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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>EXPANSION</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>AARINENA-RAIS</td>
<td>AARINENA Regional Agricultural Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACDEP</td>
<td>Association of Church Development Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>African, Caribbean and Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAF/Gallé</td>
<td>Association pour le Développent des Activités de Production et de Formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRIS</td>
<td>International Information System on Agricultural Sciences and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri-SMEs</td>
<td>Agro-based Small and Medium-sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGST</td>
<td>Agricultural and Food Engineering Technologies Service (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMU</td>
<td>Arab Maghreb Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGOC</td>
<td>Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSAD</td>
<td>Arab Network for Sustainable Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAARI</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARIS</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Agricultural Research Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCAM</td>
<td>Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d'Agriculture du Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Associate Professional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARD</td>
<td>Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>Advanced Research Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARS/USDA</td>
<td>Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASARECA</td>
<td>Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTT</td>
<td>Agricultural Society of Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABI</td>
<td>CAB International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Central Asia and the Caucasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Common Agricultural Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARBAP</td>
<td>Centre Africain de Recherches sur Bananiers et Plantains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Commodity Chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE-CAC</td>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe / Central Asia and the Caucasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN-SAD</td>
<td>Community of Sahel - Saharan States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR</td>
<td>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIED</td>
<td>Centro de Investigación, Educación y Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRAD</td>
<td>Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNFR</td>
<td>Comisión Nacional de Fomento Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPA</td>
<td>Comité des Organisations Professionnelles Agricoles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORAF</td>
<td>Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développment Agricoles (see WECARD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPs</td>
<td>Challenge Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWANA</td>
<td>Central &amp; West Asia and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBSA</td>
<td>Development Bank of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC</td>
<td>Direct sowing, Mulch-based systems and Conservation agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBO</td>
<td>EGFAR Back Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECART</td>
<td>European Consortium on Agricultural Research for the Tropics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECASARD</td>
<td>Ecumenical Association for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of Central African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDPM</td>
<td>European Centre for Development Policy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOG</td>
<td>Economic and Social Council of the UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</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 for Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARD-Infosys+</td>
<td>European Agricultural Research for Development Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBRAPA</td>
<td>Empresa Brasileña de Pesquisa Agropecuaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDA-TM</td>
<td>Environmental Development Action in the Third World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>European Research Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSD</td>
<td>Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development network (World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARA</td>
<td>Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIOCRUZ</td>
<td>Fundação Oswaldo Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONTAGRO</td>
<td>Fondo Regional de Tecnología Agropecuaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORAGRO</td>
<td>Foro Regional de Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOs</td>
<td>Farmers' Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Global Forum on Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKP</td>
<td>Global Knowledge Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL.RAIS</td>
<td>Global Alliance of the Regional Agricultural Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMOs</td>
<td>Genetically Modified Organisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPPs</td>
<td>Global Partnership Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRET</td>
<td>Groupe de Recherche et d’Echanges Technologiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>Genetic Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM&amp;B</td>
<td>Genetic Resources Management and Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSV</td>
<td>Global Shared Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAPAR</td>
<td>Instituto Agronômico do Paraná</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCs</td>
<td>International Agricultural Research Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM</td>
<td>Information and Communication Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
<td>International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUC</td>
<td>International Centre for Underutilized Crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>International Development Research Centre</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>IFPRI</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFSA</td>
<td>International Farming System Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Authority on Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIRR</td>
<td>International Institute of Rural Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>International Livestock Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOTEC</td>
<td>Sistema de Información Científica y Tecnológica del Sector Agropecuario en las Américas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INIBAP</td>
<td>International Network for the Improvement of Banana and Plantain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRM</td>
<td>Integrated Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>International Plant Genetic Resources Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>Intellectual Property Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>Integrated Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iSC</td>
<td>interim Science Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>International Service for National Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRA</td>
<td>Institut Sénégalais de Recherche Agricole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>International Trypanotolerance Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-PGRFA</td>
<td>International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARI</td>
<td>Kenya Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABEX</td>
<td>Laboratório Virtual da Embrapa no Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>Less Developed Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAELA</td>
<td>Movimiento Agroecológico para Latinoamérica y el Caribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFAR</td>
<td>North American Forum on Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARI</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARO</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURA</td>
<td>Network of European Agricultural and Tropically and Subtropically oriented Universities and Scientific Complexes Related with Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM&amp;AE</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management and Agro-Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU</td>
<td>Organisation of African Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC</td>
<td>Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAR Group</td>
<td>Participatory Education, Awareness and Resources Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM</td>
<td>Participatory Ecological Land-Use Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhAction</td>
<td>Post-harvest Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;ID</td>
<td>Policies Management and Institutional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoW</td>
<td>Plan of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCIANDINO</td>
<td>Programa Cooperativo de Investigación Tecnológica para la Región Andina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCICARIBE</td>
<td>Caribbean Agricultural Science and Technology System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCINORTE</td>
<td>Programa Cooperativo de Investigación Agrícola para la Región Norte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCIs</td>
<td>Programas Cooperativos de Investigación y Transferencia de Tecnología Agrícola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCISUR</td>
<td>Programa Cooperativo para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario del Cono Sur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCITROPICOS</td>
<td>Programa Cooperativo de Investigación y Transferencia de Tecnología de los Trópicos Suramericanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROLINNOVA</td>
<td>Promotion of Local Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMusa</td>
<td>Global Programme for Musa Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>Question and Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIS</td>
<td>Regional Agricultural Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>Regional Economic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Regional Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKS &amp; IP</td>
<td>Rural Knowledge Systems and Innovation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Regional Priority-Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>Research and Technology Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUN</td>
<td>Rural Universe Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACAU</td>
<td>Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCAR</td>
<td>Southern African Center for Cooperation in Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARD</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARD-FSE</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development - Farming Systems Evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAR</td>
<td>Rural Institutions and Participation Service (FAO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEAFAR-CARD South East Asian Forum on Agricultural Research - Centre for an Agricultural Research Database
SEARCA South East Asian Regional Center for Graduated Study and Research in Agriculture
SEUR Sub-regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe (FAO)
SICTA Sistema de Integración Centroamericano de Tecnología Agrícola
SMEs Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
SMS Short Message Service
SPS Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards (WTO)
SRF Sub-Regional Forum
SWOT Strength-Weakness-Opportunities-Threats
UN United Nations
UNDP United Nations Development Program
UