importance that need to be brought to the attention of the SC. Each GFAR-SC member will also carry out an 'oversight' function on GFAR, on behalf of his constituency.

2.21 The Panel now recommends revisiting, updating and completing the GFAR chart approved in 1998, given its crucial importance in terms of providing guidance and direction to the Secretariat, and the Secretariat's accountability to the Committee. This clarification should also include the role of the Chair and Vice Chair, with specific terms of reference for each, including their roles in the GFAR management team, indicating the method and duration of the appointments, as well as that of all the other committee members and their alternates. The GFAR-SC should also be empowered to constitute subcommittees as and when it so desires.

2.24 The Panel recommends that the development of this funding strategy be seen as a priority activity for the DSG, to be discussed and put in train at their next meeting.

2.26 The Panel recommends that IFAD's role be strengthened to broaden the donor support base, and to increase and continue donors' financial contributions to GFAR. As IFAD will become an ex-officio member of the SC (if the recommendation regarding the facilitating agencies is accepted – see para 2.16), it will also be able to perform an oversight function on behalf of the donors, to ensure the effectiveness and value-added of the activities of the Secretariat, and to report to the DSG on the activities undertaken during the periods between DSG meetings.

2.26 The Panel recommends that all stakeholder representatives in the SC carry out 'Oversight' activities for their constituency in the same way that IFAD will do for the donors.

2.28 The Panel endorses FAO's inclusion of the GFAR Secretariat in the Mid-Term Plan, since it may facilitate the contribution in-staff (person-year) which it recommends in para 2.34 below. This could become an important part of the sustainable funding strategy mentioned above.

2.31 The Panel is of the opinion that the GFAR secretariat should be more forthcoming in forging relationships with the different research units within FAO. The Panel felt that since the Secretariat is located in FAO headquarters in Rome, there may well be several GFAR-relevant opportunities which have yet to be harnessed.

2.32 The Panel commends the work of the facilitating agencies as well as the host institution and recommends that they continue their support for the next three years. The new Legal Agreement for hosting the GFAR Secretariat should establish FAO's contribution - in cash and in-kind - more clearly, so as to avoid any future misunderstanding.
2.34 It is hoped that these four GFAR Secretariat posts can be funded (in cash or in kind) according to the panel’s recommendation:

- that the CGIAR fund one professional, either through direct contribution, or by each IARC contributing $10k to fund the one post for strengthening the GFAR constituencies.
- that FAO fund one ITC professional, who would develop the EGFAR working closely with its WAICENT and at least one secretary.
- that Italy and IFAD continue to provide funding for the post of Executive Secretary as well as operational funds to enable the Secretariat to meet the requirements of its programme of work.
- that the fourth position be filled by the secondment of a senior officer from an ARI or any other GFAR stakeholders, following the example of CIRAD, France, as of 1 August 2000. Moreover, RF/SRF and NARS, like the other constituencies, could, in due course, consider the secondment of staff for certain periods and for specific tasks, according to GFAR priorities.

Section 3. GFAR’s Business Plan and Secretariat Work Programme

3.01 The GFAR Business Plan has been developed around the four lines of action agreed upon by its SC and ratified by the first plenary meeting of GFAR 2000. The Business Plan should define the role each stakeholder will play in respect of the lines of action agreed upon, as well as the expected output and the milestones to measure progress. As stated earlier, this distinctly differs from the GFAR Secretariat’s Programme of Work, which aims at facilitating the implementation of the Business Plan through partnership arrangements among the seven stakeholders. It is anticipated that the true horizon of a GFAR Business Plan will be two three-year rolling programmes. Every three years, coinciding with the plenary meeting, the previous three-year plan will be reviewed, the next three-year plan updated, and a further three-year plan developed to take the place of the one now completed. The GFAR Secretariat will have a three-year Work Programme divided into three annual plans with their separate budgets.

3.02 The four lines of action of the Business Plan identified at GFAR 2000, Dresden are:

- Setting a global vision and a global agenda: developing a vision statement and a global agenda on strategic issues in ARD;
- Strengthening, broadening and deepening the regional and sub-regional fora and thereby the NARS themselves;
- Improving global and regional/sub-regional knowledge systems through using the latest advances in information technology; and.
- Developing innovative research partnership mechanisms among all the stakeholders, around four main thematic research areas. This is also part of GFAR’s mandate, where appropriate, in addition to its key role of seeing that priority agricultural research issues are debated and presented in an informed but neutral way. The four thematic research areas referred to have emerged from a consultative process as well as from priority research agenda and are as follows:
- Genetic resource management and biotechnology;
- Natural resource management and agroecology;
- Commodity chains and underutilised plant species; and
- Policy management and institutional development.

Added to the above four lines of action should be the role of advocacy played by the Secretariat in facilitating research partnerships. This role was mentioned in many of the early documents, and commented on as being very important by several respondents to the questionnaire. The Panel recommends that in the light of diminishing resources for agricultural research, particularly in the public sector, the Secretariat’s advocacy role be given a higher profile. This should be done in close collaboration with other stakeholders, especially the CGIAR and the Future Harvest initiative. Equally important and worthy of mention is its advisory role. In addition to setting up a global agricultural research agenda, commissioning state-of-the-art issue papers and providing a forum for reviewing priority global research issues also form part of the Secretariat’s key responsibilities.

3.03 The GFAR Business Plan was fully debated at GFAR 2000, Dresden. This broad approach, to which the Panel concurs, was considered appropriate as the forum meeting was the very first of its kind since GFAR had been instituted. The thirty-two working groups set up on the first day to discuss the proposed Global Vision and the Action Plan were one of the highlights of the forum, as they enabled all participants to have a say in the deliberations. The groups largely endorsed the content of the above lines of action, particularly with regard to the first three items of the consultation. The importance of the four thematic areas selected for focus was also generally endorsed. There was more criticism (often unfounded) over the very active role played by the Secretariat in facilitating joint action in the four areas, than over the intrinsic importance of the lines of action and themes to all GFAR stakeholders. Consequently, this would appear to be an area in which the panel feels remedial action is required, so as to ensure that the relevant stakeholders are effectively involved in each activity. It is imperative for the merged GFAR Secretariat to avoid any loss of credibility as a result of alienating any of its stakeholders. This is not always an easy task, particularly in a forum where there is a diversity of views, but where stakeholders need greater collaboration in areas of common interest. There is still much duplication of work among stakeholders, and failure by NARS to collaborate in programmes that each one tries to maintain individually, in spite of lacking the required critical mass of staff or the necessary funds to be operationally effective, leads to an inefficient use of resources. There are several most encouraging exceptions to this situation, however, and these need to be documented so that the improved institutional mechanisms and ‘best practices’ can be more widely replicated or adapted elsewhere, where relevant.

A. Strengthening Regional and Sub-regional Fora

3.04 The Panel confirms its view that strong sub-regional and regional fora are the sine qua non for building a strong global system of agricultural research for development. These fora must play a role in strengthening their member-NARS, in promoting research collaboration between them at the sub-regional and regional level, and in setting a sound basis for research collaboration with other parts of the global system, through the identification of regional priorities. The various fora ultimately depend on strong NARS. The Panel is of the view, however, that GFAR - and its secretariat - should focus on the regional and sub-regional associations, where the majority of its Business Plan activities will take place. There are four major reasons for this:
• According to GFAR's guiding principles, one of which is subsidiarity, activities should take place at the lowest level at which they can operate effectively;

• There tends to be greater coherence, sharing of common problems and even more similarity between the agro-ecology and farming systems of neighbouring countries at sub-regional level, than is the case across a continental region;

• There are enormous advantages to be gained from sharing information gleaned from similar if not identical agro-ecological zones in neighbouring countries, and more importantly by collaborating in research programmes, especially when so many of the smaller countries lack a critical mass of staff in any one programme. By sharing a research agenda with neighbours, one can overcome this difficulty (para 3.48 below); and

• In Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), there is a history of strong sub-regional agricultural research networks/fora: for example, SACCAR, ASARECA and WECARD/CORAF in SSA and the PROCs and SICTA in LAC. Also, their newer regional organizations, FARA (in SSA) and FORAGRO (in LAC), have been set up as light organizations to represent their joint views more forcefully in global fora, and organize better collaboration and exchange of information across the whole region as well as inter-regionally.

3.05 The pattern of agricultural research cooperation is somewhat different in AARINENA in the West Asia and North African Region (WANA), and in APAARI in the Asia-Pacific Region. In these two cases, agricultural research collaboration and networks had been organized at the regional level long before GFAR came into existence (see Annex 8 on AARINENA), as indeed with most of the subregional fora in LAC and SSA regions. Nevertheless, both AARINENA and APAARI have now also divided their regions into sub-regions, from which many of the new research partnership programmes are emerging. In the case of AARINENA, there are five subregions: the Maghreb in North Africa, the Mashreq Fertile Crescent, the Nile Valley and the Red Sea, the Arabian Peninsula, and West Asia. In the case of APAARI there are four sub-regions: South Asia, North East Asia, South East Asia and the Pacific Islands. The new regional forum ‘Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC)’ is much smaller than the RFs for the other four regions, and its two sub-regions are reflected in its name. The Panel fully concurs with the policy adopted since the 1995/96 development of the NARS Action Plan, i.e. that it is up to each region to decide what roles should be played at the regional and sub-regional levels, as well as determining what is the best way for them to organize themselves. These arrangements could also vary over time, in the light of changing conditions.

3.06 There is almost universal agreement that one of GFAR’s prime responsibilities is to help build stronger NARS and NARS regional and sub-regional fora. With regard to the latter, the Secretariat has a key role to play, as and when requested to do so, and by so doing it will indirectly strengthen NARS as well. The direct strengthening of NARS, however, is a task undertaken principally by the NARS themselves, working in concert with IARCs - especially ISNAR and ARIs, with support from donor programmes as well as those of NGOs and the private sector. The Secretariat has been requested by the R/SR fora to facilitate the exchange of successful experiences in NARS integration and management across regions. But the main task of the Secretariat is to provide support to the regional fora, particularly in a number of areas where strengthening is required. These areas were revisited and debated at an informal meeting between EIARD, ISNAR and the Secretariat in April 1999, and published in a paper by the NARS Secretariat (Bibl. no. 66). The proposals were then discussed further at the NARS-SC meetings - both at MTM99 in Beijing and at GFAR 2000, Dresden, as well as electronically and at other times of contact. These meetings identified the need to:
- keep abreast of advances in information technology, communications and knowledge systems;
- strengthen ownership and to be broader-based, both sectorally and with other stakeholders;
- improve governance;
- have a permanent secretariat and develop better management capacity;
- strengthen impact assessment and dissemination of results; and,
- consolidate institutional and financial sustainability.

3.07 ICT/ Knowledge systems. The R/SR fora and their NARS are fully cognizant of the need to keep abreast of advances in information and communication technology. It is important to have the appropriate hardware and training in the use of the software so as to communicate more rapidly and be able to access additional information relevant to their needs. Most of the stakeholders are assisting in this endeavour and GFAR certainly has a comparative advantage to act in this sphere. The NARS, NGOs and farmer organizations are deeply involved in setting up the RAIS; the donors in providing funds (EIARD, EC, USAID, DFID); and the IARCs and ARIs in facilitating access to their databases and in training (CTA, IDRC, CABI, CIRAD). In addition, the Secretariat is playing an important role in coordinating this operation. It is also engaged in setting up EGFAR as an information gateway and a forum at the global level, to ensure easier access to the large global networks, such as FAO’s WAICENT.15 However, in view of the critical importance of EGFAR to the R/SR fora, the Panel has two key recommendations to make: The first relates to the essential need to recruit, as soon as possible, a full-time professional to further develop EGFAR, and ensure that it relates well to other networks while not duplicating any of their activities. The second is to post well-qualified ICT specialist APOs to each of the RAIS (in agreement with them). Requests for assistance of this type have already been made. These APOs should, first of all, receive three months training under the ICT specialist at the Secretariat in Rome. Such training would equip them to help RAIS become effectively operational through electronic compatibility/connectivity etc., and facilitate information exchange.

3.08 Ownership: broadening and deepening the partnership. The development of real stakeholders in ARD is of paramount importance and, as the April 99 report states (Bib. no. 66), this requires the development of a proactive mentality and a sense of commitment and social responsibility. It also means that stakeholders must develop a clear awareness of their common interests, and the benefits to be gained from effective collaboration in order to achieve their common and agreed objectives with greater ease. With the dynamics of scientific progress and the rapid pace of institutional diversification in ARD, new actors are playing an important role with the NARS, ARIs and IARCs (the three traditional actors in this field), now being joined by the private sector, universities, NGOs and farmer organizations. Thus, NARS need to be more broadly based, to accommodate the different stakeholders. The Panel recommends that the regional and sub-regional fora consider reviewing their ability to speed up the process of broadening the range of stakeholders they are bringing together and include representatives from these sectors. It is encouraging to note that all R/SR fora have included this issue in their prospective forward plans. Ideally, this should be a reflection of a similar broadening at the NARS level.

3.09 Sub-regional and regional fora should also expand their membership subsectorally (again, ideally, as a reflection of such developments at the national level) to embrace the broad, natural resource definition of ‘agricultural’ institutions which

15 For further details, see paras 3.16 to 3.24, below.
includes livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resource management, on an equal footing with crop agriculture.

3.10 **Permanent Secretariat and Management Capacity.** In order to ensure long-term sustainability of regional fora, it is vital that these have a small but effective secretariat, preferably fully funded by its constituents, to strengthen the sense of ownership and commitment. From reviewing experience in the various fora, and in recognition of their critical importance, the Panel recommends that each R/SR forum consider having a permanent (not itinerant) secretariat, and a full-time Executive Secretary. Of course, each forum must make its own decision in this matter, but those that do not have a permanent secretariat might like to compare experience with those that do. The panel further stresses the need to strengthen the operational and management capacity of each forum secretariat. Moreover, further training is needed for both managers and their partners involved in managing networks as opposed to just research programmes. WECARD/CORAF’s example of having an Executive Secretary, Scientific Programme Officer IT Specialist and a Publications Editor is a good one, and is facilitated by the generous secondment of staff from member-NARS - something which other fora may not be able to replicate. However, this indicates the level of commitment by NARS members to their forum in West and Central Africa (see Annex 9).

3.11 **Improving governance.** In order to broaden stakeholder representation in the fora, multi-player decision-making systems are needed to facilitate the active participation of the different stakeholders in the governance of their fora. The Panel recommends that there be a clear definition of tasks among the various staff, chairpersons and committees set up to manage each forum, based on competencies and responsibilities. In this manner, the development of an agreed and more specified Business Plan would greatly enhance transparency and accountability in general. Almost all fora have this form of management already, but again experience could be shared (although not all will have similar constitutions or working procedures). It is important to have clear terms of reference for the Chairperson and the Executive Secretary of each.

3.12 The representatives of the regional fora from the South in the GFAR-SC should continue to meet as a subcommittee, to consider issues of specific interest. Such meetings could usefully precede CG meetings, and they might invite NARS members of the CGIAR. They could then review and discuss CG documents and provide as coherent and helpful an input as possible to the CG meetings (just as the EFARD group does at present, in terms of European views). Up to now, some donors have provided funds through FAO to cover the cost of sending regional representatives (appointed politically by national ministers, under an FAO procedure) to attend CGIAR meetings. However, regional representation at these meetings is slowly being phased out in favour of fora representatives, who have also been representing their regions in CGIAR meetings since 1996. The Panel recommends that FAO consider making available to the GFAR Secretariat the funds originally provided to cover the cost of regional representation at these meetings. This would ensure more effective participation and representation of regional fora in the GFAR-SC.

3.13 **Strengthening impact assessment and dissemination of results.** This is something of vital importance, and assistance is already being provided to several fora and their NARS. For example, Purdue University in the US, is collaborating through a USAID programme in Mali, with both INSAH and WECARD/CORAF (see Annex 9). If there is interest on the part of R/SR fora, the Secretariat could also facilitate interaction with TAC and with other institutions working in this field.

3.14 **Consolidating institutional and financial sustainability:** The regional fora need financial support to: pay for their operational expenses, undertake specific activities, i.e. commission papers, engage consultants etc; and provide access to competitive funds for
promoting research for development partnerships among NARS, or between NARS and other stakeholders:

(i) The various fora should make efforts to raise funds in their own region. Ideally, such funds should come from the NARS themselves, to ensure ownership, but this is likely to be only partially feasible for the time being. The Secretariat should continue to help the various fora in presenting a case to the regional multilateral banks on the importance of providing core support to these associations, identifying funds for fora activities and enlisting their sponsorship to promote new mechanisms for funding partnership research. IDB is already assisting FONTAGRO, and the Asian Development Bank is considering helping to set up, and participate in, a similar fund for APAARI;

(ii) Donors should provide funds to strengthen the financial position of fora and partnership research within each sub-region. In most cases, these competitive endowment funds - for which the NARS and their partners can bid - should be provided directly to the regional/subregional fora. This is already under discussion in the case of ASARECA with support from the EC and USAID, and for WECARD/CORAF, again from the EC. As pointed out above, this endowment fund already exists in the case of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), through FONTAGRO; and

(iii) One particular area of support to fora that donors should consider, in addition to financial assistance, is that of providing young professionals or Associate Professional Officers (APOs) through FAO or from any other bilateral mechanism, as is already the case with one APO staff member in APAARI. As discussed above, these are immediately required in the IT field, as soon as the IT specialist takes up his/her post in the Secretariat, to help train and backstop them.

3.15 Now that the two secretariats have been merged, the current secretariat must continue to designate staff and financial resources to the needs of the NARS regional and sub-regional fora. These fora should also identify the support they require in order to be strengthened, and the way in which the Secretariat can assist them. On the question of financing, it is likely that each forum requiring support will have to continue to make a direct request to donors, when the need occurs, and not expect the Secretariat to become involved.

B. Improving Information and Knowledge Systems - EGFAR and RAIS

3.16 Facilitating the exchange of information and knowledge has been one of GFAR's objectives since its launch. This was a vital element of the 1996 Plan of Action for Global Partnership in Agricultural Research (Bibl. no. 83), and it is one of GFAR's key lines of action today. Any system or initiative relating to information and communication must strengthen all stakeholders, particularly the NARS and their fora. It must avoid worsening the current inequitable access to information and take steps to bridge the gap by making information as widely accessible as possible. It must also ensure that NARS have access to the necessary I&C technology. A global system of information- and experience-sharing can make a critical contribution to improving the effectiveness of agricultural research, but it must be conceived in such a way that the "playing field is levelled" between stakeholders.

3.17 Responses to the review panel's questionnaire and interviews with stakeholders indicate that information and knowledge dissemination continues to be seen as a priority for GFAR action. However, they also caution against duplication in a field where there is already considerable activity:
3.18 Initial efforts to develop an “Electronic Global Forum for Agricultural Research” (EGFAR) were led by the GFAR Secretariat located in Washington, starting in 1997. The intention was to put all information on one global site, with stakeholders having “kiosks” to present their material. This work received some technical support from the World Bank, but only limited financial support from other donors. Progress was slow - although the initial target was to have the initiative operational in 1998. Subsequently, it was wisely decided to aim at a more decentralized system - an enabling framework for a global information system - and to contribute building blocks to that system. With the support of FAO and the World Bank, the GFAR Secretariat (at the time, the GFAR and NARS Secretariats) organised a consultation meeting in Rome in March 1999 (ibid. no. 51) that brought together about 50 participants to discuss the vision for a Framework for a Global Agricultural R&D Information System, the role of each stakeholder or institution in its establishment and the steps necessary to ensure its success. Participants were also reminded that the CG external review had recommended that the CGIAR, FAO, World Bank, NARS, ARIs and NGOs should collaborate in developing an effective Global Knowledge System for Food Security.

3.19 In discussing the best way to establish a global framework, the Rome meeting recognised the fundamental importance of having a global system based on strong Regional/Sub regional Agricultural Information Systems (RAIS) or Networks (RAIN). Ultimately, these would be as strong as the National Agricultural Information Systems (NAIS) which are their essential constituents. The main databases are found at the national level, which is where most interaction with end-users takes place. The role of the regional system should be - in part - that of ensuring information-networking among national databases. Since the task would be enormous if the RAIS seek to cover all areas of information on the research being undertaken, together with the channelling of research results and information from agricultural research to those who need it, they (the RAIS) must prioritise in what areas they wish to concentrate their effort, based on regional priorities or regional networks.

3.20 Any discussion of a global framework or system would need to acknowledge the role of the World Agricultural Information Centre (WAICENT) at FAO in setting out and/or improving the existing normative framework for facilitating information flows on a standard basis, and also on WAICENT’s technical advice. FAO systems, such as CARIS and AGRIS, or their equivalents in some regions, have already helped to structure information exchange. An effective interface with information and knowledge generated by CGIAR and other stakeholders would also be necessary, and should take account of concrete projects on innovative aspects of the Global Knowledge Systems, such as those proposed by NGOs in the natural resource management field: InterDev, an information system aimed at capturing local knowledge (already at a pilot stage); Prolinova, to systematise and understand innovations; and Policy Net, aimed at understanding its policy and institutional context (ibid. no. 51). A diagram showing players in the Global Information System at national, regional and global levels is attached as Annex 7.

3.21 Regional Agricultural Information Systems (RAIS). Regional/Sub-regional Fora are at different stages in reviewing the state of national information systems, existing resources in their region, what their regional information strategy should be, and what support is required. They are also starting from very different situations, in terms of present resources. The GFAR/NARS secretariat has played a coordinating role in this process. It has
provided some funding for consultants and meetings, and has contributed to the design of a conceptual framework for what the RAIS should cover and do. Furthermore, the secretariat has worked closely with regional/sub-regional fora and with FAO/WAICENT, CTA, CABI and CIRAD, in supporting the emerging regional systems (Bibl. nos. 54 to 61). RAIS are envisaged as a set of interrelated databases and information facilities available in each region, all of which participate in a regional strategy and share minimum standards. This should also include helping in the establishment or improvement of Web Pages for regional/sub regional fora. Each regional/sub-regional forum has a person/focal point responsible for the information area. This person can be a full-time professional (as in the case of WECARD/CORAF and of APAARI), a consultant (as in the case of AARINENA and of FORAGRO), or a young APO - which is also the case of APAARI. These persons held a meeting during GFAR-2000, at where they decided to establish an electronic discussion group to interact and exchange experiences on information issues. On the basis of this exchange of experience, they are proposing to create an Inter-regional Agricultural Information Partnership among RAIS, aimed at capacity building, information standardization, software development and expert systems development. It is very important that the regional/sub regional fora continue to exchange views and experience in this area, both at the level of information specialist and at that of research manager. The overall purpose requires a minimum common approach, resulting in compatibility between systems. At the same time, each region/sub region must feel able to move according to its own needs and at its own speed (subject, of course, to the availability of adequate funds to allow them to do so). This re-emphasises the need for the GFAR Secretariat to have a full-time professional IT specialist.

3.22 Well-functioning, appropriately designed RAIS are a critical component of a global information system. Donors will need to support capacity building and the needs of developing countries with respect to ICTs, otherwise there is a real danger that the existing gap will become larger in terms of access to information, and the consequent link to development. Access, input, and the use of information are all limited by the lack of trained personnel and inadequate systems. The panel recommends that donors continue to support the development of RAIS - including strengthening the capacity of persons involved and of the systems. In the short-term, adequately trained APOs should be assigned to help regional/sub regional fora. As suggested below, support to RAIS will also include strengthening the capacity of the GFAR Secretariat to provide coordination and backup. As one respondent pointed out:

_The GFAR Secretariat is very active and has given good support and does reach out to the Sub-regions. The workshop on information was a very good contribution that has helped us in developing our strategy. The initiative to find funds to assist us in developing web pages is very useful. This type of support should continue._ (A NARS/Sub regional Forum respondent)

3.23 **EGFAR - the Gateway and the Forum.** The GFAR Secretariat is in the process of developing the EGFAR gateway function and links to a set of interrelated web pages for interaction among stakeholders (Bibl. nos. 62 and 63). Within EGFAR, one essential element - the NARS Forum - will promote a learning process and a pool of knowledge on NARS management issues through interaction among interested parties, based on networking and on sharing experience (Bibl. nos. 64b and 64c). Nine subject areas have already been identified with NARS participants for discussion groups. Each will be coordinated by a lead NARS group that will be responsible for the initial discussion paper - e.g. Research Funding Strategies in ARD by EMBRAPA (Brazil); Integration of NARS: From NARIs to NARS by BAR (Philippines); Management of Information and Knowledge Systems by PCARRD (Philippines); S&T Trends and their Implications, by Campinas University and IICA (Costa Rica). This exchange will depend on technical support from the GFAR Secretariat and on some funding, if required. But the main dimension will be a learning process generated by a
stakeholder-led initiative on Internet. In at least one instance, the NARS group has been asked to slow down the development of their module, since the Secretariat cannot offer adequate backup.

3.24 **GFAR Secretariat support to ICT.** Technical aspects of EGFAR and RAIS depend at present on the time devoted to this activity by the Secretariat, on the support of WAICENT staff, on consultants and on an APO working in the Secretariat. This is not adequate. WAICENT has indicated that it cannot dedicate more time to GFAR, as it is already stretched in terms of fulfilling its overall mandate in the area of agricultural information. It must also use its resources for key functions of global normative development. In spite of the valid work of the Secretariat and the role played by the APO, members of the review panel are convinced that at this crucial development stage, the information and communication area requires a senior ICT specialist in the Secretariat to provide support to RAIS and EGFAR. The lack of such a person (along with some financial resources) is hampering the development of EGFAR and RAIS. This person should work as a member of the GFAR team, in close association with WAICENT - so as to understand the work and requirements of both - but on the EGFAR and RAIS agenda. Collaboration with WAICENT could also focus on particular tasks. One such area of collaboration which was identified while the review panel was in Rome, relates to the information support that RAIS could provide to major rural development projects in a given region (i.e. interaction between ASARECA’s RAIN and FAO’s “Horn of Africa” Special Project). The role of the GFAR specialist would also require understanding and close liaison with other major actors in the knowledge and information field, such as the World Bank. The Panel’s preference (see paragraph 2.34 on funding GFAR’s activities) would be that this post be funded as part of FAO support to GFAR. In any case, however, it recommends that funding be provided for the recruitment of a senior ICT specialist for GFAR, for a three-year period, as soon as possible. Donors are being contacted for this purpose.

C. **Setting Priorities and Focusing in Facilitating Research Partnerships in GFAR**

3.25 Given the limited amount of available resources, some donors and stakeholders have raised the question of focus and priority setting. One way of focusing could be to limit GFAR action to only one or two of the four themes that have been chosen as priority areas. Nevertheless, both at GFAR 2000, Dresden and in the review panel’s subsequent consultation with stakeholders, there was clear interest in developing research partnerships in these four thematic areas. As GFAR is a stakeholder-led initiative, whatever it does will ultimately depend on the interest, commitment and capacity of the stakeholders concerned. Consequently, GFAR’s comparative advantage in carrying out a programme or activity is contingent on the comparative advantage of the interested stakeholders. It is therefore a question of mobilising the latter.

3.26 Although stakeholders are entirely free to develop whatever partnerships they judge to be important within the framework of the Global Forum, the Secretariat should concentrate its efforts on just a few strategic cases that are considered to be of high priority and high potential impact. Since the GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting, the Secretariat has been discussing this particular point with various stakeholders, and several ideas and criteria are emerging as a consensus on how to move in this direction. This is analysed in a recent document on the role of GFAR in strengthening research partnerships.\(^\text{14}\) A first step in this direction is that the Secretariat should concentrate most of its efforts on facilitating the development of a few “**Global and Regional R&D Framework Programmes**”; and not on single collaborative projects, which are the responsibility of the interested stakeholders. But even here, the potential options emerging are quite numerous. The Panel recommends the

\(^{14}\) On this see GFAR Secretariat: *Some Thoughts on the Follow-up to Dresden 2000 on Research Partnerships*, Rome, GFAR, July 2000.
following criteria for priority setting and for the selection of those cases on which the Secretariat should concentrate its efforts:

- The relevance of the concrete partnership or programme from the point of view of GFAR's objectives, which are those of food security, poverty eradication and environmental sustainability.
- The existence of a lead stakeholder that can play an articulating role, working in close collaboration with other stakeholders of ARD (a core group of participating and committed institutions).
- The possibility of integrating into the programme both traditional and new players in agricultural research, in a multi-stakeholder initiative (i.e. NARS, IARCs, NGOs, ARIs, Farmers and the private sector).
- The identification of value-added through interaction and synergisms among the participating stakeholders.
- The possibility of an integrated approach covering not only research activities but also post-harvest and marketing development efforts, or the policy framework that conditions its effective impact.
- The opportunity of developing a coordination mechanism that facilitates concertation among stakeholders and donors in the development of the Global Framework Programme.

On the basis of these criteria it should be possible to identify a small portfolio of strategic Global and Regional R&D Framework Programmes in which the GFAR Secretariat could play a facilitating role during the next three years. This will also facilitate the evaluation of its performance and its contribution to the emergence of a Global Agricultural Research System.

D. Developing Innovative Partnership Proposals

3.27 The four thematic topics were chosen by the GFAR-SC from recommendations provided by representatives of the four fora (now five, with the Central Asia and Caucasus (CAC)), and with the agreement of the committee members representing the other stakeholders. The plant genetic resources and biotechnology theme is patently a key global research issue and is surrounded by dissension and much misinformation. GFAR and its Secretariat have a significant role to play here. The natural resource management and agroecology theme is also of great importance, both on global environmental and sustainable livelihood grounds; and the new thrust of Interdev, PROLINNOVA and Policy Net is a welcome new initiative developed largely by the NGO constituency (see para 3.36 below).

3.28 The commodity chain and underutilised plant species theme is another important one, but needs clearer definition, as there is a lack of clear understanding among many in the research community as to what is meant by a commodity chain. The policy management and institutional theme is a vital one, due to a dearth of good policy analysis in support of the need for reform, and often ineffective institutional performance. Such reform would provide the right incentives for relevant agricultural research that can have development impact and the urgent need to strengthen all research institutions and their ability to operate collaboratively and effectively in developing countries. In all these thematic areas, the Secretariat acts as a facilitator and has a role to play in bringing partnerships together. However, once partnerships are initiated, the Panel recommends that the Secretariat needs only to keep a watching brief, monitor successful partnerships in all these thematic fields through an agreed reporting system, and get directly involved only if requested to do so by the regional or sub regional fora, or when issues emerge that need to be aired at the global level, by commissioning a special study or hosting an appropriate workshop.
Genetic Resources Management for Agriculture and Biotechnology

3.29 At the launch of GFAR in 1996, biotechnology and genetic resources conservation and utilization were identified as belonging to a high priority theme providing opportunities for collaboration between GFAR stakeholders. In the responses to the review panel’s questionnaire, 38 respondents (48%) felt that genetic resources management and biotechnology were “very important” for GFAR to be involved in and a further 23 (29%) felt they were “important”. Fifteen (19%) saw GFAR involvement as being “less important”, some adding the comment that they thought this was already a crowded field. Strongest endorsement came from the NARS respondents, although more than half of the respondents from ARIs, donors and the private sector also gave “very important” ratings. In terms of assessment of the GFAR process so far, 26 respondents (33%) rated it as being “very useful”, and a further 26 (33%) felt it was “useful”. Since these two components have their own specificity, comments will be made separately with regard to each one.

3.30 Genetic Resource Management for Agriculture. This area is clearly important for GFAR stakeholders since effective genetic resource policy is crucial for continued exchange and management of genetic resources and for the sharing of its benefits. There are divergent views on how to handle these issues, based on sharply differing interests and also on misinformation. Furthermore, it is an area in which the Global Plan of Action, approved in Leipzig in June 1996, may be of help in identifying and addressing this critical element of the global research agenda.

3.31 Given the interest expressed by a number of stakeholders, the GFAR-SC launched a specific initiative in this area in October of 1999. The objectives were to analyse the benefits of a multilateral system for access and benefit-sharing, to identify policy options for national access legislation, to contribute to policy capacity and awareness and to promote regional and global partnerships. As a result of the Steering Committee decision, the secretariat worked with an ad hoc group constituting those stakeholder representatives possessing the most knowledge in this area. There was considerable activity in the six or seven months preceding the Dresden-2000 meeting in Dresden. Two International Centres (IPGRI and IRRI) were involved, as were staff of the Inter-Governmental Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, hosted by FAO. Several GFAR members belonging to ARIs agreed to contribute issue papers. USAID funded the organisation of a workshop held at IRRI on the impact of PVP on rice germplasm, and the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) provided $65,000 for a series of activities that led to the preparation of a concept and issues paper. Following intensive consultation among stakeholders, the concept paper, ten short papers (“micro papers”) on particular policy issues, and the text of a Dresden Declaration on Plant Genetic Resources, were ready for discussion at GFAR 2000, Dresden (Bibl. nos. 19 to 31).

3.32 Some elements of this initiative may provide a model for dealing with specific issues in the future - strong stakeholder involvement, the use of an ad hoc stakeholder group once the SC has approved the initiative, donor funding of specific activities, GFAR’s contribution to clarifying issues on which there is divergence, and an opportunity to move towards a better common understanding. It is not yet clear, however, how the Declaration (Bibl. no. 31) will be used, and whether GFAR stakeholders and GFAR 2000, Dresden participants will communicate the contents to their governments. The Panel suggests that the policy papers should be disseminated formally, although they can already be used in response to requests for information, and are available on the EGFAR website.

---

15 This para is largely taken from Annex 4 to the questionnaire, which has similar analysis paragraphs on all the themes and lines of action, but none of the rest of these are included in the main text, so please refer to Annex 4 for them.
3.33 Just as in the case of other areas, the Secretariat should only get involved in GRM/IPR issues when a clear niche has been identified, as well as the relevant value-added for the stakeholders. In this context, the Panel is of the view that the GFAR-SC should set up a review of genetic resource management and IPR issues in developing countries, and strengthen regional and sub-regional fora so that they can support NARS in these areas. GFAR can also be active in creating awareness among policy-makers and legislators vis-à-vis the policy options open to their countries, and in strengthening research and policy management capacity on genetic resources in developing countries. Stakeholders will want to determine, through the GFAR-SC, the role to be played by the Secretariat in facilitating all of these matters.

3.34 Biotechnology. Biotechnology issues offer just as much opportunity for disagreement and controversy as those dealing with genetic resource management. The supporters promise more efficient breeding programmes for plants and animals and the creation of better diagnostic tools for animal and plant diseases. Others point to the risks posed by certain aspects of biotechnology - particularly with regard to genetically modified organisms and their possible negative effects on human/animal health and on the environment. When asked at the Dresden meeting for suggestions as to further thematic areas to be added to GFAR’s present concerns, several participants proposed that “biosafety” be explicitly added to biotechnology, rather than having it dealt with under the biotechnology label. Issues related to Intellectual Property Rights are just as critical for biotechnology as they are for genetic resource management.

3.35 Given the divergence of opinions in this field, it may prove to be an area in which GFAR’s role of providing a neutral platform for discussion and exchange of views can be useful (Annex 14). One proposal for research partnership, discussed in Dresden, dealt with “Developing a Common Vision for the Role of Biotechnology in Food and Agriculture”. This is now being implemented through a series of activities led by the CGIAR, several regional/sub-regional fora and FAO. Biotechnology is also an area in which the research capacity of developing countries is generally weak, where research requires an even larger investment than other areas of agricultural research, and where there are barriers to the information flow. GFAR stakeholders can collaborate in eliminating this latter constraint. FAO is currently organising an Electronic Forum on Biotechnology in Food and Agriculture, with the objective of providing “an open forum that will allow a wide range of parties, including governmental and non-governmental organisations, policy-makers and the general public, to discuss and exchange views and experience about specific issues concerning biotechnology in food and agriculture for developing countries.” At the GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting, there was discussion on several proposals for research collaboration involving GFAR stakeholders, such as setting up a global network on trait discovery in rice, and the global initiative for the improvement of livestock productivity through the control of trypanosomiasis. At present, GFAR’s private sector group is discussing, with the Secretariat, concrete steps to further develop the dialogue initiated at GFAR 2000, Dresden and to facilitate the development of global initiatives discussed there.

Natural Resource Management and Agroecology

3.36 This theme is of major importance, particularly since most of the available arable land is already under cultivation - much of it in marginal areas - or is becoming affected by degradation, erosion or salinity. In the AARINENA region, improved soil and water management is the overriding research issue. Traditional agricultural and NRM research has produced many excellent recommendations for physical and technical improvement, but in many cases insufficient attention has been given to the socio-economic and cultural setting, or to ensuring beneficiary involvement as equal partners in a fully participatory manner. The approach put forward by a group of European NGOs and ARIs that met in Rambouillet in 1999 (Ibid. no. 36) recommended the setting up of Interdev, PROLINNOVA and Policy Net
This promises to help reorient research/extension systems towards a more farmer-demand-led approach in the context of better conservation of our depleting natural resource base, and the development of more sustainable farming systems that will help address poverty alleviation and improve food security.

3.37 Importantly, this theme has made the NGO constituency better able to unite as a stakeholder in GFAR, although the large numbers of NGOs involved make it difficult to harness representation that all can endorse. Time is needed for this process to advance, and harnessing NGO initiatives around this NRM theme promises to strengthen NGO involvement at regional, sub-regional and national levels. A words of caution, however: NGOs must remember that much excellent research has gone before and is ongoing in this field. Consequently they should avoid alienating the other research stakeholders in IARCs, ARIs and donor groups with whom they need to collaborate in ensuring that a much more participatory approach is followed with farmers. This is particularly important in NRM themes where entire communities - and not just individual farmers - need to be involved.

3.38 The other comment, to be found in several questionnaire responses, relates to the potential danger of the Secretariat becoming overly involved in the development of these themes. As already stated, the Secretariat acts as a facilitator, and it has a role to play in bringing partnerships together. However, in the case of NRM, such partnerships will be largely at sub-regional level or below, where other stakeholders play the major role.

Commodity Chains and Underutilized Crops

3.39 **Commodity Chains.** During the development of the NARS Action Plan in 1995/6 (Bibl. no. 83) it was evident that while there was full agreement on the three main goals of the CGIAR system - improving food security, alleviating poverty and conserving the natural resource base - a fourth goal also existed, that of strengthening national economies. which meant paying more attention to many of the cash crops (fibers, beverages, rubber, oil palm, etc.) that were not part of the CG mandate. Furthermore, it was pointed out that all of these crops had important roles to play in alleviating poverty (through generating income and employment), improving security (by providing income to buy food), and in natural resource conservation. Many such crops are perennial tree crops that provide much better cover, especially on sloping land, to lessen or prevent soil erosion and land degradation. The whole question of the need for more research on non-CGIAR mandated crops was raised as an issue at all four regional fora meetings in 1995/6. (Bibl. nos. 83).

3.40 For instance, many of the larger LDCs are already undertaking strong research in these commodities, often assisted by ARIs in the developed world. A classic case is cotton, where the francophone West African cotton-producing countries have had continuous support from CIRAD, and in most cases have well-established major production, marketing and processing entities in each country. Cotton has indeed been the engine of growth in these countries and contributed significantly to poverty alleviation and food security. In Mali Sud, when the cotton agency began paying village farmer groups to organize the marketing of their own cotton, the farms so-generated inspired effective village development. Linked to the “Groupement Villageois” programme and supportive functional literacy and numeracy programmes. This can be contrasted with the lack of outside assistance for cotton production, coupled with disastrous parastatal processing industries in the former British colonies of East Africa, which has led to the demise of cotton production and processing there. The effectiveness of the commodity chain approach to research and development is well-demonstrated in this example, and it could be replicated in many cash crops, especially perennial tree crops such as coconut, coffee, tea, cocoa, oil palm and rubber – all of which lie outside the mandate of the CGIAR system. Within the system, INIBAP - now subsumed under IPGRI - has well-demonstrated the effectiveness of this “filière” or commodity chain approach, in the area of *Musa* genetic improvement. In this case, a wide range of partners
have been brought together from both the North and the South, including NGOs and farmer organizations; and now the private sector has expressed an interest in participating in this fully-global programme.

3.41 In defining the global programmes for these commodities, the concept of 'commodity chain' based on the French "filière" approach was put forward, and it is encouraging to note that a special unit under IPGRI/CIRAD was established at Montpellier to stimulate contacts between stakeholders on such global programmes. In view of the misunderstanding of the term 'commodity chain' in some circles, the Panel wishes to clearly restate the definition given in the discussion paper prepared for the GFAR-SC in May 1999 entitled "the Establishment of Global Programmes for Commodity Chains" (Bibl. no. 43). A commodity chain means that, for a given crop, research is not limited to the conventional agricultural components related to yield increases but that the crop is considered 'globally' in all aspects of a chain - from its production through its processing, to its consumption or use by consumers. This approach adds an important new dimension to the traditional agricultural research agenda, and implies the involvement of a full range of new partners, usually not involved in agricultural research. The Panel thus endorses the proposal that the GFAR Secretariat assist its stakeholders in developing global programmes initially on a few commodity chains, which will be jointly identified, based on the priorities expressed by the NARS regional fora (Bibl. no. 43).

3.42 The Panel further endorses the concept that global programmes should build on existing achievements and be based on ongoing activities. In sugarcane, for example, the International Society of Sugarcane Technologists (ISSCT) includes most of the public institutions, cooperatives and private concerns involved in any research affecting the industry, although research investment is mainly through the private sector. Cocoa, on the other hand, is an example of a commodity where very little collaboration has previously existed, but where the private sector has recently taken the initiative in developing of the International Sustainable Cocoa Programme (ISCP). This is a global initiative, which at present is very much biased towards the cocoa industry, with little representation from other stakeholders. At a recent meeting in Paris, it was agreed that efforts be made to broaden participation (Bibl. no. 46).

3.43 It is clear that the commodity chain approach can be applied equally well to food crops. Thus, it is encouraging to see much more attention being given to post harvest research, which was not traditionally a part of the CG centres' mandate (with some notable exceptions, of course, such as CIP/potatoes). Here is an appropriate niche in which research by GFAR stakeholders can provide value added. It is also an area that has potential for more effective partnerships with the private sector, as is being demonstrated by the ROCAFREMI pearl millet network under the umbrella of the WECARD/CORAF sub-regional forum in West Africa (Annex 9).

3.44 Underutilized Crops. The role of underutilized plant species in the twenty first century has been well spelled out in a paper presented to the GFAR-SC meeting at ICW 1999 (Bibl. no. 44). The importance of many such species in subsistence agriculture and/or for income generation has been underestimated in the past. More attention should be given to the research and development of a number of these crops, for many good reasons related to agro-biodiversity, ecosystem stability, food security and nutrition, potential for value-added and new market opportunities. In most cases, this is likely to be based at a sub-regional or local level. As far as GFAR involvement is concerned, two of its guiding principles apply: that of subsidiarity, whereby activities should be implemented at the lowest possible level at which they can be efficiently executed, and that of additionality, whereby initiatives should be promoted only where there is clear value to be gained from encouraging successful research and development partnerships.
The Panel endorses the recommendations (of the paper on underutilized plant species) that the sustainable promotion of some of these underutilized crops is needed in order to contribute to economic development, people's well-being, and the maintenance of genetic diversity and associated local knowledge. A better understanding of the socio-economic mechanisms impeding a greater utilization of these locally important crops is also essential in order to strengthen their role in poverty alleviation. Several mechanisms exist, such as those fostered by GFAR, to ensure that lessons learned in one region can also benefit others. Moreover, the strengthening of the links among international stakeholders involved in the promotion of such underutilized species is indeed strategic to allow best use of capacities and promote synergism across regions. The Panel also affirms that the proposed creation of a Task Force - comprising IPGRI, the ICUC and FAO - to develop a strategic research plan for the utilization of these crops through sub regional and regional networks, as well as a global plan of action, is an appropriate way of moving forward.

Strengthening Policy Management and Institutional Development

Policy Management. It is vitally important to better sensitise policy-makers to the potential high returns from good quality research (which means producing good evidence from assessments of technology generation and impact). This applies to policy-makers in the Ministries of Finance and Planning, as well as in the sectoral ministries that exist in different countries to deal with agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries, natural resources, the environment, rural development, and science and technology. Relatively, far too little research is carried out in the field of policy analysis: this is an essential area to be covered in order to convince policy makers that so many of their policies impact against agricultural development. In this context, excellent policy case studies have been carried out in Thailand and Costa Rica by the policy research group at the Universities of Gottingen and Hanover, under the sponsorship of a GTZ Policy Research Project (Bibl. nos. 99 100). These studies clearly indicated the unfortunate direct and indirect effects of current government policies that affected the uptake of IPM technologies, and made specific recommendations to redress the situation (Bibl. no. 101). At GFAR 2000, Dresden, (Bibl. no. 94), the working groups defined three particular issues on which policy review urgently needs to be carried out by stakeholders: the issue of competitiveness, a key area for analysis to assist policy formulation under globalisation; approaches and strategies to encourage private/public sector partnerships, (see para 2.04 above); and, policy research aimed at developing appropriate actions for the transformation of agricultural R&D organisations (para 3.46 below).

The Panel is encouraged that members of regional and sub regional fora identified such opportunities for partnerships in improving policy management, at the Dresden meeting. Many activities in this sphere are already ongoing, such as the West African Policy Analysis Network that is being established by farmer organisations in the WECARD/CORAF sub-region. In cooperation with IFPRI and the respective RF/SRF, interested stakeholders have agreed to work on inter-regional collaboration for the comparative analysis of policy options and policy instruments in key areas of ARD policy. Other good examples include the policy analysis networks of ECAPAPA in East and Southern Africa and the REPA one in West Africa, (see Annex 9). Under GFAR auspices it would also be useful, however, to ask the ARI stakeholders to put together a list of the many advanced research institutes well qualified in policy analysis in OECD countries, and encourage their participation in more North South networks and research partnerships. This could include, for example, ODI in UK, ZEF in Bonn, and the many Universities in the US and Canada (such as Michigan State, Texas A&M, Stanford, Cornell, McGill, and others). The aim would be to help develop partnership programmes on policy analysis to strengthen this aspect of the weaker but emerging NARS institutions, and try to develop centres of excellence in one or two NARS institutions in each region/sub region. The Panel recommends that the DSG consider giving more support to regional networks undertaking research on policy-related issues, and to relevant ARIs and IARCs so that they can better assist NARS in developing their own capacity
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to carry out policy research - particularly by building up local university or government departments.

3.48 **Institutional Development.** The Panel was also pleased to note that some of the innovative partnership proposals put forward at GFAR 2000, Dresden were also institutional ones. These included one linking Farmer Movements for Sustainable Agriculture that brought together farmer organisations in East Asia and Central America in the community IPM field; and another that linked FOS in Uganda and the Philippines with NGOs linked to rural people and farmers in Europe to help strengthen these LDC institutions. The third topic of policy analysis mentioned in para 3.46 above on transforming R&D systems relates directly to two crucial institutional development topics: institutionalising effective research extension farmer linkages; and, how to effectively integrate national research programmes in certain fields across a subregion. The Panel strongly recommends that more research be carried out on how to effectively institutionalise truly participatory research extension farmer linkages that makes research and extension programmes directly responsive to farmer demand, as was put forward in the farmer organisations and NGO Declarations. Any such proposals have to include reviewing appropriate incentives to really transform present R&D systems, as the lack of these has inhibited change in the past. The Panel also recommends that early attention be given to reviewing innovative ways of integrating national research programmes into subregional research efforts in specific fields, as is being attempted in PROCISUR and PROCIANDINO, and in the SADC Genebank, (report on GFAR-2000 Conference: Highlights and Follow up Action in Annex 13); and has been a key feature of the Nile Valley Research programme in AARINENA that initially started on faba bean research (Bibl. 102).

3.49 In conclusion, the Panel notes that there has been far too little policy management research carried out, and even less on critical institutional development that is impeding progress on obtaining more impact from research programmes, or from harnessing the huge potential benefits of institutionalising shared sub-regional or even region-wide programmes between nation states, that underlies the whole rationale of having regional and sub-regional fora. Here is an area where GFAR has the opportunity to add critical and highly beneficial value, and is an appropriate note on which to end this report!

---

**PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARISED BELOW**

3.02 The Panel recommends that in the light of diminishing resources for agricultural research, particularly in the public sector, the Secretariat’s advocacy role be given a higher profile. This should be done in close collaboration with other stakeholders, especially the CGIAR and the Future Harvest initiative. Equally important and worthy of mention is its advisory role. In addition to setting up a global agricultural research agenda, the commissioning of state-of-the-art issue papers and the provision of a forum for reviewing priority global research issues also form part of the Secretariat’s key responsibilities.

3.04 The Panel is of the view that GFAR - and its secretariat - should focus on the regional and sub-regional associations, where the majority of its Business Plan activities will take place.

3.05 The Panel fully concurs with the policy adopted since the 1995/96 development of the NARS Action Plan, i.e. that it is up to each region to decide what roles should be played at the regional and sub-regional levels, as well as determining what is the best way for them to organize themselves.
The panel has two key recommendations to make: The first relates to the essential need to recruit, as soon as possible, a full-time professional to further develop EGFAR, and ensure that it relates well to other networks while not duplicating any of their activities. The second is to post well-qualified ICT specialist APOs to each of the RAIS (in agreement with them).

3.08 The Panel recommends that the regional and sub-regional fora consider reviewing their ability to speed up the process of broadening the range of stakeholders they are bringing together and include representatives from these sectors.

3.09 Sub-regional and regional fora should also expand their membership subsectorally (again, ideally, as a reflection of such developments at the national level) to embrace the broad, natural resource definition of 'agricultural' institutions which includes livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resource management, on an equal footing with crop agriculture.

3.10 The Panel recommends that each R/SR forum consider having a permanent (not itinerant) secretariat, and a full-time Executive Secretary.

3.11 The Panel recommends that there be a clear definition of tasks among the various staff, chairpersons and committees set up to manage each forum, based on competencies and responsibilities.

3.12 The Panel recommends that FAO consider making available to the GFAR Secretariat the funds originally provided to cover the cost of regional representation at these meetings. This would ensure more effective participation and representation of regional fora in the SC.

3.22 The panel recommends that donors continue to support the development of RAIS – including strengthening the capacity of persons involved and of the systems,

3.26 The Panel recommends the following criteria for priority setting and for the selection of those cases on which the Secretariat should concentrate its efforts:

- The relevance of the concrete partnership or programme from the point of view of GFAR's objectives, which are those of food security, poverty eradication and environmental sustainability.
- The existence of a lead stakeholder that can play an articulating role, working in close collaboration with other stakeholders of ARD (a core group of participating and committed institutions).
- The possibility of integrating into the programme both traditional and new players in agricultural research, in a multi-stakeholder initiative (i.e. NARS, IARCs, NGOs, ARIs, Farmers and the private sector).
- The identification of value-added through interaction and synergisms among the participating stakeholders.
- The possibility of an integrated approach covering not only research activities but also post-harvest and marketing development efforts, or the policy framework that conditions its effective impact.
• The opportunity of developing a *coordination mechanism* that facilitates concertation among stakeholders and donors in the development of the Global Framework Programme.

3.28 The panel recommends that for all thematic research proposals, the GFAR Secretariat should keep a watching brief, monitor successful partnerships in this field through an agreed reporting system, and get directly involved only if requested to do so by the sub regional for a, or when issues emerge that need to be aired at the global level, by commissioning a special study or hosting an appropriate workshop.

3.33 The Panel is of the view that GFAR should set up a review of genetic resource management and IPR issues in developing countries, and strengthen regional and sub-regional fora so that they can support NARS in these areas.

3.41 The Panel thus endorses the proposal that the GFAR Secretariat assist its stakeholders in developing global programmes, initially on a few commodity chains, which will be jointly identified, based on the priorities expressed by the NARS regional for a.

3.42 The Panel further endorses the concept that global programmes should build on existing achievements and be based on ongoing activities.

3.45 The Panel endorses the recommendations of the paper on underutilized plant species: that the sustainable promotion of some of these underutilized crops is needed in order to contribute to economic development, people’s well-being, and the maintenance of genetic diversity and associated local knowledge.

3.47 The Panel recommends that the DSG consider giving more support to regional networks undertaking research on policy-related issues, and to relevant ARIs and IARCs so that they can better assist NARS in developing their own capacity to carry out policy research -- particularly by building up local university or government departments.

3.48 The Panel strongly recommends that more research be carried out on how to effectively institutionalise truly participatory research/extension farmer linkages that makes research and extension programmes directly responsive to farmer demand, as was put forward in the farmer organisations and NGO Declarations.

3.48 The Panel also recommends that early attention be given to reviewing innovative ways of integrating national research programmes into subregional research efforts in specific fields.
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Terms of Reference for GFAR Review Panel

1. Background

In its Beijing meeting of 25May 1999, the GFAR Steering Committee (SC) and Donor Support Group (DSG) recommended that an external review of the first phase of the GFAR initiative be carried out by the time of the Dresden meeting. Following discussions held in Delhi in August 1999, the management team recommended that the SC and the DSG consider this evaluation more as a stripe review starting just before Dresden so that it could assist the GFAR Secretariat in designing the new programme of work. Both IFAD and IDRC have agreed to provide support to three external evaluators to carry out a stripe review of GFAR.

2. Focus areas for the stripe review

The stripe review will analyze the following three areas that structure the GFAR initiative:

- GFAR Programme of Work;
- Representativeness, membership and governance; and
- Organizational structure.

2.1. GFAR Programme of Work

At the time of the review (May 2000), GFAR’s achievements will still be limited because of its short lifetime and the complexity of setting up this unique organization. However, there are three main topics that the review should address:

2.1.1. The Content

One of the first tasks of the GFAR Secretariats was to translate the Plan of Action, approved in October 1996 by the founding members of GFAR, into an operational programme of work. This was done in close consultation with the different stakeholders and based on their priorities. A GFAR Plan of Action 1998-2000 was circulated in December 1997 and an emerging GFAR Programme of Work 1999-2000 was formally approved in May 1999.

The main lines of action are:

- Building a Global Shared Vision and formulation of a Global Strategic Agenda
- Promotion of Research Partnerships in four specific research areas: (a) genetic resources management and biotechnology; (b) natural resources management and agro-ecology; (c) global commodity chains; (d) policy management and institutional development
- Creating an enabling global framework for agricultural research information for development
- Strengthening NARS and their regional and sub-regional fora

The team will review the research priorities as well as the on-going and planned activities in the light of the mission statement and of the goals stated in the original Plan of Action. Recommendations will be formulated for improvement or change.
2.1.2. The Mode of operation

The second topic for review is the manner in which GFAR Secretariats operate and have implemented their "facilitation role" for each of the four lines of action mentioned above. A modus operandi for this facilitation role has emerged from the practice developed over the last 18 months.

The team will review the different on-going and planned activities and analyze in particular how best to strengthen the concept of "multi-stakeholder participatory processes", which is at the core of the Global Forum approach.

2.1.3. The Effectiveness and added value

The GFAR Secretariats were conceived as small units. The annual core budget for the two secretariats is approximately US$ 350,000 plus the in-kind contributions of FAO, ISNAR and the World Bank. The GFAR DSG, led by IFAD, also managed to raise operational funds in the range of US$ 500,000 (for two years) as seed money to launch activities carried out by the different stakeholders.

The review team will attempt to measure the effectiveness of and identify the specific added-value brought by the different GFAR activities (capacity-building, information sharing and dissemination, reduction of research cost, more efficient research agenda, etc.). A special effort will be made to identify specific indicators for measuring the GFAR added value and assisting in the design of a revised action plan.

2.2. Representativeness, membership and governance

It was agreed in Cairo in May 1997 that membership of the SC (governance body) would be reviewed after three years. It is a very critical topic for which external recommendations would help the GFAR Steering Committee to adequately revise that current status if needed. The following questions could be addressed.

2.2.1. Membership

One issue is the question of regional versus global representation. Should GFAR evolve towards an entirely regionally-based membership, or should it remain mainly as it is - a mixture of two levels: stakeholders globally defined and regional representation (in the case of two of the seven stakeholders).

2.2.2. Representativeness

As it is a critical issue for the legitimacy of GFAR action, particularly in the field of strategic issues, adequate modalities for representation of the different stakeholders are required, based on transparency and accountability.

Right since its establishment, GFAR has been very sensitive to this question, and has made a lot of effort to help the constituency representatives to develop GFAR awareness in their respective constituency and to become accountable through consultation and reporting.
activities. However, further improvements could be sought, particularly in the light of membership evolution.

2.2.3. Governance

GFAR governance is currently implemented through two steering committees (GFAR and NARS) and a donor support group (DSG). Discussions are on-going on the idea of having only one GFAR SC, with the developing-country NARS representatives forming a sub-committee to discuss, in particular, the fourth line of action “strengthening NARS and their regional and sub-regional fora”.

The team will review the pros and cons of a single SC, particularly in the light of a possible change in the composition of membership (fully regionally-based or mixed global/regional).

Another important question to be addressed by the review team relates to the manner in which GFAR should manage “multi-partner activities”, such as the so-called global actions/programmes. Indeed, the crystallization of GFAR leads to the implementation of global actions/programs for international research cooperation. How to steer these global actions is a question that GFAR still has to address. The review could refer to existing models for suggested use.

2.3. GFAR organizational structure

The GFAR organizational structure has been established to better address the two challenges that GFAR was facing at its inception: to establish a true global dialogue platform on the evolution of international cooperation while insuring that the developing-country NARS, as a central component of it, will be in a position to fully participate in this dialogue and will have their needs adequately addressed.

Three issues have to be addressed by the review team.

2.3.1. The Secretariats

In early 2000, the GFAR SC mandated its Chairman to consult with the facilitating agencies and the main GFAR stakeholders regarding the implications of a possible merge of the two secretariats into a unified body, to be hosted by FAO.

Since then, the two secretariats have started to operate as a “virtual unified secretariat”. The team will review the pros and cons of a unified secretariat in respect of the dual mandate (global and support to developing country NARS) and make recommendations accordingly.

2.3.2. The Facilitating Agencies

The facilitating agencies have been critically instrumental in the establishment of GFAR. Some changes are occurring with ISNAR withdrawing from the group. The review team will examine the future role of the facilitating agencies and how they articulate with the GFAR DSG.
2.3.3. The sustainability of GFAR

The review team will also have to address GFAR's funding situation and suggest a medium to long-term funding strategy. In this respect, the role and function of the GFAR Support Group will be reviewed.

3. Composition of the review panel

It is proposed that the panel be formed of three persons. The following names are suggested:

4. Review timetable

- First step: Preparatory Work

The review will start in mid-May 2000 with a desk duty to be carried out in Washington and in Rome. Both the GFAR and NARS Secretariats will provide the reviewers with adequate documentation. These visits will also provide an opportunity to interact with three out of the four facilitating agencies.

Based on the desk study, the panel is expected to formulate questions and hypothesis that will underline the second step.

- Second step: The GFAR-2000 Meeting

The second step of the review will be carried out during the GFAR and MTM 2000 meetings in Dresden, at which the reviewers will be attending as observers. This will allow them to interview representatives of all categories of GFAR stakeholders while, at the same time, reducing travel costs. The panel will have an opportunity to interact with the GFAR SC in Dresden.

- Third step: Preparation of the Report

The report will be prepared by the three consultants over the summer, and a first draft will be ready by September 1. The draft report will be circulated to the GFAR SC the DSG, for comments. The objective is to have the report discussed and endorsed at the GFAR-SC meeting in October 2000.
ANNEX 2
THE GFAR CHART

The GFAR Chart defines the rules and regulations of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR). The first GFAR Chart was approved by the GFAR Steering Committee on October of 1998, and on the basis of that chart the Global Forum has been able to operate well during its two first years of existence. Having finalized the initial phase for the establishment of GFAR, this revised version has been improved on the basis of the very rich experience obtained during the first two years of operation. This revised version also integrates the very valuable recommendations that came out of the First GFAR External Review that took place between June and September of 2000, to whom a special appreciation is expressed. In fact, this revised version is an immediate follow-up to the recommendation of the External Review that the GFAR Chart should be revised and expanded. This revised version is being submitted to the consideration of the GFAR Steering Committee in its meeting of October 21, 2000, for its approval.

1. BACKGROUND

The Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) was formally established in Washington in October 1996, on the basis of an agreement between the stakeholders of agricultural research for development (ARD), a group of donors who support this initiative and a group of facilitating agencies who have played a key role in this process (the facilitating agencies being FAO, IFAD, ISNAR and the World Bank). A Declaration and Plan of Action for Global Partnership in Agricultural Research was adopted at the Global Forum on Agricultural Research, International Centers Week 1996, Washington DC, USA, October 30 – 31, 1996.

A GFAR Steering Committee and a NARS Steering Committee were formally established in May 1997 and since then have regularly met twice a year at the time of the CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting (in May) and International Centers Week (in October). At the time of their establishment in May 1997, these two committees decided to be assisted by a distinct secretariat. The GFAR Secretariat was hosted by the World Bank in Washington and became operational with the nomination of a GFAR Executive Secretary in May 1998. The NARS Secretariat of the Global Forum has been functioning in FAO since August of 1998, on the basis of an exchange of letters between FAO and GFAR that define the roles and responsibilities of both FAO and the Global Forum in this partnership and of another exchange of letters between FAO, ISNAR and IPGRI that precise the conditions of secondment of an ISNAR Senior Officer to the NARS Secretariat. The NARS Executive Secretary took office in October of 1998.

In February 1998, some donors led by IFAD met in Rome and decided to establish a GFAR Support Group, which also meets regularly twice a year, usually after the GFAR and NARS Steering Committee meetings.

In the GFAR Steering Committee meeting of October 1999, the decision was taken to initiate a process of merging the two secretariats into a single unified GFAR Secretariat, and to explore with FAO the possibility of locating the new GFAR Secretariat in this organization. After the relevant consultations, in February of 2000, an Aide-Mémoire was signed between FAO and GFAR for the hosting by FAO of the new unified GFAR Secretariat, once this decision would be formalized in the GFAR-2000 Conference that was going to take place in...
Dresden (May 21-23, 2000). In its meeting of May 25 at the end of GFAR-2000, the GFAR Steering Committee formally took the decision of integrating the two secretariats into a single secretariat. The FAO Representative confirmed the commitment of FAO to host the new integrated secretariat, that would replace the NARS Secretariat, as expressed in the above mentioned Aide-Mémoire of February of 2000. The Steering Committee accepted the gracious offer of FAO, and decided to locate the unified secretariat in FAO, starting on June 1, 2000.

This document aims at describing more precisely the different mechanisms of governance of GFAR, namely: (i) the GFAR Steering Committee, (ii) the GFAR Executive Secretariat, (iii) the GFAR Support Group; and (iv) the GFAR Facilitating Agencies. The respective responsibilities of these different bodies as well as the terms of reference of the persons in charge of each of them will also be presented. However, before doing so, it is important to reaffirm the GFAR mission statement and the guiding principles that GFAR stakeholders have agreed to adhere to (see boxes 1 and 2).

**Box 1: GFAR mission statement**

GFAR’s mission is to mobilize the stakeholders in agricultural research for development in their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources.

**Box 2: Guiding principles of GFAR’s mode of operation**

- **Subsidiarity**
  Programs and projects are planned and managed at the lowest level at which they can be effectively executed.

- **Complementarity**
  GFAR strives to develop a global agricultural research system by drawing on the complementary strengths of the stakeholders.

- **Additionality**
  GFAR supports programs and projects that aim specifically to add value to what each stakeholder can do on its own.

- **Involvement of all stakeholders**
  GFAR operates through its stakeholders and mobilizes all stakeholders in planning and executing its programs and activities.

- **Partnership**
  GFAR’s work program supports the evolution of the development-aid concept towards that of full partners with common interests collaborating for mutual benefits. The NARS of the developing countries along with their regional and sub-regional fora are the cornerstones of the global agricultural research system that GFAR aims to create.
2. THE GFAR STEERING COMMITTEE

2.1. Categories of stakeholders and composition

At a meeting in Cairo in May 1997, the GFAR provisional Steering Committee established in October 1996 identified as GFAR constituencies seven categories of stakeholders and the following composition for this committee for a total of 13 seats:

- Regional fora of the NARS of the South: 5 seats (LAC, WANA, SSA, AP and EE/CA);
- Advanced Research Institutions and Universities involved in cooperation with NARS (ARIs): 3 seats (Europe, North America and Australasia);
- International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs): 1 seat;
- NGO community: 1 seat;
- Farmers’ Organizations: 1 seat;
- Private Sector: 1 seat;
- Donors’ community: 1 seat.

During the Cairo meeting, the GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC) was officially established with the composition defined above. In order to guarantee some continuity in the work of the GFAR-SC, it was also decided to revisit its composition only every three years, i.e. at the time of the GFAR plenary meetings, acting as the GFAR General Assembly.

The first GFAR plenary meeting has taken place in May 2000 and the GFAR-SC did not see the need of modifying the composition of the committee. As a consequence, the current composition will remain valid till 2003.

2.2. Nomination, legitimacy and accountability of members

The GFAR-SC considers that it is the responsibility of its different categories of stakeholders and of their constituencies to nominate and ensure the legitimacy of their representatives to the steering committee as a basic condition for having an overall legitimacy for the GFAR-SC and of the decisions it takes. To facilitate the process, the GFAR-SC has adopted the following guiding principles for its stakeholders:

Each constituency should establish a transparent nomination process.

The accountability of a representative to its constituency must be guaranteed by regular consultations of the constituencies (with a minimum of one consultation before the GFAR meetings) as well as by reports to the constituencies as often and as widely distributed as possible. One of the roles of the GFAR Secretariat is to assist the GFAR-SC members in these consultations and reporting processes.

In order to ensure some continuity in the representation and facilitate the GFAR decision process, each constituency should nominate its representative for a period of three years and also designate an alternate. Ideally, the two nominations should not coincide in time.

---

1 A Central Asia and Caucasus (CAC) agricultural research forum has been established in January 2000.

2 This is also supported by a recommendation of the GFAR External Review. Another recommendation of the GFAR External Review suggests to add to the GFAR-SC as ex-officio members the four facilitating agencies. Adjustments to the Chart will be made once the GFAR-SC has taken its decision.
If a GFAR-SC member has to leave his/her position, for any reason, the alternate should take over immediately for the remaining time of the on-going mandate and the constituency should nominate a new alternate during its next meeting.

The Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson are chosen from the SC membership by consensus nomination for a three-year mandate, renewable once. If, for any reason, no consensus is reached, then they will be elected by a majority secret vote. Both the SC members and the alternates are eligible for the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair. The Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson must come from two different groups of stakeholders.

Elections should, as much as possible, coincide with the organization of the GFAR plenary meetings, allowing the Chair and Vice-Chair to implement the conclusions and recommendations made by one GFAR plenary meeting and to report on their actions to the next GFAR plenary meeting.

If the Chairperson has to resign before the normal term of his/her mandate, the Vice-Chairperson should take over for the remaining period of the ongoing mandate and the GFAR-SC should nominate a new Vice-Chairperson during its next meeting. The same rules apply if a Vice-Chairperson has to resign from his/her mandate.

The mandate and responsibilities of the GFAR-SC members are detailed in Annex 1 and those of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson in Annex 2.

### 2.3. Functions of the GFAR Steering Committee

The GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC) is the governing body of the Global Forum. To perform its duties it is assisted by the GFAR Secretariat that is described in section 5 of this Chart. The GFAR-SC has the following functions:

- Approve the general policy and strategy of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), making sure they are consistent with the mission of GFAR, with its objectives and with the recommendations of the Plenary Meeting of the GFAR, the latter playing the role of a General Assembly.
- Approve the rules and regulations of GFAR.
- Elect the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of GFAR from the members of the Steering Committee, as described in the previous section.
- Appoint the GFAR Executive Secretary and make sure the GFAR Secretariat is staffed with highly competent persons that can contribute to the objectives of GFAR. This also includes approving the composition of the GFAR Secretariat, the persons that are posted to it and the Agreement with the Host Institution for the functioning of the secretariat.
- Discuss and approve the GFAR Mid-Term Plan (Business Plan) and the Programme of Work of the GFAR Secretariat.
- Approve the annual budget of GFAR as well as the three-year budget forecasts that are prepared by the GFAR Secretariat.
- Approve the annual Technical Reports and the annual Financial Reports presented by the GFAR Secretariat, making sure that the funds provided by donors are being judiciously utilized.

For the NARS representatives, the Chairperson of each Regional Forum becomes “de facto” the GFAR-SC member, unless otherwise specified by the Regional Forum. The alternate should be a recognized leader of agricultural research or rural development of the region.
h) Facilitate the flow of information and the exchange of experiences among stakeholders of agricultural research for development.

i) Discuss and endorse the various initiatives the stakeholders want to carry out in strengthening their own constituencies or in carrying out joint activities among them.

j) Promote those activities or initiatives it considers appropriate for achieving the objectives of GFAR and organize the GFAR Plenary Meeting every three years or with the periodicity determined by the GFAR-SC.

k) Commission an external evaluation every five years to assess the progress being made in the direction of the objectives and goals of GFAR.

l) Establish the sub-committees or working groups that may be deemed necessary to accomplish its mandate in an efficient and effective manner.

3. **THE GFAR COMMITTEES**

The GFAR Steering Committee can establish sub-committees or specialized committees when it deems appropriate to help it carry out its multiple tasks. Three presently exist: the NARS Sub-committee, the GFAR Management Team, and constituency working groups that some stakeholders are organizing.

### 3.1 The NARS Sub-Committee (NARS-SC)

#### 3.1.1. Composition

The NARS sub-Committee is composed by the representatives of the five regional fora to the GFAR-SC and their alternates. The representatives of the sub-regional fora are also invited as permanent observers of this committee; the NARS sub-Committee may also invite the heads of delegations from the CGIAR members from the South to attend some or part of their meetings and to discuss NARS inputs to the CGIAR system.

#### 3.1.2. Functions

The main purpose of the NARS Sub-Committee is to strengthen the participation of the NARS and their Regional/Sub-regional Fora in the Global Forum, given the key role they play in agricultural research for development. It should be pointed out that similar mechanisms are being established to strengthen the participation of the other stakeholders as well, which are analyzed in section 3.3. The NARS Sub-committee will have the following functions:

- To review all GFAR plans and activities specifically related to one of the four GFAR lines of action, namely the “strengthening of the NARS and of their Regional and Sub-Regional Fora (RF/SRF)”.
- To discuss the overall agenda of GFAR from a NARS perspective in order to develop common positions and ensure that the NARS priorities are fully taken into consideration.
- To promote inter-regional cooperation and collaboration both South-South and South-North, as well as the exchange of experiences in how to promote regional/sub-regional cooperation in agricultural research.
- To provide a forum where NARS can discuss topics of common interest at the global level, such as develop common positions in CGIAR-related issues as well as in other fora related to agricultural research for development.
The NARS sub-committee elects a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson who report to the GFAR-SC on progress made by the NARS specifically regarding these different functions and convey to the GFAR-SC the specific requests and needs of the NARS.

3.2 The GFAR Management Team (GFAR-MT)

3.2.1 Nature and Justification

Given the nature of GFAR as a stakeholder-lead organization it is considered important to have an interface between the GFAR-SC and the GFAR Secretariat. In order to facilitate the continuous interaction between these two bodies and to strengthen the management capacity of GFAR to monitor the implementation of the decisions taken by the Steering Committee, the GFAR Management Team has been established constituted by two members of the GFAR-SC (the Chairperson and the Vice-chairperson) and two members of the GFAR Secretariat (the Executive Secretary and the Officer in charge of providing support to the GFAR-SC). The GFAR Management Team responds to the specific requirements of the governance of a stakeholder-lead organization, and it provides a space for the Chairperson and Vice-chairperson to get involved in the monitoring of the progress made by the Stakeholders and by the GFAR Secretariat in implementing the decisions of the Steering Committee. In functioning as an Executive Committee of the GFAR-SC, this committee also serves on an advisory capacity to the Secretariat on how best to orient its efforts.

3.2.2. Composition

The GFAR Management Team is composed by two persons from the Steering Committee and two persons from the GFAR Secretariat: the GFAR Chairperson (who also chairs the Management Team), the Vice-Chairperson, the Executive Secretary and the Officer of the GFAR Secretariat who provides support to the meetings of the GFAR-SC.

Considering the critical role played by the GFAR Support Group for the future of GFAR, the Chairperson of this Group is invited to participate as an “observer” to the GFAR Management Team meetings, when this is possible.

The GFAR-MT can invite to any of its meetings specific members of the Steering Committee when the topics covered relate to the specific constituency of this SC member, or any staff of the GFAR Secretariat when his/her support is required. The Chairperson can also invite as an observer any person who may provide a valuable input into the decision-making process.

3.2.3. Functions of the GFAR-MT

The GFAR Management Team meetings will:

- Review the progress made by the GFAR Stakeholders and the GFAR Secretariat since the last GFAR Steering Committee meeting as well as the contacts that the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson have had over the period under review.

- Discuss and agree on the draft GFAR Secretariat Programme of Work before its submission to the GFAR Steering Committee.

- Review the financial situation and approve the necessary budgetary adjustments, if needed.
Advise on the agenda of the next GFAR Steering Committee meeting.

Approve financial supports provided by GFAR and expenditures of over US $10,000 within the annual budget approved by the GFAR Steering Committee.

Organize a brainstorming session on one or two global strategic issues (a few experts and observers may be invited to participate).

3.2.4. Mode of Operation
The GFAR Management Team meets normally twice a year, usually in between two GFAR Steering Committee meetings. The meetings will normally last one or one and a half days, according to the agenda. Opportunities of organizing these meetings at the time of other planned meetings to which some of the members have to participate are carefully explored in order to reduce costs. Ad hoc meetings can be called by the GFAR Chairperson if urgent matters have to be addressed. The minutes of the GFAR Management Team meetings will be distributed to the GFAR Steering Committee members by the GFAR Secretariat.

3.3 Constituency Working Groups (optional)
Besides the NARS-SC that plays an important role in strengthening the participation of the NARS and their Regional/Sub-regional Fora, other stakeholders may wish to consider organizing similar mechanisms to strengthen the participation of their constituency in the GFAR, or they may use an existing mechanism for this purpose. In order to reduce costs, and taking full advantage of the information and communication revolution that is generating a global society, these Constituency Working Groups do not necessarily have periodic face-to-face meetings, but they rather operate in a decentralized mode through continuous electronic interaction among their members, and with the GFAR Secretariat. They only meet face-to-face in the GFAR Plenary Meetings every three years, or when they can organize a meeting among them taking advantage of other scheduled meetings where their members may be present. No budget allocation to support their meetings is being made available in GFAR, although some of the mechanisms mentioned below have their own funding sources. The following ones are presently operating, or are under discussion:

a) In the case of the international centres (IARCs) of the CGIAR the main interaction takes place through the two CGIAR representatives in the GFAR-SC (member and alternate), and through two mechanisms that play a very important role in this process: the TAC Secretariat and the CDC. Thus there are existing mechanisms in place that facilitate an active dialogue, as well as a strong participation of IARCs in this process.

b) The GFAR NGO Working Group which was established at GFAR-2000 constituted by the two NGO representatives in the GFAR-SC (member and alternate) and the regional representatives NGOs selected to participate in the respective Regional Fora. This group will function as an advisory group on how to promote and coordinate NGO participation in the GFAR, through continuous e-mail interaction among them. This group has a close interaction with the CGIAR NGO Committee, with whom they develop common activities. The NGO regional representatives actively participate in the respective Regional Forum.

c) The GFAR Private Sector Working Group was established, constituted by the two representatives of the private sector in the GFAR-SC (member and alternate), with the rotary participation of other persons from the private sector, seeking to develop an
active interaction with different types of agroindustries in different regions. This group has a close interaction with the CGIAR Private Sector Committee. They are also exploring how to develop closer links with existing associations of agroindustries that could collaborate in facilitating the participation of the private sector. The GFAR Private Sector Working Group organized the special workshop that took place at GFAR-2000 on Public-Private Sector Cooperation in Research on Genomics in Dresden (May 16, 2000).

The GFAR Farmers' Organizations Working Group is constituted by the two representatives of this stakeholder in the GFAR Steering Committee (member and alternate). By working in a complementary way, IFAP and Via Campesina are seeking to strengthen the participation of farmers in the Global Forum. IFAP is considering the possibility of establishing a Science and Technology Committee, which would greatly facilitate getting farmers involved in the discussion of the strategic issues that are being discussed in GFAR and of interacting with other stakeholders in this process. The GFAR Secretariat will collaborate with IFAP in consolidating this step.

In the case of Advanced Research Institutes (ARIs) the situation is different in the different regions. In the case of Europe the European Forum on Agricultural Research (EFARD) and its Executive Committee greatly facilitates the participation of European researchers in GFAR, as well as in the debate on strategic issues in this area. In the case of North America and of Japan there are no similar mechanisms in place. Although it should be pointed out that in the US and in Canada other types of mechanisms are emerging, building on existing mechanisms such as the university associations that exist in both countries.

In the case of donors, this function is being carried out by the GFAR Donor Support Group (GFAR-DSG), whose functions are described in section 6 below.

4. GFAR MEETINGS

4.1 Global Forum Plenary Meetings
The GFAR will convene a plenary meeting every three-years. The location will be agreed by the GFAR-SC at least one year before the meeting date. The agenda will be set up at least one year before in order to allow a bottom up process and the preparation by the different stakeholders of their contributions in order to facilitate the decision process. The budget of these meetings is elaborated as a special project, outside the regular core budget as agreed upon by the GFAR-SC and the GFAR Donor Support Group for the three-year period.

4.2 Meetings of the GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC)
The GFAR-SC meets regularly twice a year at the time of the CGIAR ICW and MTM meetings, in order to avoid unnecessary expenses and to facilitate the interaction between the CGIAR and the other GFAR stakeholders. The planning of the GFAR meetings is done in close collaboration with the CGIAR Secretariat to get sufficient time for GFAR-related meetings and avoid, as much as possible, conflicting agendas. If required, extraordinary meetings can be convened at the initiative of the Chairman after consultation with all members.

The agenda of the meetings is prepared by the GFAR Secretariat in consultation with the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson. The draft agendas and important documents to be tabled are circulated at least three weeks in advance to allow the GFAR-SC members and their alternates to consult their constituencies.
The Chairperson may decide to divide the meetings in two sessions: (i) an *open session* to give to all GFAR members and supporters to exchange views and share experiences; and (ii) a *close session* for GFAR-SC members to discuss GFAR business matters and take decisions.

### 4.3 Permanent electronic interaction among GFAR members

In between “Global Forum Plenary Meetings”, GFAR stakeholders and their constituencies interact on a permanent basis through the “*Electronic Global Forum on Agricultural Research (EGFAR)*” under the overall supervision of the GFAR-SC. EGFAR is complemented by an intensive *electronic communication system* that facilitates permanent interaction among GFAR stakeholders in real time. It should be pointed out that GFAR is possible thanks to the new information and communication technologies that make permanent interaction and dialogue among the stakeholders of agricultural research possible, as well as *intensive networking among the key actors* involved in agricultural research and development efforts. *Electronic fora* on various topics are being used as an instrument to debate issues and seek to develop a greater common understanding of strategic issues and develop joint efforts on those topics. The work of the GFAR Secretariat in designing and implementing joint activities among stakeholders is facilitated by this electronic communication network.

### 5. THE GFAR SECRETARIAT

The GFAR Secretariat provides support to the GFAR Steering Committee and to all stakeholders in their active involvement in the Global Forum. It assists in the convening of the various types of meetings of the GFAR, in the formulation of the GFAR Mid-Term Plan, in the implementation of it through an annual Programme of Work, and in the preparation and organization of the triennial plenary meetings of the Global Forum.

#### 5.1 Specific Goals

The goals of the GFAR Secretariat are the following:

**Communication.** To develop a far-reaching, multi-channel system for the exchange of information among all GFAR constituents.

**Dialogue.** To single out and facilitate discussion of critical strategic issues and to contribute to the emergence of a global research agenda.

**Partnership.** To build a healthy environment for improved research partnerships, essential for the achievement of a global research agenda. South–South and inter-regional cooperation will particularly be actively promoted.

**Research.** As a consequence of the previous three, to foster the development of a global agricultural research system and to enhance, through sub-regional and regional fora, the capacity of NARS to generate and transfer, in a participatory manner, appropriate technologies that respond to users’ needs.

#### 5.2 Functions:

The GFAR Secretariat assists the GFAR community in reaching these goals in various ways. The functions of the GFAR Secretariat are to:

a) Prepare a three year Mid-Term Plan and an annual Programme of Work and Budget for approval by the GFAR Steering Committee.

b) Assist the various stakeholders in the implementation of the activities that are included in the Programme of Work.
c) Organize the GFAR Steering Committee meetings and the triennial Global Forum plenary meeting, and help the various constituencies to prepare their contributions to these meetings.

d) Facilitate communication among GFAR constituencies, in particular through the development of an Electronic Global Forum on Agricultural Research (EGFAR).

e) Assist the Regional and Sub-regional Fora or groupings of developing countries to:
   - Translate the broad concept of NARS into an operational reality to increase the effectiveness of agricultural research at the national level.
   - Set regional and sub-regional priorities and develop the research agendas accordingly.
   - Promote NARS-NARS cooperative research initiatives and strengthen partnerships between the NARS and the other GFAR stakeholders.

f) Promote inter-regional and sub-regional linkages through improved information exchange and the formulation and implementation of inter-regional or sub-regional partnerships.

g) Commission studies and organize workshops and meetings when necessary to facilitate the discussion on strategic issues or to develop the global and regional research agendas.

h) Maintain an active contact with all donors and assist the GFAR Support Group in mobilizing financial resources.

The terms of reference of the GFAR Executive Secretary are presented in Annex 3.

6. THE GFAR DONOR SUPPORT GROUP (GFAR-DSG)

The GFAR donor support group (GFAR-DSG) mobilizes financial support for GFAR and helps to coordinate the donor community’s support of GFAR’s activities. Its specific goals are to:

- facilitate consultation among donors on GFAR-related issues to forge and strengthen consensus, synergies, and complementarity in agricultural research on every level - regional, subregional, national, and international;
- organize donor representation on and participation in the GFAR Steering Committee;
- support the activities of the GFAR and NARS Steering Committees, especially mechanisms for interaction and institutional arrangements that foster collaboration among NARS and the various components of the GFAR.

The GFAR-DSG agrees to the following “Guiding Principles”:

Voluntary support. The DSG is voluntary. It is open to all donors who actively support agricultural research activities, whether global, regional or national. The GFAR work programme covers a broad range of activities, and donors may selectively support those initiatives they consider most in accordance with their own objectives and policies.

Transparency. The DSG works in a transparent manner. Information on its evolving policies and on the activities it supports is made available to all GFAR stakeholders.

Pledging. Pledging of funds is limited to the GFAR Steering Committee and GFAR-NARS Sub-Committee, based on the approved programmes of work. Funding for GFAR should
remain distinct from support to CGIAR. The GFAR and CGIAR work programs are complementary.

**Limited scope.** Most research funding is decentralized. A primary aim of the DSG is to facilitate linkages and information exchange and to build collaborative partnerships among the NARS at the regional, subregional, and global levels, and among all the GFAR constituencies. The DSG may also contribute to the development of a coherent framework for decentralized efforts, thereby increasing their transparency and effectiveness. With that aim it cooperates with existing "donor clubs" with either a geographical or a thematic focus.

### 7. THE GFAR FACILITATING AGENCIES

From the earliest stages of discussions that led to the establishment of GFAR, four institutions were deeply involved and expressed their strong commitment to facilitate the process. These agencies are: FAO, IFAD, ISNAR and the World Bank. Each of them played a key role in making GFAR a reality, based on their comparative advantages:

- FAO, initially hosting the NARS Secretariat of GFAR, now the GFAR Secretariat
- IFAD launching and chairing the GFAR Support Group
- ISNAR seconding a Senior Officer to the NARS Secretariat
- World Bank initially hosting the GFAR Secretariat

Over time the role of these facilitating agencies has evolved but the GFAR-SC recognizes their initial critical role and believes that they should continue to play the following three functions:

- Facilitate the link between GFAR activities and development programs, given the importance of this link for achieving their common mission of poverty alleviation, food security and environmental sustainability.
- Sensitize and mobilize all GFAR stakeholders towards achieving its goals and objectives.
- Support, directly or indirectly, the GFAR stakeholders and the GFAR Secretariat in implementing the agreed GFAR strategic agenda.

Thus, the facilitating agencies play an important role in the context of GFAR, especially in facilitating the link between research and development. As a consequence, the GFAR-SC would like to invite them to become "ex officio" members of the GFAR Steering Committee, with voice but without vote.
Annex 1
Mandate and Responsibilities of the GFAR-SC Members

The members of the GFAR Steering Committee play a very important role given the fact that
the Steering Committee is the governing body of GFAR, and given the nature of GFAR as a stakeholder-lead organization. Thus the members of the Steering Committee have a very
important responsibility that goes beyond the participation in the GFAR-SC meetings and in its decisions. The Steering Committee members also play a very important role in the
functioning of the Global Forum as such, and in assuring the active participation of the
constituency that he/she represents in the committee.

Thus the GFAR-SC members have two types of functions:

1. Participate in the deliberations of the GFAR-SC covering the various functions of this committee that are described in section 2.3 of this Chart, and in the decisions and follow-up action that this may imply.

2. Secondly, each SC member has a very important liaison function with the constituency he/she represents. This implies:
   - Play a proactive role in seeking to organize and further develop his/her constituency (this is related to the development of "constituency working groups" or other type of mechanisms that were discussed in section 3.3 of this Chart).
   - Ensure that adequate information is fed back to all interested members of their constituencies.
   - Bring forward strategic issues in agricultural research and rural development that are of interest to their constituencies that they consider should be brought to the attention of the Steering Committee and of the international community.
   - Promote the involvement of his/her constituency in the discussion of the strategic issues that are been discussed in GFAR and in the research partnerships that are being developed.

The GFAR-SC members play a key role in developing in GFAR the capacity to strengthen
the interaction between the local/national level, the regional/sub-regional level, and the global level. The interaction between these three levels will play a major role in making of GFAR a dynamic and agile framework for involving stakeholders and for developing a real dialogue among them on key policy issues, or in facilitating their participation in important research partnerships.

At the Cairo meeting in May 1997, each constituency was given a 3-year period to organize its process to legitimate its representation to GFAR. At that time, as some constituencies were not yet fully organized, some representatives have been chosen on their own capacity on a consensual basis, often from the CGIAR Committees related to their constituency. It is expected that these "ad interim" representatives will rapidly organize their constituency and put in place a more formal nomination process, following the above mentioned principles and guidelines.
Annex 2
Terms of Reference for the GFAR-SC Chair and Vice-Chair

The Chairperson, who is chosen from the members and alternates of the GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC) as described in section 2.2, has the following functions:

a) Presides at all meetings of the GFAR-SC and of the Plenary Meetings of the Global Forum every three years.

b) Assures that the Steering Committee is adequately addressing the various functions it has, as described in section 2.3 of this Chart.

c) The Chairperson is ex-officio member on all standing committees of the SC.

d) The Chairperson is responsible for providing leadership to the SC in determining the policies under which the Executive Secretary will operate the Secretariat and the annual Programme of Work.

e) The role of the Chairperson is concerned with both internal and external GFAR matters. In internal matters he will interact closely with the Executive Secretary to monitor the development of GFAR programmes.

f) In the external dimension, the Chairperson may represent GFAR as appropriate. The Chairperson is also expected to assist the Executive Secretary in developing and maintaining relations with donors and with all the GFAR constituencies.

g) Preside the GFAR Management Team in carrying out its functions, as described in section 3.2 of this Chart.

The Vice-Chairperson has the following functions:

a) Assist the Chairperson in his/her tasks.

b) Preside the Steering Committee when the Chairperson cannot be present.

c) He/she may be assigned special responsibilities within the Steering Committee or in the follow-up to its decisions.

d) As member of the GFAR Management Team the Vice-Chair will be involved in the monitoring of the development of GFAR programmes as described in the TORs of the GFAR-MT (section 3.2 of this Chart).
Annex 3
Terms of Reference
of the GFAR Executive Secretary

The Executive Secretary is responsible for the efficient functioning of the GFAR secretariat and for coordinating the implementation of administrative, institutional and operational activities approved by the GFAR Steering Committee. The Executive Secretary:

- acts as Secretary to all GFAR Steering Committee meetings;
- reports to the Director of the Research, Extension and Training Division (SDR) of FAO on matters regarding FAO, the host institution;
- reports to the Chairperson of the GFAR Steering Committee on GFAR matters and in the implementation of the Programme of Work of the GFAR Secretariat;
- coordinates with the Chief of the Research and Technology Development service of FAO (SDRR), the implementation of joint activities approved by the GFAR Steering Committee and FAO.

The Executive Secretary should establish and/or maintain close contact with the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats as well as with the representative bodies (secretariat, committees, representatives) of all the constituencies of the GFAR, in particular the NARS Regional/Sub-regional Fora and other relevant regional organizations.

The tasks to perform are as follows:

a) Management and supervision of the GFAR Secretariat and of the staff that is posted to it, in order to assure that it effectively carries out the functions described in section 5 of this Chart;

b) Preparation and monitoring of a 3-year rolling workplan and corresponding budget and its coordination with the FAO MTP, in particular the workplan of the Service of Research and Technology Development and its regional and sub-regional activities;

c) Implementation of the annual Programme of Work as approved by the GFAR Steering Committee and financed by the GFAR Support Group. When implementing it, a special attention will be given to the joint activities developed with FAO in support of the regional and sub-regional fora;

d) Assist in the development of mechanisms for systematic and improved interaction between the GFAR stakeholders, in particular between and within the regional and sub-regional fora;

e) Assist the Regional/Sub-regional Fora in developing programmes aimed at strengthening NARS and regional/sub-regional cooperation in agricultural research;

f) Organization and support of all GFAR Steering Committee meetings;

g) Organization of the Plenary Meetings of the GFAR every 3 years;

h) Maintain close interaction with all the institutions that GFAR has to relate to, in carrying out its mandate;

i) Supervision of all GFAR publications: annual reports, working papers, brochures, studies and workshop proceedings, etc;
j) Participation in meetings of the various constituencies (NARS, ARIs, CGIAR, Private Sector, NGOs, Farmers' Organisations) that are of importance for the overall coordination of GFAR activities,

k) Advice to the Chairperson, as need arises, on the formation of ad hoc technical committees and Working Groups; and

l) Dissemination of all GFAR Steering Committee decisions to all partners;

m) Any other task assigned by the GFAR Steering Committee.

In order to carry out the above tasks the Executive Secretary will have the support of a small team of professional staff that will be posted to the GFAR Secretariat by various stakeholders, on the basis of specific collaborative agreements that will be negotiated with them. Since the activities that the GFAR carries out are basically in the hands of the stakeholders, the above tasks refer to a role of facilitation or a role of assisting the respective stakeholders carry out the agreed collaborative activities.
ANNEX 3

The Seven Stakeholders of GFAR

01 A key strength of GFAR is that it provides a common meeting place in which all seven stakeholders can participate, and the comparative advantage of each be brought together in the research and development process. While the Forum itself meets formally only every three years, its stakeholders carry on their programmes continuously in pursuit of their agreed aims, facilitated by a central secretariat and its Steering Committee. The seven stakeholders comprise the NARS and their fora; the IARCs (mostly belonging to the CGIAR); the donors (both multi and bilateral, including foundations); the advanced research institutes (ARIs) of the developed countries; the private sector; non-governmental organisations; and farmer organisations.

02 The National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) are often just the NARIs of the country or region concerned, although they are now broadening their base to better utilize their collective experience, and include representatives of universities, (which may or may not be primarily responsibility for public research at the national level), the private sector, extension services, NGOs, and farmer organizations. NARS have regional and sub-regional research fora at varying stages of establishment in all the developing regions of the world. There is a tendency for the NARIs in these fora to be principally crop-oriented, while there are frequently parallel fora for livestock, forestry, fisheries and natural resource management – all of which need to be integrated into the principal regional fora - just as is happening now with APAARI in the Asia-Pacific region, where all these networks are already strongly institutionalized and an Asia Pacific Forum has been proposed, to bring all groups together. Usually, it is assumed that Government extension services are included under NARS without changing the wording to NARES in order to embrace research and extension systems. However, they have not been regularly involved in fora except in the few cases where they exist at national level (e.g.: CORPOICA, Colombia) or in occasional regional fora workshops.

03 The International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs) comprise 16 CGIAR Centers and a further four not within the CG. Each has a Board of Trustees. The CGIAR also has its own Secretariat located in the World Bank and its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) located in FAO/Rome. An important role for the GFAR Secretariat concerns facilitating coordination with the CGIAR, as one of the stakeholders. While good collaboration has been maintained with both the CG Secretariat and TAC, and some of the IARCs, such as IPGRI and ISNAR, more needs to be done. Some members of the CG system (like many of the donors) are still uncertain as to the added value of GFAR, despite almost universally recognizing the importance of the GFAR concept, and the value of the triennial meetings; others feel threatened by the fact that GFAR is indeed an umbrella organization bringing together all the stakeholders in ARD, of which the CGIAR is just one of the seven constituents, and by a perception that the two organizations are competing for the same envelope of funds. Such perceptions need to be more fully aired and discussed. The cost of the GFAR Secretariat is minimal compared to that of the CG institutions. More importantly, while both share the same goals of alleviating poverty, improving food security and conserving the natural resource base, the CGIAR addresses them by carrying out research through its 16 international centers whereas GFAR does so through the organization and mobilization of the various stakeholders. Improving partnerships, collaborating where feasible with the private sector, and strengthening NARS, including advocacy with policy makers, should all contribute - through complimentarity of action - to acquiring additional
funds or spending those available more wisely and effectively. The Panel considers that any unease by partners on either side needs to be clarified, and recommends that the GFAR Secretariat with the GFAR Chair meet formally with the Center each year.

04 The advanced research institutes (ARIs) in the developed countries (OECD) are a great source of professional research expertise that has not always been well integrated into the global agricultural research system, although many individual institutions play key roles in collaborative programmes, in partnership with NARS - including many important cash and industrial crops that are largely outside the mandate of the CG System. The European Forum for Agricultural Research for Development (EFARD) brings together all ARIs in Europe, including research institutes from the ECART network and many university departments, some from the NATURA network, which links university agricultural research (for development) departments. Similar fora have also been set up in Europe at the national level - although of varying strengths - in the different member countries, which comprise all the EU nations, plus Switzerland and Norway.

05 Facilitating coordination with the ARIs, and strengthening their participation in the global forum is another important task for the GFAR Secretariat. EFARD is currently reviewing, together with regional fora in West Asia and North Africa and in Sub-Saharan Africa, how they can become partners in some of the priority research areas of these fora, and the GFAR Secretariat has facilitated in encouraging them to do this. Unlike EFARD in Europe, the ARIs in North America and Asia-Pacific have not managed to agree on a collaborative approach so far. Individual ARIs in these countries are of course playing significant roles in research partnerships - not only with individual NARIs but also with their fora. However, they appear to be unconvinced that any coordination between them under the aegis of GFAR, could have a particular benefit. This situation remains a challenge for the GFAR Secretariat, which would benefit from being able to demonstrate the impact of institutional collaboration from the emerging EFARD experience - if successful! The Panel recommends that both the North American and Asia-Pacific ARIs consolidate their support to GFAR as has been done by EIARD/EFARD in Europe, in the light of their each having a representative on the Steering Committee (SC).

06 The Donors comprise multilateral and bilateral donor agencies and also foundations. The multilateral donors include the World Bank, IFAD and FAO, which are the facilitating agencies of GFAR, and other UN agencies - such as UNOPS -, the Commonwealth Secretariat and the Regional Banks. With regard to the latter, IDB has played a key role in helping set up FONTAGRO in Latin America, but no such assistance has yet been forthcoming from AfDB in Africa or AsDB in Asia. Many bilateral donors have provided assistance, especially from the EU countries, under their EIARD (Switzerland and Norway and the EC itself) donor consortium that set up EFARD and/or individually. In this respect, particular mention must be made of the support provided by France and Italy. USAID, CIDA/IDRC and ACIAR have also provided assistance. The Rockefeller Foundation has assisted FONTAGRO in Latin America, and the Ford Foundation has supported NARS and some of their regional programmes. Furthermore, some of the regional Arab funding institutions are considering supporting AARINENA initiatives in West Asia/North Africa.

07 The private sector is currently conducting a much greater portion of the total agricultural research with the advent of the new biotechnologies, and has been wisely co-opted into both the CGIAR system and GFAR. However, with such a wide range and diversity of private enterprise associated with agricultural research in the development
context, the sector still has to review the validity of its representation. There is considerable representation from the agricultural inputs sectors relating to pesticides, seeds and fertilizers; and to some of the plantation production companies, whereas greater representation is required from the agro-industrial processing or food wholesaling and retailing sectors. Of course, the interests of private industry do not always coincide with those of the public or NGO sectors, but it is important to recognize differences as well as areas where there is agreement as to what valuable partnerships can be built.

08 In order to help improve coordination with the private sector, the GFAR Secretariat needs to discuss with private sector representatives, the best approach towards improved collaboration. The private sector paper tabled at Dresden spells out the rationale for their participation in GFAR. The paper points out the advantages to be gained from the sector's main areas of research - particularly in biotechnology, genetic improvement and the enhancement of environmentally-friendly technologies. It also addresses the constraints to the use of proprietary technologies, suggesting that a consultation is required among stakeholders, to articulate divergent positions and identify key issues; it also suggests that once this has been done at the global level, regional symposia can be pursued on this topic. An outline of the process is provided, as well as appropriate, substantive actions to encourage better collaboration with the private sector. This includes identifying pilot partnerships and establishing measurable goals for the private sector research community, over the short- and longer-term. The Panel recommends that the GFAR Secretariat assist this Sector by organizing a global workshop on issues of relevance to improved public/private sector collaboration, and following up with regional workshops on these issues over the next three years, in a timetable drawn up with the agreement of each region and in line with the priority each region gives to harnessing better private sector participation.

09 The non governmental organizations (NGOs), have particular skills in the conduct of adaptive participatory research at the farm level, helping to organize and motivate farmer groups, and also disseminating new technologies. Moreover, they are often good at addressing environmental concerns through multidisciplinary natural resource management planning and implementation. With regard to the latter, they have played a major role in GFAR by developing new thematic approaches for NRM and agro-ecological research. Again, there are so many NGOs, even in the research and development field, that securing better representation for their constituents remains an important issue. The Panel recommends that the GFAR Secretariat continue to assist NGOs to strengthen their representation as key stakeholders in GFAR.

10 Farmer organizations also have a vital role to play. Since farmers are the end users of all research, they should play a key role in setting the research priorities to ensure that research is responsive to their needs. Farmers are innovative researchers and are often well aware of the valuable indigenous knowledge that is sometimes in danger of being lost. Such knowledge needs to be documented and built on in collaborative research programmes that bring together the farmer and research scientist in full partnership. Much greater effort will have to be made to build up truly representative farmer organizations at national and regional levels over the next ten years, so as to make research and extension programmes really demand-led. IFAP itself is already trying to become more representative by having a recruiting drive for new members and reducing the annual subscription from US$3,000 to US$200. Likewise, more farmer organizations that are successfully representing the smaller farmer are needed, such as Via Campesina, which originated in South America but which is now expanding its membership to other resource-poor farmers in other parts of the globe.
The Panel recommends that, in view of the weak voice of farmer organizations GFAR, special assistance continue to be given to strengthening their voice by ensuring assistance is given to them by all other stakeholders at all levels - local, national, sub-regional, regional and global.

11 The NGOs and farmer organizations tabled a joint Declaration at the GFAR 20 Dresden Conference, calling for widening the scope of the Forum to encompass more than just agricultural research. While issues concerning agrarian reform, organization of markets and consumer rights will have to be raised in other fora, the Panel agrees on the importance of interpreting the research agenda in its broadest sense and of the importance of focus on policy issues. It also endorses the decision that for the next three years no changes should be introduced in the composition of the stakeholders. It is also of the view that the GFAR Secretariat should remain neutral and the debate on differences among stakeholders should remain a key focus of GFAR. It is encouraging that both farmer organizations and NGOs welcome GFAR as an opportunity for debate and exchange of ideas and that they are willing to collaborate on the basis of their own Declarations made in Dresden. To encourage their further enthusiastic participation in GFAR, the Panel recommends that the GFAR Steering Committee further review and debate the policy points raised in the NGO and farmer organizations' Declarations.
ANNEX 4

Form for GFAR Panel Review Questionnaire

Request for input into the review of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR)

Introduction

A panel of three consultants, Abbas Kesseba, Tim Dottridge and John Russell, has been requested to review the GFAR process and the support provided by the Secretariat. Its external assessment is to be submitted to the GFAR SC by mid-August 2000. The terms of reference (which are available on request) cover (i) the policy framework and GFAR’s Programme of Work, (ii) its governance and the representativeness and membership of its stakeholder constituencies, and (iii) its organizational structure.

The four main lines of action in its Programme of Work that will be reviewed are:

1. building a Global Vision and Strategic Agenda as a policy framework for GFAR’s activities;
2. promotion of research partnerships in four specific areas (a) genetic resources management and biotechnology; (b) natural resource management and agro-ecology; (c) global commodity chains; and (d) policy management and institutional development;
3. information and knowledge management (creating an enabling global framework for agricultural research information for development);
4. strengthening national agricultural research systems and their regional and sub-regional fora.

It is essential in the review of an organization such as GFAR that we benefit as much as possible from the views and experiences of key stakeholders. We would therefore be grateful if you could respond to the following four questions. Your reply should be sent to: GFAR-REVIEW at fao.org which is the confidential mailbox that has been set up for the exclusive use of the review panel, or by fax to Rome or Ottawa (GFAR Review c/o Dr. Abbas Kesseba +39.06.54.59.21.35 or GFAR Review c/o Tim Dottridge +1.613.565.8212).

We hope that it will be possible for you to reply in the next two weeks (by June 19), since we would then expect to have an opportunity to follow up with some respondents by telephone. Many thanks for taking the time to reply to our questions.
Questions

(1) Who are you?

1.1. To which of the GFAR stakeholder groups do you belong? (Please put an X in the relevant column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NARS</th>
<th>ARIs</th>
<th>IARCs</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Farmers’ Organizations</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Donor Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Did you participate in the GFAR-2000 Conference? (Please put an X in the relevant column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(2) Please indicate for each line of action of the current GFAR programme of work:

(a) The relative importance you give to this activity in terms of what GFAR should do: (1 = Very Important; 2 = Important; 3 = Less Important).

(b) Indicate with an X the activity(ies) in which you have participated, in interaction with the GFAR secretariat or with other GFAR stakeholders, including RF/RF (if any).

(c) What is your assessment of the process launched by GFAR in the areas in which you are acquainted with GFAR activities? (0 = Don’t know; 1 = Very Useful; 2 = Useful; 3 = Not Useful).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE OF ACTION</th>
<th>(a) RELATIVE IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>(b) HAVE PARTICIPATED IN:</th>
<th>(c) ASSESSMENT (GFAR PROCESS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building a Global or Regional Vision and Strategic Agenda as a policy framework for GFAR’s activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion of research partnerships on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. genetic resources management and biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. natural resources management and agro-ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. global commodity chains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. policy management and institutional develop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Information and Knowledge Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) What do you see as the most important contribution that GFAR can make to Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) compared to other organizations? What should be the focus of its future work?

(4) Please give comments or suggestions on any other aspects of the subjects under analysis, and on how to improve their effectiveness (see the first two paragraphs of the introduction).
Analysis of Questionnaire, including tables
Results of the Questionnaire sent by the External Review Panel

The detail of responses is shown in the attached tables.

1. Overall comment
80 responses were received compared to 160 sent out (50% return rate).

This was certainly not intended as a representative sample, but was useful to the reviewers in providing a general sense for some stakeholder groups of (1) the relative importance of areas of GFAR work, (2) the perceived usefulness of the process that GFAR has launched to date, and, in some cases, to compare the difference in responses between stakeholder groups. It was also invaluable for the reviewers, from the more open questions (3 and 4 on the questionnaire), to have an opportunity to receive comments from respondents on perceptions and views about present activities and future directions. In a limited number of cases, this served as the basis for a follow-up discussion with particular respondents, but the questionnaire gave the panel access to a wider set of opinions than they could manage in the time available for interviews.

In terms of coverage, the questionnaire was least satisfactory with respect to farmer organizations, with only two participants. The Panel was fortunate, however, to be able to meet with the Executive Director of IFAP while he was in Rome, and one panel member was able to meet with the International Secretary of Via Campesina in Dresden, following the GFAR2000, Dresden meeting. This, however, and the small numbers for some other stakeholder groups, emphasizes the need to further develop stakeholder constituencies, and the GFAR Secretariat’s contacts with them.

Some indications of the views expressed in the questionnaires are referred to in the text of the report. What follows is a brief review of the responses to question 2 - which, with respect to each line of action in the current GFAR programme of work, asked (i) for an indication of the relative importance of the line of action in terms of what GFAR should do; (ii) whether the respondent had participated in interaction with the GFAR Secretariat or with other GFAR stakeholders on the particular line of action; and (iii) for an assessment of the usefulness of the process launched by GFAR to date. This review is offered only as an aid to reading the tables themselves.

For each question, the number responding on the usefulness of the process was usually less than those commenting on the importance of the line of action. However, those commenting on the usefulness were usually more numerous than those who had actually had an opportunity to participate in interaction with the GFAR secretariat or other stakeholders. This means that for all lines of action, some respondents who had not participated were nevertheless able and willing to give an opinion on the usefulness of the work. References below to responses about usefulness are given as a percentage of those expressing an opinion.

2. Overall result. In terms of overall response on the importance of the areas of GFAR activity, the highest percentage suggesting that an activity was “very important” was for Strengthening NARS and their Regional and Sub-regional fora (74% of all respondents rated this as “very important”), followed by Information & Knowledge Management (71%), Building a Global or Regional Vision and Strategic Agenda (65%) and Natural Resource
Management (53%). The same four areas of activity were rated highest in terms of their usefulness, though with Global or Regional Vision replacing Information & Knowledge Management in second place.

3. Responses to specific questions:

1. Building a Global or Regional Vision and Strategic Agenda as a policy framework for GFAR’s activities.

(A) Importance. 52 respondents (65%) felt that it was “very important” for GFAR to do this. Twenty-one (26%) felt that it was “important”, and 5 (6%) that it was “less important”. The strongest support for this activity (over 2/3 of the respondents in the particular stakeholder group saying that it was “very important”) came from respondents from the Advanced Research Institutions (ARIs), the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) and the International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs).

(B) Usefulness. 14 respondents (18%) had no opinion about the usefulness of the process launched by GFAR in this area. Of those giving an opinion, respondents felt a bit less strongly about the usefulness of the process launched to date by GFAR as compared to the rating of the importance of this issue. Of those expressing an opinion, 35 (52%) felt that it was “very useful”, 27 (40%) that it was “useful”, and 5 that it was “not useful”. The NARS respondents were the group that gave strongest backing to its usefulness (13 out of 16 giving an opinion saying that it was “very useful”).

2. Promotion of Research Partnerships on:

2.1 Genetic Resources Management and Biotechnology

(A) Importance. 38 (48%) of respondents felt that this was “very important” as an activity for GFAR to do. Twenty three (29%) that it was “important” and 15 (19%) that it was “less important”. Strongest endorsement of the importance came from NARS (12, or 71% of the 17 NARS respondents). Other groups where more than half gave it a rating of “very important” were the ARIs, the donors and the farmers. Five of the 7 NGO respondents (63%) rated this as “less important”.

(B) Usefulness. 22 (28%) of the respondents gave no opinion as to the usefulness of the GFAR process in this area. Of those giving an opinion, 45% felt that it was “very useful”, 45% “useful” and 10% “not useful”. In the case of four groups (ARIs, NARS, the private sector, farmer organizations), more than half of the respondents qualified the work as “very useful” - but the number of respondents is small for farmers (2) and the private sector (6). In spite of NGO respondents having rated this area “less important”, 5 of the seven NGO respondents found the work “useful”.

2.2 Natural Resource Management and Agroecology

(A) Importance. 42 respondents (53%) rated this as a “very important” activity for GFAR, 27 (34%) as “important” and 8(10%) as less important. Strong endorsement came from NGOs and ARIs (over 2/3 of respondents rating activity in this area as “very important”).
with 61% of NARS rating it this high. None of the nine donor responses gave it such a high rating.

(B) Usefulness. 26(33%) gave no opinion on the usefulness of the process in this area. Of those giving an opinion, 19(35%) thought it “very useful”, 30(55%) “useful” and 5 respondents felt it was “not useful”. Three NGO respondents (50% of the six giving an opinion) and 8 ARI respondents (50% of the 16 giving an opinion) rated work in this area as “very useful”.

2.3 Commodity chains

(A) Importance. 24 responses (30%) rated this area as “very important” - the lowest percentage in this category of all the lines of action. The aggregation of those rating it “very important” and “important” came to 64% of respondents - which left it with the highest percentage of respondents rating it “less important”. Both farmers’ organizations respondents rated it “very important”. Of the donor respondents, 57% rated it “less important”, as did 88% of NGO respondents.

(B) Usefulness. 32 persons (40%) gave no opinion on usefulness. Of those giving an opinion, 14 (29%) said that the process launched was “very useful”, 26 (54%) rated it “useful” and 16% said it was “not useful”. The ARIs were the only group of respondents where the majority of those giving an opinion (8 out of 13) rated work in this area as “very useful”.

2.4 Policy Management and Institutional Development

(A) Importance. 31 respondents (39%) rated this as a “very important” activity in terms of what GFAR should do, and the same percentage rated it “important”, with 9 respondents (11%) rating it “less important”. Those most strongly supportive were NGO (6 respondents out of 9 rating it “very important”) and NARS (11 out of 18 or 61%).

(B) Usefulness. 31 responses (39%) gave no opinion. Of those giving an opinion, 16(33%) rated the process launched by GFAR in this area as “very useful”, 25 (51%) rated it “useful” and 8(17%) said it was “not useful”. Of the groups with a sizeable number of respondents, only the NARS group had more than half rating the GFAR process in this area “very useful” (9 out of 13 giving an opinion).

2.5 Information and Knowledge Management

(A) Importance. 57 (71%) rated this as a “very important” activity for GFAR- the second highest percentage of strong support for any of the lines of action. Strongest support came from NARS and IARC respondents (over 75% of respondents saying “very important”) along with the smaller groups of private sector and farmer organizations respondents. 71% of ARI respondents rated its importance in the highest category.

(B. Usefulness. 25 respondents (31%) gave no opinion. Of those giving an opinion, 60% rated the process launched by GFAR in this area as “very useful” (the second highest percentage of “very useful” ratings); 35% “useful” and 5% “not useful”.
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2.6. Strengthening NARS and their Regional and Sub-Regional Fora

(A) Importance. Overall 59 (74%) gave this a rating of “very important” as an activity for GFAR, making it the category receiving the highest percentage of strong support. Most groups showed strong support (greater than 70% saying “very important” for ARIs, donors, farmer organizations, NARS and private sector).

(B) Usefulness. 23 (29%) of respondents gave no opinion as to the usefulness of the process launched by GFAR in this area. Of those giving an opinion, 68% thought the process launched by GFAR in this area was “very useful”, 23% “useful” and 8% “not useful”. Respondents from ARIs, donors, and NARS had more than 50% saying “very useful”. Of the seven IARC respondents giving an opinion, only one rated the process launched as “very useful”, 4 “useful”, and 2 “not useful”.

(Table 1)

**Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team**

**01 – Global/Regional Vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>Importance In Percent</th>
<th>Participated in it Frequency</th>
<th>Participated in it In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>Usefulness In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 14 6 1</td>
<td>0 67 29 5</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>52 48</td>
<td>5 6 10</td>
<td>24 29 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 4 4 1</td>
<td>0 44 44 11</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>33 67</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
<td>11 44 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>50 50 0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>0 2 0</td>
<td>0 100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 11 2 2</td>
<td>0 73 13 13</td>
<td>6 9</td>
<td>40 60</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>33 33 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 17 0 0</td>
<td>6 94 0 0</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>22 78</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>11 72 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 2 6 1</td>
<td>0 22 67 11</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>11 89</td>
<td>0 2 3</td>
<td>0 22 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 3 3 0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
<td>17 50 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2 52 21 5</td>
<td>3 65 26 6</td>
<td>29 51</td>
<td>36 64</td>
<td>14 35 27 5</td>
<td>18 44 34 6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

For Participation:
0 = Did NOT participate
1 = Did participate
2 = Important/Useful
3 = Less Important/Useful

For Importance and Usefulness:
0 = Don't Know
1 = Very important/Useful
### Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team

#### 02 - GRM and Biotechnology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Participated in it?</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>In Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 12 5 2</td>
<td>10 57 24 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 4 4 1</td>
<td>0 44 44 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 4 6 5</td>
<td>0 27 40 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 12 4 1</td>
<td>6 67 22 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 1 3 5</td>
<td>0 11 33 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 3 1 1</td>
<td>17 50 17 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4 38 23 15</td>
<td>5 48 29 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- For Participation or Importance and Usefulness
- 0 = Did NOT participate
- 1 = Did participate
- 2 = Important/Useful
- 3 = Less Important/Useful
### Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team

#### 03 - NRM and Agroecology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 15 5 0</td>
<td>5 71 24 0</td>
<td>10 11 48 52</td>
<td>5 8 7 1</td>
<td>24 38 33 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 0 7 2</td>
<td>0 0 78 22</td>
<td>6 3 67 33</td>
<td>2 0 6 1</td>
<td>22 0 67 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 50 50</td>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 6 6 3</td>
<td>0 40 40 20</td>
<td>8 7 53 47</td>
<td>6 2 5 2</td>
<td>40 13 33 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 11 4 2</td>
<td>6 61 22 11</td>
<td>13 5 72 28</td>
<td>6 5 6 1</td>
<td>33 28 33 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 6 3 0</td>
<td>0 67 33 0</td>
<td>3 6 33 67</td>
<td>3 3 3 0</td>
<td>33 33 33 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2 2 1</td>
<td>17 33 33 17</td>
<td>5 1 83 17</td>
<td>4 0 2 0</td>
<td>67 0 33 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 42 27 8</td>
<td>4 53 34 10</td>
<td>46 34 58 43</td>
<td>26 19 30 5</td>
<td>33 24 38 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

For Participation or Importance and Usefulness

0 = Did NOT participate
1 = Did participate
2 = Important/Useful
3 = Less Important/Useful
0 = Don't Know
1 = Very important/Useful
(Table 4)

**Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team**

**04 - Commodity Chains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>Importance In Percent*</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>Participated in it? In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>Usefulness In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 8 10 1</td>
<td>10 38 48 5</td>
<td>12 9 57 43</td>
<td>8 8 5 0</td>
<td>38 38 24 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 22 33 44</td>
<td>6 3 67 33</td>
<td>3 0 5 1</td>
<td>33 0 56 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 50 50</td>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 5 4 6</td>
<td>0 33 27 40</td>
<td>11 4 73 27</td>
<td>7 1 6 1</td>
<td>47 7 40 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 7 6 4</td>
<td>6 39 33 22</td>
<td>12 6 67 33</td>
<td>8 3 6 1</td>
<td>44 17 33 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 0 1 8</td>
<td>0 0 11 89</td>
<td>7 2 78 22</td>
<td>3 1 1 4</td>
<td>33 11 11 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 0 3 2</td>
<td>17 0 50 33</td>
<td>4 2 67 33</td>
<td>3 0 2 1</td>
<td>50 0 33 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4 24 27 25</td>
<td>5 30 34 31</td>
<td>53 27 66 34</td>
<td>32 14 26 8</td>
<td>40 18 33 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**

For Participation or Importance and Usefulness

0 = Did NOT participate 0 = Don't Know
1 = Did participate 1 = Very important/Useful
2 = Important/Useful 3 = Less Important/Useful
(Table 5)

**Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team**

**05 - Policy Management and Institutional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 33 43 14</td>
<td>18 3</td>
<td>86 14</td>
<td>9 2 8 2</td>
<td>43 10 38 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 11 56 33</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td>89 11</td>
<td>3 0 5 1</td>
<td>33 0 56 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>50 50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 20 40 7</td>
<td>9 6</td>
<td>60 40</td>
<td>7 1 5 2</td>
<td>47 7 33 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 61 28 6</td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>44 56</td>
<td>4 0 4 1</td>
<td>22 50 22 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 67 22 11</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>78 22</td>
<td>3 2 3 1</td>
<td>33 22 33 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 33 50 6</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>4 1 0 3</td>
<td>67 17 0 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31 39 39 11</td>
<td>54 26</td>
<td>68 33</td>
<td>31 16 25 8</td>
<td>39 20 31 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- For Participation or Importance and Usefulness:
  - 0 = Did NOT participate
  - 1 = Did participate
  - 2 = Important/Useful
  - 3 = Less Important/Useful
- 0 = Don't Know
- 1 = Very important/Useful
Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team

06 - Information and Knowledge Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>Importance In Percent</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>Participated in it? In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>Usefulness In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 15 3 2</td>
<td>5 71 14 10</td>
<td>11 10 52 48</td>
<td>5 10 4 2</td>
<td>24 48 19 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 5 4 0</td>
<td>0 56 44 0</td>
<td>6 3 67 33</td>
<td>3 1 5 0</td>
<td>33 11 56 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
<td>0 2 0 100</td>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 12 2 1</td>
<td>0 80 13 7</td>
<td>13 2 87 13</td>
<td>7 3 4 1</td>
<td>47 20 27 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 14 3 1</td>
<td>0 78 17 6</td>
<td>6 12 33 67</td>
<td>2 12 4 0</td>
<td>11 67 22 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 4 3 2</td>
<td>0 44 33 22</td>
<td>5 4 56 44</td>
<td>4 4 1 0</td>
<td>44 44 11 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 5 1 0</td>
<td>0 83 17 0</td>
<td>3 3 50 50</td>
<td>4 2 0 0</td>
<td>67 33 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1 57 16 6</td>
<td>1 71 20 8</td>
<td>44 36 55 45</td>
<td>25 33 19 3</td>
<td>31 41 24 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND:
For Participation or Importance and Usefulness:
0= Did NOT participate 0= Don't Know
1= Did participate 1= Very important/Useful
2= Important/Useful
3= Less Important/Useful
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### Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team

#### 07 - Strengthening NARS and their RF/SRF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 19 2 0</td>
<td>0 90 10 0</td>
<td>13 8</td>
<td>62 38</td>
<td>3 15 2 0</td>
<td>19 71 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 7 1 1</td>
<td>0 78 11 11</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td>56 44</td>
<td>3 5 1 0</td>
<td>33 56 11 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 1 0 1</td>
<td>0 50 0 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6 7 2 0</td>
<td>40 47 13 0</td>
<td>11 4</td>
<td>73 27</td>
<td>7 1 4 3</td>
<td>47 7 27 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 15 3 0</td>
<td>0 83 17 0</td>
<td>5 13</td>
<td>28 72</td>
<td>3 11 4 0</td>
<td>17 61 22 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 4 4 1</td>
<td>0 44 44 11</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>78 22</td>
<td>3 3 2 1</td>
<td>33 33 22 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 5 1 0</td>
<td>0 83 17 0</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td>50 50 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6 59 13 2</td>
<td>8 74 16 3</td>
<td>44 36</td>
<td>55 45</td>
<td>23 39 13 5</td>
<td>29 49 16 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**
- For Participation: 0= Did NOT participate, 1= Did participate, 2= Important/Useful, 3= Less Important/Useful
- For Importance and Usefulness: 0= Don't Know, 1= Very important/Useful
Annex 5
GFAR Global Vision Statement

The Dresden Declaration
“Towards a Global System for Agricultural Research for Development”

Preamble

At the dawn of the 21st century, we, the stakeholders of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), wish to remind the international community of the increasing importance and relevance of the three challenges that have guided agricultural research over the past decades:

- increasing food production, food access and quality to keep pace with or exceed the rate of population growth;
- economic development in the rural areas to alleviate the poverty and improve the quality of life that leads to exclusion of an important part of the world population, especially small farmers in marginal areas;
- development of sustainable agricultural production systems that are compatible with sustainable management and conservation of natural resources.

These challenges have to be addressed in a rapidly changing socio-economic context. The following trends provide uncommon opportunities but may also create some threats to agricultural research for development:

- Decrease of public research funding in the agricultural sector and emergence of privatized agricultural research, which imply a major change in the division of labour, necessitate the building of new partnerships and raised the issue of private versus public intellectual property rights.
- Globalization and trade liberalization may improve food security through increased access to food at a global level, yet all people may not benefit equally.
- Scientific advances in areas such as agro-ecology, the use of advanced information and communication technologies (ICT) and modern biotechnology are offering opportunities for improving agricultural production and productivity as well as nutritional value, while ensuring sustainable agriculture. There is, however, a critical need to assess the potential impact of these new technologies on human health and the environment.

To address these challenges, the GFAR stakeholders gathered in Dresden, Germany, from 21 to 23 May 2000, have adopted the following Global Vision for Agricultural Research for Development which builds on the diversity and complementarity of the different GFAR stakeholders.
GLOBAL VISION FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT

Advances in agricultural research and development, including major breakthroughs in the new areas of science, have significantly contributed to meeting the challenge of food and nutrition security, agricultural sustainability, production and productivity. However, the world still faces an increasingly complex challenge of feeding its growing population and of eradicating poverty, while assuring an equitable and sustainable use of its natural resources.

We, the GFAR stakeholders, believe that:

- food security, nutritional quality and safety, poverty alleviation and sustainable natural resources management are not only of concern to developing countries but are critical global issues with major impact on the well-being of the society;
- addressing these issues is a prerequisite for assuring peaceful coexistence, the attainment of human rights and basic human development in the new century;
- tackling these challenges is a matter of urgency, considering the rapid process of environmental deterioration and increasing inequalities, with long-term, pervasive impacts taking place in many parts of the world;
- agriculture, rural development and the management of natural resources are not only economic activities, but also strategic dimensions of contemporary societies that have important economic, social and environmental functions. It also includes the access to resources by farmers such as land, water and genetic resources.

We share a vision for the future encompassing: (a) the appreciation of the role knowledge plays in the development of agriculture; (b) the conviction that knowledge generation and utilization is increasingly based on global research systems and networks and on farmers-led experiments and innovations; and (c) the belief that new developments in areas of natural resource management, information and communication technologies (ICT) and modern biotechnology generate new opportunities. These new developments represent an enormous potential but, at the same time, could lead to serious negative effects, widening of technology gaps and social exclusion processes. As a consequence, their socio-economic, human health and environmental impacts have to be monitored, risks and benefits evaluated and then regulated as appropriate.

The GFAR stakeholders envision the development of an agriculture including crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry, which is:

- sustainable, equitable, profitable and competitive, fulfilling its functions in the context of community-centered rural development, fully recognizing the role of women in agriculture;
- diversified and flexible in its structure to cope with heterogeneous and rapidly changing agro-ecological and socio-economic environments with an important role for the farm family;
- responsive to multiple sources of knowledge and innovation, both modern and traditional.

This vision implies a progressive shift of paradigm in Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) towards a holistic “Knowledge Intensive Agriculture” accessible to small and poor farmers.

In implementing this vision, the GFAR stakeholders agree to adhere to the following principles:

- Programmes should clearly be subsidiary and complementary to the on-going work and provide a clearly identifiable added value.
- Agricultural research should be demand-driven and implemented through equal partnerships among GFAR stakeholders.
• Priorities for the research agenda are set with a focus on farmers' perspectives, taking into account the multi-functionality and regional heterogeneity of farming systems.
• Research design and dissemination should involve the intended users and beneficiaries, particularly farmers.

The GFAR stakeholders commit themselves to establishing the following three building blocks of the Global System for Agricultural Research for Development as first steps to implement the Global Vision:

1. The formulation of a global strategic research agenda, which capitalizes on the comparative advantages and the strengths of the different GFAR stakeholders;
2. The promotion of innovative, participatory, cost-effective and sustainable research partnerships and strategic alliances;
3. The ICT networking among stakeholders and the establishment of specialized agricultural knowledge and information systems.

We are convinced that these concerted actions can contribute to the emergence of a global system for agricultural research for development. We are also convinced that this will not succeed without additional investments in agricultural research, which implies additional efforts from the international community and the establishment of new funding mechanisms to mobilize both the public and private sectors. Therefore, the GFAR stakeholders request the policy and decision-makers to strongly support the on-going renewal of agricultural research for development.
ANNEX 6
Set of Summary Tables showing activities in GFAR Action Plan by stakeholders

**THEME/TOPIC No. 1: Strategic Thinking: Development of a Global Vision (GV) and of a Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Lead Stakeholder:                               | a) Most stakeholders have engaged in visioning exercises. The need for a “visioning” exercise has been a general feeling.
   b) The need & scope for a GV was collectively discussed and adopted.
   c) A global consultation through 3 meetings (Beijing, Wash. & Dresden) and e-mail interaction.
   d) Consultants prepared draft of an “Issues Paper”, that was then discussed in two meetings (Washington & Dresden), and through intensive e-mail interaction.
   e) Final GFAR-2000 discussion of GV through inter-stakeholder roundtables aimed at facilitating participation and dialogue.
   f) Mutual inputs from one stakeholder to another. Main case is input into CGIAR-GV (still in process).
   g) Dissemination of GFAR-GV and on-going dialogue with stakeholders around differences of opinion. Important forum function. | 1. Objectives:
   a) Get people to think on desirable future: Process as important as GV.
   b) Develop sense of purpose
   c) Develop sense of urgency
   d) Develop Framework for Action
2. Niches identified: Types of GVs:
   a) Stakeholders’ Visions. Each Stkh. has developed its Vision 2025, including CGIAR Vision (in process).
   c) An emerging Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues.
3. Tools or mechanisms:
   a) Visioning exercises.
   b) Dialogue and consultation.
   c) Identification of differences that are recognized & generate dialogue.
   d) Use of consultants.
4. Concrete partnerships / mechanisms:
   a) Process used for reaching a GV.
   b) Enriching each Stakeholders perception through dialogue.
   c) Special arrangements that are emerging for the discussion of each of the Strategic Issues in the Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues. | 1. Global activities:
   b) An emerging five-point Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues:
      1 – IPRs in ARD.
      2 – Access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing.
      3 – Biosafety regulations and decision-making.
      4 – Sustainable funding strategies for ARD cooperation.
      5 – Creating a favorable environment through agricultural development policies.
2. Regional activities:
   a) Completion of the formulation of the regional visions and strategic agendas
   b) Participation to the formulation of the global ARD strategic agenda |
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### Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder(s)</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lead Stakeholder:</td>
<td>a) No general lead-stakeholder.</td>
<td>1. Objectives: a) Create awareness on main GRM policy issues.</td>
<td>1. Global activities: a) A proposal for strengthening research (analysis) and policy-making capacity on GRM, to be pursued with relevant stakeholders and in close collaboration with responsible agencies (FAO and IPGRI) (related to Crucible initiative). b) Facilitation of the implementation of the Leipzig GPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Facilitate initiatives for identification of policy options and for policy management capacity building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Facilitate dissemination of “best practice” &amp; approaches in IPR management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Promote global &amp; regional partnerships related to Leipzig GPA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Niches identified: Different Types of GRM activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders are very actively involved:</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Provide a forum for debate on strategic issues on GRM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) ARIs</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Identification &amp; dissemination of “best practice” and of policy options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) IARCs (CGIAR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Interaction between the inter-govt. Commission and the GFAR stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Tools or mechanisms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Policy papers prepared to facilitate debate on strategic issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Farmers Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Dresden Declaration on GRAFT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Regional awareness workshops (i.e. CORRA/IRRI workshop &amp; others).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) EG FAR used as a platform for communication and for dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- A group of consultants involving stakeholders plays an important role.
- Strong e-mail interaction.
- At the same time RF/SRF addressed these issues in their annual meetings given the priority they attach to them (i.e. ASARECA, FORAGRO, AARINENA, and others).
### Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders

1. **Lead Stakeholders:**
   - a) In the case of biotechnology policy for developing countries, the lead stakeholder has been the Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS). FAO and ISNAR are playing an important role here.
   - b) In the case of global R&D programmes, no general lead stakeholder has appeared, although each emerging initiative has been based on a lead stakeholder, working with a group of “core stakeholders”. For example, in the case of trypanosomosis, it has been a “consortium” of an IARC (ILRI), an ARI (CIRAD) and a group of NARS (WECARD/CORAF). In the case of the rice genome, there is a lead IARC (IRRI), with a strong group of NARS, of ARBs and the private sector (Monsanto). The CGIAR is here playing a very important role.

2. **Core Stakeholders:**
   - The most active stakeholders have been:
     - a) ARIs
     - b) IARCs (CGIAR)
     - c) NARS
     - d) Private sector

### Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place

- a) Several Regional/Sub-regional Fora have expressed interest, or are developing, regional workshops and networks on biotechnology policy.
- b) The NARS/FAR Secretariat has developed a close collaboration with FAO in seeking to assure stakeholder involvement in the e-conference this organization is carrying out on the role of biotechnology for food and agriculture.
- c) Most Regional/Sub-regional Fora have engaged in the organization of biosafety workshops, or are disseminating information on “best practice” in this field.
- d) An increasingly active interaction among stakeholders is taking place in exploring new forms of research cooperation in various areas of biotechnology. (see column on emerging proposals)

### Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date

1. **Objectives:**
   - a) Create public awareness on biotechnology policy issues.
   - b) Develop a shared vision of the role of biotechnology in developing countries.
   - c) Disseminate “best practice” & approaches in biosafety.
   - d) Facilitate global & regional partnerships in biotechnology seeking to assure participation of NARS in them.

2. **Niches identified:**
   - a) Provide a forum for debate and dialogue on strategic issues on biotechnology.
   - b) Facilitate regional/global research partnerships in biotechnology.

3. **Tools or mechanisms:**
   - a) Some RF/RF have prepared policy papers to facilitate debate on strategic issues.
   - b) Use of internet and e-conferences for global or regional electronic fora on this topic (FAO e-conference).
   - c) EGFAR is used as a platform for communication and for dialogue.
   - d) “Global R&D Framework Programmes” in key research areas.

4. **Concrete partnerships:**
   - a) Coop. with FAO in regional dimension of e-conference on biotechnology.
   - b) Groundwork laid for partnerships in last column.

### Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003

1. **Global activities:**
   - a) Collaboration with FAO in e-conference on biotechnology for food & agriculture, seeking to strengthen regional dimension.
   - b) Facilitate new modalities of cooperation between public and private sector in the context of “Global R&D Framework Programmes”, with the interested stakeholders. Three cases emerging:
     - b-1: Global Initiative for the Application of Biotechnology to the Improvement of Livestock Productivity through the Control of Trypanosomosis.
     - b-2: A public-private common approach for trait discovery in rice.
     - b-3: A similar approach is starting to take shape in the cotton genome sequencing.
   - c) Establishment of a Consortium for assessing the potential benefits and risks of GM crops.

2. **Regional activities:**
   - a) Some RF/RF are interested in promoting regional workshops on biotechnology policy issues, or on specific applications of biotechnology (i.e. AARINENA Workshop in Kuwait).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. 1</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Global Activities: For MEF 2000-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Natural Resources Management and Agroecology (NRM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Types of Interactions and Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other Relevant Proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topics No. 3: Natural Resources Management and Agroecology (NRM)**

- Global Activities: For MEF 2000-2005
- Natural Resources Management and Agroecology (NRM)
- Types of Interactions and Activities
- Other Relevant Proposals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1. Objectives:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) IARCs and ARIs: IPGRI (through INIBAP) and</td>
<td>a) A conceptual paper prepared by IPGRI, discussed and</td>
<td>a) Promote CC (“filière”) approach to</td>
<td><strong>1. Global activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRAD, with the support of GFAR have constituted</td>
<td>endorsed by the GFAR Steering Committee.</td>
<td>facilitate agroindustrial development</td>
<td>a) PROCOCOs: A global research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a coordination unit to identify/promote initiatives.</td>
<td>b) Participation of members of the coordination unit to</td>
<td>pattern with strong rural participation</td>
<td>programme for coconuts with a CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meetings of some commodity boards/scientific</td>
<td>b) Facilitate links between ARD and</td>
<td>approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conferences developing close interaction with private</td>
<td>agro-industrial production and</td>
<td>b) A Sugar Cane global research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sector.</td>
<td>markets, through integration of post-</td>
<td>programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Request to RF/SRF on their priorities, and on how</td>
<td>harvest &amp; marketing.</td>
<td>c) The Cassava Global Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to integrate NARS into this process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Other proposals are being discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Contact made with the CFC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>among partners but no clear proposals yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Niches identified:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Non-CGIAR mandated crops.</td>
<td><strong>2. Regional activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other ARIs</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Develop links between ARD and</td>
<td>a) CORNET – The East African Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td>commodity groups and associations.</td>
<td>Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Date palm Network in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) FAO and IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AARINENA region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Different actors in commodity chains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Cotton Network in AARINENA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APAARI and CAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Tools or mechanisms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Tools or mechanisms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) IPGRI/CIRAD Coordination Unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) IPGRI/CIRAD Coordination Unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Concept of “Global Programmes”:</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Exploring new sources of funding and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Exploring new sources of funding public/private joint ventures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>public/private joint ventures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Concrete partnerships:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Concrete partnerships:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Groundwork has been laid for emerging</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Groundwork has been laid for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnerships that appear in last column.</td>
<td></td>
<td>emerging partnerships that appear in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) At global level, most interesting step</td>
<td></td>
<td>last column.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been signature of agreement between IPGRI/COGENT and BUROTROP for PROCOCOS CC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) At global level, most interesting step has been signature of agreement between IPGRI/COGENT and BUROTROP for PROCOCOS CC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</td>
<td>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</td>
<td>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</td>
<td>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS) since this is an area of high priority to them.</td>
<td>a) A conceptual paper prepared by IPGRI, discussed and endorsed by the GFAR Steering Committee.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>1. <strong>Global activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ICUC – International Centre for Underutilized Crops.</td>
<td>b) Request to RFSR on their priorities and ongoing regional programs.</td>
<td>a) Increase the sustainable utilization of the genetic resources of developing countries.</td>
<td>a) A Global Plan of Action will be prepared by the Task Force previously mentioned, aiming at increasing the utilization of these crops' commodities through regional and sub-regional networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) IARCs and ARIs: IPGRI/CIRAD Coordination Unit.</td>
<td>c) Several Regional/Sub-regional Fora are developing regional programs or networks on underutilized crops with a CC approach.</td>
<td>b) Promote CC (“filière”) approach to facilitate value-added and agro-industrial development of local underutilized crops with market potential.</td>
<td>b) The Network of Agro-industrial Development of Peasant Economies (RESEA) is emerging from interaction between NARS from LAC region and European ARIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Facilitate development of rural SMEs that can generate income and employment for rural poor.</td>
<td>c) A regional network on Fruit Production, Post-harvest and Marketing System in the Caribbean Islands is being established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other ARIs</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Integrate peasant economies into the national and international markets.</td>
<td>d) Improving food security and safety through value-added indigenous food processing in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Development of an agro-ecological research network for organic vegetable production and marketing in the LAC region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) FAO and IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Global scientific networks such as BAMNET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Objectives:**

a) Increase the sustainable utilization of the genetic resources of developing countries.

b) Promote CC (“filière”) approach to facilitate value-added and agro-industrial development of local underutilized crops with market potential.

c) Facilitate development of rural SMEs that can generate income and employment for rural poor.

d) Integrate peasant economies into the national and international markets.

**2. Niches identified:**

a) Non-CGIAR mandated crops.

b) Develop links between ARD and rural development programmes based on development of rural SMEs.

**3. Tools or mechanisms:**


b) Concept of “Global and Regional Programmes on CC-UC”.

c) Exploring new sources of funding and public/private joint ventures.

**4. Concrete partnerships:**

a) Groundwork has been laid for emerging partnerships that appear in last column.

b) At global level, the most interesting step has been the establishment of the Task Force mentioned above and the announcement of support for the Groundnut Network.

**N.B.:** Most of these initiatives are either regional or sub-regional. They could interact with similar initiatives in other regions to form a “loose global network”, such as may be the case of tropical fruits, which is of interest to various regions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. POLICY MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1. Objectives:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Global activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS) since this is an area of high priority to them.</td>
<td>a) All Regional/Sub-regional Fora have identified the importance of the policy dimension in terms of effective development impact of ARD. This has been reflected by the establishment of regional networks in ASARECA, WECARD/CORAF and FORAGRO, where this has been identified of very high priority.</td>
<td>a) Strengthening NARS Capacity in policy analysis and development.</td>
<td>a) Agricultural policies, rural poverty and competitiveness: Re-thinking agricultural policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Two IARCs: IFPRI and ISNAR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Facilitate participation of stakeholders in policy debates in their countries positioning ARD in it.</td>
<td>b) Creation of a research partnership between FOs like the European Farmers Coordination, Via Campesina and researchers in agricultural economy and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Niches identified:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Reposition debate on agricultural policies in developing countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Capacity-building on policy management in priority areas (i.e. GRFA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Farmers’ Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Tools or mechanisms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Regional/Sub-regional networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Inter-regional comparative analysis will be explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Concrete partnerships:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Regional activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) ECAPAPA (ASARECA), REPA (WECARD/CORAF) and the Innovation Policy Network (IAC).</td>
<td><strong>a) Improved participation of Farmers’ Organizations in the development policy dialogue in West Africa.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1. Objectives:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS) since this has to do with modernization of NARS.</td>
<td>a) NARS are confronting a challenge in terms of reforms to modernize them and make them more effective.</td>
<td>a) Facilitate exchange of experiences on NARS integration &amp; reform.</td>
<td><strong>1. Global activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Two IARCs: IFPRI and ISNAR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Contribute to development of new forms of ARD cooperation.</td>
<td><strong>a) Development of closer links between research and extension services in NARS.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Niches identified:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Regional activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Exchange of experiences among NARS on strategic issues for NARS.</td>
<td><strong>a) Organization and management of technological integration in agriculture and agro-industry in the Southern Cone (PROCISUR).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Tools or mechanisms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Farmers’ Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) NARS Forum in EGFAR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Concrete partnerships:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Ideas under discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### THEME/TOPIC No. 6: Improving Information and Knowledge Flows among Stakeholders (ICT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td>a) GFAR Steering Committee convened the Rome Consultation Meeting on how to enhance global cooperation in ARD information (co-sponsored by FAO &amp; World Bank). b) Consultants have been used to work with stakeholders to: 1 - Develop a Conceptual Framework for the RAIS 2 - Formulate first draft of Regional Information Strategies (WECARD/CORAF, FORAGRO-INFOTEC, AARINENA). c) Regional Workshops to identify information needs and to validate Regional Information Strategy. d) Electronic fora to discuss information needs among end-users (FORAGRO and APAARI). e) In GFAR-2000 interaction among the RAIS was initiated. f) Use of Internet to establish EGFR as a decentralized system of stakeholder-led websites for: 1 - Communication among Sikkhs. 2 - Gateway function. 3 - Knowledge marketplace and specialized fora (i.e. NARS Forum).</td>
<td>1. <strong>Objectives:</strong> a) Facilitate info &amp; knowledge flows among Stakeholders b) Strengthen capacity of NARS &amp; of RF/SRF to use ICT (avoid tech. gap) c) Address the issue of information glut through Gateway function of EGFR d) Move from model of large global centralized DB to decentralized DBs. e) Increase use of Internet as a tool for dialogue and for development of learning processes among stakeholders through EGFR. 2. <strong>Niches identified:</strong> Different Types of Information Management Activities at: a) Local Level b) National Level c) Regional Level d) Global Level 3. <strong>Tools or mechanisms:</strong> a) Information Strategies b) DB development and Information Systems linking them. c) EGFR: The basis have been laid for 1 - Communications Platform 2 - Gateway Function 3 - NARS Forum</td>
<td>1. <strong>Global activities:</strong> a) Fully develop EGFR (see its three components). b) Strengthen the ownership of EGFR by stakeholders. c) Strengthen interaction with other global actors (i.e. FAO/ WAI accents, CGIAR, etc.). 2. <strong>Regional activities:</strong> Advance process of establishment/strengthening of RAIS: a) FAR-AIS b) AARINENA-RAIS c) FORAGRO-INFOTEC d) APAARI-RAIS 3. <strong>National activities:</strong> a) Strengthen RAIS in the North to facilitate access to info resources there (EIARD/InfoSys). 4. <strong>Local activities:</strong> a) Development of an approach to Knowledge Management of local innovations in NRM: the InterDev Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders have identified ICT &amp; access to information as high priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.B.</strong> In the Rome Consultation Meeting the GFAR Secretariat was asked to: (a) promote process of developing an “enabling environment” for a GKSARD. (b) support mainly the development of RAIS in cooperation with RF/SRF. (c) manage EGFR as a system of stakeholder-led decentralized websites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# THEME/TOPIC No. 7: Strengthening NARS and Regional/Sub-regional Fora (RF/SRF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lead Stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Objectives:</td>
<td>1. Global activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The four Regional Fora, and their respective Sub-regional Fora, are the key actors in this process (AARINENA, APAARI, FARA &amp; FORAGRO), and more recently CAC Regional Forum.</td>
<td>a) Although historical evolution varies, some of the RF/SRF have been under development for the last ten years. Two models predominate: 1 - Strong SRF and a RF that provides a framework for action at regional level. 2 - Strong RF with little development of the SRF.</td>
<td>a) Strengthen RF/SRF in their capacity to perform the various functions assigned to them. b) Facilitate inter-regional exchange of information &amp; collaboration among RF/SRF. c) Facilitate exchange of experiences in NARS integration and in NARS reform to increase their effectiveness. d) Support the participation of NARS and of RF/SRF in setting the global research agenda.</td>
<td>a) Facilitate participation in further developing the emerging Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues (linking the national-regional-global) b) Facilitate activities aimed at assuring sustainability of RF/SRF. Action with donors and with regional development banks. c) Facilitate exchange of experiences on how to implement Regional Strategies. d) Facilitate exchange of experiences on how to evolve towards “regional integration” in agricultural research (ARD) which is more than “regional networks”. Experiences such as those underway in PROCISUR and PROCIANDEO in LAC should be carefully followed and assessed for lessons to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Through the RF/SRF, specific NARS play a key role in this process.</td>
<td>b) The NARS-SC has been established in 1996 as part of GFAR process. c) A diagnosis has been made of strengths and weaknesses that led to a proposal for the strengthening of RF/SRF on the basis of this report. d) RF/SRF have developed Regional Strategies for strengthening of ARD and hold periodic meetings. NARS/GFAR Secretariat participates. e) To initiate inter-regional exchange &amp; coop., cross-participation in the RF/SRF meetings is starting. f) Launching of the NARS Forum in EGFAR to facilitate exchange of experiences among NARS. g) Given importance of access to information, establishments of RAIS becomes an important RF/SRF activity. h) Increasing contribution to the formulation of A Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues (see Table 1).</td>
<td>2. Niches identified: Interaction between the national, the regional and the global levels in discussing the Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues (see Table 1). GFAR Secretariat has an important role in linking these three levels. b) Information &amp; Communication. c) GRM policy.</td>
<td>2. Regional activities: a) Strengthen RF/SRF through Regional Funds to support regional cooperation in ARD. Cases: 1 - FONTAGRO (LAC) 2 - ASARECA Regional Fund 3 - WECARD/CORAF Regional Fund 4 - Extension to other regions. b) Support the development of the RAIS. c) Facilitate the development of the main regional networks being developed by RF/SRF mentioned in previous tables (Datepal, Coffee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Discussion fora and reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Although historical evolution varies, some of the RF/SRF have been under development for the last ten years. Two models predominate: 1 - Strong SRF and a RF that provides a framework for action at regional level. 2 - Strong RF with little development of the SRF.</td>
<td>3. Tools or mechanisms: a) EGFAR and RAIS. b) Discussion fora and reports.</td>
<td>b) Facilitate exchange of experiences on how to evolve towards “regional integration” in agricultural research (ARD) which is more than “regional networks”. Experiences such as those underway in PROCISUR and PROCIANDEO in LAC should be carefully followed and assessed for lessons to learn.</td>
<td>4. Concrete partnerships: a) SSA/SRF for FARA Info. Strategy. b) Two-inter-regional partnerships: 1 - EFARD / AARINENA 2 - EFARD / FARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The Regional Forum concept has been adopted by the European ARD community (EFARD/EIARD/EC). c) All other stakeholders in the global system have a stake of having strong NARS and RF/SRF and can thus collaborate in this process (IARCs, ARIs). d) Two organizations have a special role in supporting this process: ISNAR and FAO/SDR.</td>
<td>To initiate inter-regional exchange &amp; coop., cross-participation in the RF/SRF meetings is starting.</td>
<td>3. Tools or mechanisms: a) EGFAR and RAIS. b) Discussion fora and reports.</td>
<td>5. Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEX 7
Diagram of EGFAR/RAIS/NAIS Information /Knowledge systems
Actors in the Global Information System For Agricultural Research for Development
ANNEX 8
Case Study of AARINENA Regional Forum
The Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa (AARINENA)

1. The Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa (AARINENA) was established as an autonomous body some fifteen years ago. It was founded on the recommendations of the 14th and 16th FAO Regional Conferences for the Near East, within the context of FAO’s drive to strengthen cooperation among NARS, and regional and international research institutes and centres. Its membership extends to 18 countries: Cyprus, Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, The Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen. Four international and regional centres and organizations (ACSAD, AOAD, FAO-RNE and ICARDA) are also members of AARINENA. To date, the association has held seven general conferences in the following cities: Damascus (1985); Nicosia (1987); Cairo (1989); Cairo (1994), Rabat (1996); Tehran (1998), and Beirut (2000).

2. AARINENA represents a group of countries and institutions of considerable importance to the global agricultural research effort. However, apart from holding biannual meetings, it has been relatively inactive over the years. It took off initially as a regional association due to the impetus provided by the process that led to the establishment of GFAR. It also benefited considerably from the subsequent support provided by the GFAR-SC, following the establishment of the latter. Nevertheless, member countries have demonstrated limited commitment (financial, in particular) to AARINENA so far and have not established the necessary terms of reference and functions for which its elected officers would be accountable.

3. In 1995, a Regional Forum on Agricultural Research was held as part of the IFAD-led process of establishing GFAR. This meeting provided the required drive for galvanizing the relevant NARS leaders to contribute to GFAR’s objectives by setting research priorities within the framework of a NARS-driven process. Following the Forum, a ‘Review of the NARS in the Region’ was prepared in collaboration with the Centre International des Hautes Etude Agronomiques Mediterraneennes (CIHEAM), FAO, and ICARDA. CIHEAM also co-organized a regional consultation on the utilization of date palm residues and contributed to an Inter-Agency Task Force on Biotechnology and Technology Transfer in the Near East.

4. In 1998, AARINENA presented its strategy, entitled ‘AARINENA towards 2000 and beyond - A strategy for the future’, which was formally adopted at the Association’s Sixth General Conference held in Tehran in May 1998. The strategy outlined AARINENA’s mission, goals, and objectives and established a set of priorities and challenges that would guide the Association in developing its Programme of Action in support of its members. At its Seventh General Conference (March 2000) AARINENA adopted the Framework for Action (2000-2005) and also developed an information strategy for the region that was to assess the present structure of its agricultural information system. In addition, the Association developed a strategy for agricultural information in the WANA region, which was built on existing strengths to promote cooperation between the various institutions within and outside the area, as part of the Electronic Global Forum on Agricultural Research (EGFAR). It has become evident from contacts with various individuals within the national
research establishments that AARINENA and its work are practically unknown among researchers in the region.

5. The programme of work contained in AARINENA’s Framework for Action (2000-2005) is built on four strategic themes:

- Building AARINENA’s organizational capacity and the sub-regional grouping of its members.
- Strengthening information and communication exchange among its members.
- Promoting policy and institutional capacity.
- Formulating regional and sub-regional project proposals.

6. This promising start was relatively short-lived, however, because AARINENA’s dynamic leadership changed and new modalities were introduced for the selection of the Chair and the Executive Secretary, on the basis that both incumbents would give of their services voluntarily, in an honorary capacity. In 1998, when the Islamic Republic of Iran was elected to the Chair, the GOI lent the services of Mr. Roozitalab to the post on a full-time basis. The post of Executive Secretary was filled by a national of Cyprus who, in turn, was supported by his Government in allotting at least 60% of his time to the Association. This situation is extremely risky, since the voluntary nature of the involvement could constitute an impediment when there is a change in representation/officers filling these functions. The consequent loss of momentum for AARINENA could easily cause it to regress to its earlier years of minimal activity. The GFAR Review Panel felt it was appropriate to visit AARINENA in order to discuss the potential for maintaining the initial momentum, identify the relevant constraints and assess the importance of the GFAR-SC’s inputs in strengthening AARINENA’s endeavours.

7. It was clear to the Panel that the GFAR-SC has greatly influenced the work of AARINENA. In particular, it has facilitated the development of the Association’s strategic framework and Plan of Action, which was shaped in accordance with GFAR’s Business Plan, adopted at the Dresden meeting earlier this year. The Panel also noted GFAR-SC’s excellent efforts to facilitate interaction between AARINENA and EIARD in support of building partnerships to fund some of AARINENA’s specific projects (such as the Date Palm Research network), during the meetings of the Executive Committee held in Beirut and subsequent follow-up in Dresden.

8. The Panel representative held discussions with FAO’s Regional Agricultural Research Officer in Cairo, (Dr. Ibrahim Hamdan) who acts as trustee for AARINENA’s financial resources, held by FAO under Trust Fund arrangements. Given the long history of FAO involvement in the development of AARINENA, Dr. Hamdan also preserves much of AARINENA’s institutional memory. The Panel discussed the progress made since the adoption of AARINENA’s Strategy and Plan of Action, and met Dr. Ahmed Rafea, the consultant responsible for preparing the information strategy. The Panel representative also
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traveled to Beirut to meet AARINENA’s newly elected Chairman and its Executive Secretary.

9. While in Beirut, the Panel representative also met the Deputy Director General of ICARDA and discussed with him ICARDA’s involvement in AARINENA. What emerged from the discussion was the impossibility of AARINENA’s making progress or implementing its Strategic Framework and Plan of Action while its Executive Secretary is employed on a voluntary basis, and has other serious commitments and responsibilities. Both the current Chairman and the Executive Secretary have a very heavy workload related to their national responsibilities, and it is difficult for them to find the necessary additional time and energy to dedicate to AARINENA. In the absence of at least a full-time, fully remunerated Executive Secretary, there is a real risk that little action can be taken.

10. In order to avoid similar situations in the future, countries seeking Chairmanship of AARINENA should be made aware of the responsibilities and the commitment expected of them. The terms of reference for both the Chair and the Executive Secretary should be very clear with regard to these responsibilities and obligations. Moreover, AARINENA’s financial base is very weak, due to the declining level of members’ contributions. In the Panel’s view, it is of primary importance for the Association to reach the required level of funding in order to implement its Plan of Action. The Panel considers the current situation to be a serious one, requiring rapid action.

11. The panel recommends that AARINENA draw up new regulations by which the Executive Secretary is to be recruited on a full time basis. The recruitment process must be based on a transparent and competitive mechanism for selecting qualified candidates, and be open to all members of the Association. Moreover, as already pointed out, the Panel recommends that the regional and sub-regional fora be supported by APOs chosen from Donor Countries, whose task it will be to assist the Executive Secretary in specific functions within the fora.

12. AARINENA needs to amend its self-reliance strategy and open up membership to the other constituencies in the region, including the private sector, NGOs, farmer organizations, universities and the relevant ARIs. It should also seek sponsorship from regional funding institutions, such as the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (AFESD), the Islamic Development Bank (IsDB), the Kuwait Fund, the Saudi Fund for Development (SFD), and the Abu Dhabi Fund for Arab Economic Development (ADFAED). The Panel recommends that the GFAR-SC facilitate the sponsorship process - seen to be a difficult endeavour. This is mainly because some countries belonging to AARINENA are not eligible to receive financial support according to the criteria of certain financial institutions. For example, AFESD cannot finance activities in non-Arab countries that are not members of the Arab league, while the IsDB cannot finance activities in non-Islamic countries that are not members of the Islamic Conference. Thus, the complexities linked to membership of the Association require very close attention, so as to identify the mechanisms that can meet the required eligibility criteria of each financial institution without compromising the current membership structure.

13. As a prerequisite for implementing its agreed Plan of Action, AARINENA will need to broaden the scope of its activities beyond crop and livestock research, to include forestry, fisheries, natural resource management, and policy research institutes operating in the region.
This would also enhance its potential to add value, and facilitate the exchange of knowledge and experience across its member-countries and institutions.

14. AARINENA’s knowledge of existing experience in the region is very limited, as it has not been able to establish a viable, regional electronic global forum on agricultural research (E-GFAR). Efforts should be directed towards establishing such a system, facilitated by the GFAR-SC in collaboration with FAO-WAICENT. A recent example of the need for such a facility is the proposed Date Palm Network project document that did not take into account either the experience gained to date in this field or the work supported previously by several donor institutions such as IFAD, IsDB and FAO. Such gaps in information can result in duplication of the work of others or neglect of important lessons that have been learned from experience.

15. The challenges facing AARINENA in the coming years are manifold. The Association will need dedicated effort on the part of its members, as well as support under the aegis of GFAR, to identify the specific actions required in order to ensure its viability and sustainability.

List of persons met:

- Dr. Ibrahim Hamdan
  Senior Officer, Regional Office for the Near East, Cairo
- Dr. Ahmed Rafea
  Computer Science Department, AUC, Cairo
- Dr. Cristo Hilan
  Director, IRA/FNAR Laboratory, MOA, Beirut
- Dr. Mahmoud Salih
  Deputy Director-General, ICARDA, Aleppo
- Dr. Miltiades Hadjipanayiotou
  Former Executive Secretary, AARINENA, Nicosia
- Dr. Ismael Muharram
  Deputy Director General, AREA, Cairo
- Dr. Mustafa Yaghi
  President du Conseil LARI and Chairman, AARINENA, Beirut
Background

1. In the course of the Panel Review of GFAR, one of the team visited Dakar from 16-19 July 2000 to attend the WECARD (West and Central Africa Research for Development Forum)/CORAF - hereinafter just referred to as WECARD - annual plenary meeting. The purpose was to obtain views on GFAR from participants who had/had not been to the first plenary meeting of GFAR (the Global Forum on Agricultural Research) held in Dresden in May 2000, and also to see how the GFAR process was developing and what support it was receiving and/or anticipated from the GFAR Secretariat. The team member concerned had worked extensively in West Africa between 1980 and 2000: as a World Bank staff member in the 80s, and as an IFAD Caisse Centrale or PTF Nigeria consultant in the 90s, (including attendance at a CORAF - when still just a francophone institution-annual meeting in Burkina Faso in 1993). He had also been involved in strengthening the NARS fora and helping to set up both FARA and GFAR itself, during the period 1994-6, again on behalf of IFAD.

2. Whereas thirteen members of NARS, NGOs, the private sector and farmer organizations from West and Central Africa attended the GFAR 2000, Dresden meeting, unfortunately only four were present at WECARD: Adama Traore, President of WECARD, Mali; Jean Detongnon, WECARD committee member, Benin; Umam Al Kaleri, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Nigeria; and Roy Macauley (Sierra Leone), representing CERAAS, Senegal. All were interviewed as were many other NARS participants from NARIs, the private sector and NGOs (see below). The list included Ndiaga Mbaye, Executive Secretary; Marcel Nwalozie, Scientific Coordinator; and Dady Demby, responsible for ICT - all staff of the WECARD sub-regional forum Secretariat. A number of other participants that were at Dresden from donor or ARI groups were also interviewed including: Alain Derevier of CIRAD (and former Executive Secretary of GFAR); Alain Darthenucq from the European Commission; Mokhtar Toure from SPAAR; Jeremy Stickings from NRI and ECART, UK; Francis Idachaba from ISNAR; and Kanayo Nwanze, the Director General of WARDA.

3. CORAF was originally set up in 1987 as a francophone organization bringing together the heads of government research services in francophone countries in West and Central Africa in response to crises in both agriculture as a sector and in agronomic research in particular. This was due to famines arising from overpopulation and land degradation, and also increasing malnutrition and poverty. It was set up as a regional body for consultation and scientific collaboration, to strengthen member NARS and national capacities to execute improved research for development programmes. It carried out this programme initially through meetings, seminars, publications and a newsletter. The development of the ecoregional research approach and the drafting of Frameworks for Action for the revitalization of African research under SPAAR, 1993-5 coincided with the setting up of the GFAR programme, when renewing the Vision of the CGIAR system in 1994-6. This led to the broadening of CORAF to include English, Spanish and Portuguese-speaking countries on a West and Central Africa-wide basis, and the introduction of the English acronym WECARD as a translation of CORAF, which stands in French for the "Conseil des responsables de la recherche agronomique africains". At a meeting with the other two sub-Saharan African subregional fora - SACCAR and ASARECA - in Kampala in February 1996, these broader goals were accepted, and a review of research priorities for the WECARD/ CORAF subregion was initiated - to be included in an Action Plan that was tabled at the meeting of the first global forum for agricultural research held in Washington during the Centers Week of the CGIAR in October 1996. At the earlier Kampala meeting the concept of setting up a sub-Saharan region-wide forum, FARA, was first agreed on in principal, in order to give the three subregions a stronger voice at international meetings and to foster improved collaboration and information exchange between them.
The present structure of WECARD

4. It was clear from the plenary meeting that the merging of francophone with anglophone and other language speaking countries of West and Central Africa has developed well and all members feel equal partners in the broadened forum. However, while broadening by country has been achieved, the broadening by type of stakeholder is moving much more slowly. While a few participants from the private sector, farmer organizations, universities and NGOs were present at this plenary forum meeting, the key members are still those from the NARIs and this is clearly much the same situation in individual NARS. However, it is clear that the situation is beginning to change, as is further discussed below. Furthermore while both crop and livestock scientists were present, there were very few from the forestry, fishery or natural resource sectors, and the GFAR goal is also to broaden the meaning of agriculture to integrate all the natural resource sectors, and not just crops and livestock under the narrower definition.

5. With SPAAR support and strong commitment by a number of member NARS, WECARD has one of the strongest Executive Secretariats of any of the regional/subregional, (R/SR), fora; some of whom do not even have a full-time Executive Secretary. In WECARD's case they have a four-man professional team, an Executive Secretary from Senegal, a Scientific Coordinator from Nigeria, a staff member responsible for ICT from Congo Brazzaville, and a publications editor also from Senegal. They also maintain good liaison with INSAH, which is a regional research centre set up under the CILSS drought relief programme for the four main Sahelian countries (Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso and Niger) with whom WECARD/CORAF has a Memorandum of Understanding, and who acknowledges that WECARD/CORAF represents their interests in the GFAR. While some budgetary support is made available to the Secretariat from SPAAR and other donors, it is encouraging that some of the staff still have their salaries paid by their own government as their former employer. This shows the high level of commitment to the institution, although there is the danger that stronger NARS might dominate the Secretariat positions. However, this danger is slight as they have a clear constitution with specific terms of reference for all their Steering Committee members, Chair persons, etc, who make all the policy decisions.

6. A more worrisome feature of shared membership of the forum by each of the NARS is that some are in danger of getting left behind due to their lack of capacity in ICT hardware and training. While it was extremely encouraging that an electronic workshop had been set up around a number of different commodities and themes to help develop their new Strategic Plan, it was clear that some of the less strong NARS members, who do not have sufficient access to modern ICT, felt that they were getting left out of the process. It would be tragic if this situation is not rapidly remedied by donor support to ensure that all NARS are up to date both with having the new ICT hardware, and being well trained to use and maintain it, so that all countries and their scientists have access to the new ICT technologies. WECARD is at the forefront with assistance from the EC, CTA and CABl and from the GFAR Secretariat in starting to develop its RAIS; and it is imperative that all scientists can access the websites and electronic databases, and participate in virtual debates. It would be most unfortunate to have a second class of NARS members being left behind in accessing the new knowledge systems, as it would seriously undermine their ability to collaborate in research programmes, and even lead them to reconsider participation in their forum. To redress this imbalance has become one of the key recommendations of the GFAR Panel Review report. In this context, the Panel is also recommending that donors support APOs, who are qualified ITC specialists to work with each fora's own staff member responsible for ICT; and Dady Demby, who fills this role in WECARD, confirmed that he would very much welcome such support. Likewise the Panel is recommending that a highly qualified experienced ICT specialist be added to the team at the GFAR Secretariat in Rome, to continue developing EGFAR and assist in the development of RAIS in all the R/SR fora that request such help.
It was also encouraging to learn that WECARD was commissioning reviews of using ICT to improve diffusion of their research networking in two countries - Ghana and Burkina Faso.

The Work Programme of WECARD

7. Apart from the problem of some countries getting left behind in the debate on the Strategic Plan, it was encouraging to see all the work that had been done in its preparation. Working groups reviewed progress during the course of the meeting and made proposals on how best to fill gaps that were noted concerning many of the perennial cash crops such as oil-palm, rubber, cocoa, etc. A series of good presentations was given by many of the research coordinators from different networks and research poles, which included the networks of GRENEWECA for cowpeas, ROCAFREMI for millet, ROCARS for sorghum and ROCARIZ for rice; the research pole of CERAAS on drought tolerant crops; the commodity chain "filière" research programme on bananas; the PRASAC and PSI programmes on natural resources including livestock integration in the farming systems; and the special project on Fallows. It was noteworthy that the ROCAFREMI millet programme had also adopted the commodity chain approach, and become involved with the private sector on improving processing. In fact, both the key scientists concerned and the relevant private Sector company were present at the plenary meeting. It was clear that broader research partnerships were also being set up with ARIs such as Winrock, Purdue and Wageningen University, or NGOs like World Vision and Global 2000; and there was generally good collaboration with CGIAR IARCs, such as IITA, WARDA, ICRISAT, ICRAF, ILRI and IPGRI.

8. At the Dresden Meeting, a number of successful research programmes from the WECARD region had been either presented or put up in poster form, including the success of the CERAAS regional centre for improvement of plant adaptation to drought. Like CIRDES, a regional centre on the livestock side in West Africa, the advantages and disadvantages of having regional centres as opposed to strengthening national centres warrant further review, and both centres appear worthy of study from the institutional standpoint. Other programmes in this success category presented at Dresden from West and Central Africa, included the Sustainable Use of Inland Valley Ecosystems in sub-Saharan Africa, the project for improvement and management of Fallows in West Africa, the International Bambara Groundnut Network (BAMNET), which is a network initiated under the underutilised plant species initiative; and the 2020 vision policy network set up in West Africa with the support of IFPRI.

9. Under the auspices of the GFAR programme, it is hoped to initiate more innovative partnership programmes. A number of these were also put forward for discussion by WECARD and their NARS members, also to elicit donor interest at Dresden. It was useful to have the opportunity of discussing some of them at the Dakar meeting. This included a programme on the "Intercropping of Cereals and Shrub Legumes on African Smallholder Farms to enhance Productivity, Animal Nutrition and Soil Fertility under Semi-arid Conditions", which provides a good example of a multi disciplinary farming system approach. Likewise, "ERICA, an ecoregional approach for change in agriculture", based in Benin and neighbouring countries. Research on a programme for "Improved Sorghum and Millet Production in Mali" was another of these innovative proposals. On the institutional side, the "Improved Participation of Farmer Organizations in the Development Policy Dialogue in West Africa" is commendable, especially as the Review Panel thinks far too little research is being done on policy analysis, which can have such high potential benefits in convincing policy-makers to make critical changes in policies that inhibit agriculture growth. Hopefully, donors are now coming forward to fund these programmes, and WECARD will feature them strongly amongst its priorities - if they are not already included – once they have finalized their Strategic Plan, and it has been agreed that these programmes are high priority ones.

The Regional Forum, FARA
10. The establishment of the regional forum in Sub-Saharan Africa is proceeding slowly, but it has now been agreed that FARA will be set up, and merged with SPAAR, and probably headquartered in Accra, Ghana, where FAO has offered to host it. WECARD has consistently supported the FARA concept, but the plenary meeting was somewhat taken aback to discover, after they had agreed that the initiative was to be fully-African, set up by Africans for Africans, that it was decided at Dresden to ask ISNAR to set it up on their behalf. This was later clarified as asking ISNAR to set out some of the legal and organizational issues, but that all the decisions would be taken by leaders of the three sub-regional fora. The episode is mentioned here as it illustrates the determination of the leaders of the WECARD forum that Africa can of course stand on its own feet, and will progress only by getting rid of the dependency syndrome that has come about through long dependence on donor aid, assisted by obtaining, if possible, a more level playing field in matters of trade and international agreements between nations of the North and those of the South. The spirit of this is nowhere better expressed that in the SPAAR/FARA "Vision of African Agricultural Research and Development" paper of 1999, (Bibl No 12), presented at their Conakry Plenary meeting in April this year, and which should be compulsory reading for all those involved with ARD in Africa!

The Sub-regional Research Fund

11. Overall, it is clear that the WECARD/CORAF forum is making good progress, and is held in high esteem by most of its members. However, the Panel stresses that if the R/SR fora can carry out their priority-setting exercise convincingly, donors should have faith in entrusting them with a pool of funds that can be competed for by its members for funding priority, sub-regional research programmes. It appears that this juncture is now being reached at WECARD, as the EC is just finalizing agreement with the forum to set up such a fund, with two windows: one of these comprising small amounts to help prepare promising research proposals, and the other a larger fund to assist in funding full-scale research programmes. It will be interesting to see exactly how this fund will operate, and to closely monitor its performance so as to learn lessons for and draw comparisons with the other fora, of which one only - FORAGRO, in Latin America - has such a fund at present.

Assistance from the GFAR Secretariat

12. The staff of the WECARD Secretariat, the Chairman, and members of their Steering Committee, were pleased at the support they are receiving from the Secretariat. They commented on the excellent help provided with regard to ICT and the setting up of their RAIS, although they stated they would definitely welcome further assistance from a qualified, resident APO, particularly if he/she was also backstopped by an ICT specialist in the Secretariat. They had also received funds before the Dresden meeting, to prepare their successful case study research programmes, and put forward the innovative proposals which, they hoped, would now receive donor support. They welcomed support for setting up their global R&D programme on Trypanosomiasis, which will be carried out by several of their NARS jointly with ILRI and CIRAD. They also share the views of the Secretariat on the importance of the policy dimension and, just like ASARECA and FORAGRO, they too, have set up their own sub-regional policy network, in addition to the 2020 proposal supported by IFPRI, already mentioned.

Conclusions

13. In general, it is most encouraging to see the transformation of CORAF/WECARD today from its initial start thirteen years ago, as simply a platform for information exchange. It is certainly proving to be a good place from which all the research networks, poles and programmes can coordinate their activities and exchange views. Ideas for innovative new research programmes are emerging, and new multi-stakeholder partnerships are being formed. The broadening of the NARS and their fora is taking
place very slowly, but there has been an encouraging start, which now needs to gather greater impetus. WECARD is ahead of other fora in developing its RAIS, but it needs more assistance on this; and the whole provision of ICT hardware, software and training is critical for access by all NARS scientists, in order to ensure that some NARS or NARS Institutes are not left behind. The concept of GFAR appears to have been well accepted by the members encountered at this forum. Those who had attended the Dresden meeting were pleased with its deliberations, which the Chairman of WECARD clearly endorsed in his presentation on GFAR 2000, Dresden, at this Dakar plenary meeting. Much more remains to be done, but from this short visit it would seem that matters are progressing along the right lines. Most NARS seem well committed to their forum and to GFAR, and this will most certainly be strengthened if the new Research Fund works well, and its progress, like that of the entire forum, is followed with interest.
## ANNEX 10

Financial Support from GFAR/NARS Secretariat to R/SR Fora - as of 1st June 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ASIA PACIFIC</th>
<th>CENTRAL ASIA &amp; CAUCASUS</th>
<th>LATIN AMERICA &amp; CARRIBEAN</th>
<th>SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA</th>
<th>WEST ASIA &amp; NORTH AFRICA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Vision &amp; Strategic Agenda</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strengthening RF/SRF</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Exchange among RF/SRF</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Strengthening constituencies</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promoting Research Partnerships:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 GRM and Biotechnology</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 NRM &amp; Agroecology</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>19,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Commodity Chains</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Policy Management &amp; Inst. Development</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information &amp; Knowledge Exchange</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>96,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GFAR-2000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>94,100</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>278,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1 - Contributions Received from Donors by GFAR 1998-2000
(as of September 30, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. DONOR</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000(a)</th>
<th>2000(b)</th>
<th>TOTAL 1998-2000</th>
<th>TOTAL 2000(b)</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy / IFAD</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR*</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIAR/CTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000(a)</th>
<th>2000(b)</th>
<th>TOTAL 1998-2000</th>
<th>TOTAL 2000(b)</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA + IDRC **</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO ***</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD **</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank ***</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany - GFAR2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other GFAR-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000(a)</th>
<th>2000(b)</th>
<th>TOTAL 1998-2000</th>
<th>TOTAL 2000(b)</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy / IFAD</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR*</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIAR/CTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- 2000(a) Contributions made up to July 31, 2000
- 2000(b) Contributions and pledges received after August 1, 2000
- ** The CGIAR contribution that appears in the column 2000(b) has to be confirmed at ICW-2000.
- ** Contributions to the First GFAR External Review (IFAD, IDRC and CIDA).
- *** Estimates covering mainly office space, equipment and communication. To be confirmed with each organization.

Page - 65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Core Budget:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of the Secretariat</td>
<td>39,579</td>
<td>167,978</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>391,557</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>16,520</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>33,320</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment- Non-Expend.</td>
<td>8,702</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>20,702</td>
<td>33,402</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment- Expendable</td>
<td>15,448</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>16,448</td>
<td>31,896</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel – Secretariat(s) &amp; Chair</td>
<td>104,373</td>
<td>120,260</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>324,633</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Core Budget</td>
<td>148,752</td>
<td>328,908</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>786,660</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>329,000</td>
<td>349,000</td>
<td>964,000</td>
<td>456,000</td>
<td>508,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Operational Budget:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking &amp; Visioning</td>
<td>8,458</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>38,458</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of res. partnerships</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>138,100</td>
<td>163,100</td>
<td>163,100</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>166,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT &amp; Knowledge Management</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>153,533</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>250,533</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>196,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to RF/SRF</td>
<td>34,715</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>159,715</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR/NARS SC Meetings</td>
<td>27,589</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>67,589</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR-2000</td>
<td>175,073</td>
<td>175,073</td>
<td>175,073</td>
<td>525,220</td>
<td>525,220</td>
<td>525,220</td>
<td>525,220</td>
<td>525,220</td>
<td>525,220</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Budget</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>249,295</td>
<td>553,173</td>
<td>854,468</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>940,000</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>849,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>200,752</td>
<td>578,203</td>
<td>862,173</td>
<td>1,641,128</td>
<td>596,000</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td>664,000</td>
<td>1,904,000</td>
<td>547,000</td>
<td>1,357,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 12

GFAR Panel Review: List of persons met or interviewed by telephone

- National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) and their Fora
  
  Roger Jones, NARCC, Sierra Leone – WECARD/CORAF
  Adama Traore, Chair, WECARD/CORAF, Mali
  Ndiaga Mbaye, WECARD/CORAF, Senegal
  Marcel Nwalozie, WECARD/CORAF
  Dady Demby, WECARD/CORAF
  Moise Houssou, WECARD/CORAF
  Ahmadou Ndiaye, WECARD/CORAF
  J. Detongnon, INRAB, Benin
  Paco Sereme, INERA. Burkina Faso
  Koffi Sie, CHRA, Ivory Coast
  E. Owusu-Benoah, CSIR, Ghana
  Olatunde Oloko, Min. of Ag. Sciences, Nigeria
  Umaru Alkaleiri, Min.of Ag., Nigeria
  Raj Paroda, ICAR, India, and Chair, GFAR
  Ali Mehdi, DCCP, AARINENA
  Miltiades Hadjipanayioutou, Former Exec. Sec., AARINENA, Cyprus
  George Orphanides, AARINENA, Cyprus
  Mustafa Yagi, AARINENA, Lebanon
  Cristo Hilan, Min. of Ag. Lebanon - AARINENA
  Joseph Mukiibi, NARO, Uganda - AARINENA
  Ismael Muharam, AREA, Egypt
  Francois Rasolo, Chair ASARECA Madagascar
  Geoffrey Mrema, ASARECA, Uganda
  John Mugabe, ACTS. ASARECA
  Patricio Faylon, PCARRD, Philippines – AAPARI
  G. Aleksidze, AAS-Georgia, CAC
  Harold Roy-Macauley, CERAAS, Senegal
  Yerken Azhigaliyev, MOE-KAZ, CAC
  Edgardo Moscardi, FONTAGRO
  Enrique Alarcon, FONTAGRO
  Jorge Kondo López, FONTAGRO, Mexico
  Ahmadou Ndiaye, OCLALAV
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• **Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)**

Ann Waters-Bayer, FUE, Germany
Cecile Broutin, GRET, Dakar
Jean Marc von der Weid, AS-PTA, Brazil

• **Farmer Organisations**

David King, IFAP, Paris
Rafael Alegria, Via Campesina
Michael Kunz

**The Private Sector**

Mariko Siby, UCODAL, Mali
Bye Malleh Wadda, Hellam Ltd., The Gambia

• **Advanced Research Institutions (ARIs)**

Russell Freed, MSU, USA
Joachim von Braun, ZEF, Germany
Hans Herren, ICIPE, Nairobi
Nazmul Haq, ICUC, UK
Eric Craswell, IBSRAM
Gil Shepherd, ODI
John Farrington, ODI
Alain de Janvry, UCB
Jeremy Stickings, NRI, UK
William Masterton, Purdue University, Mali
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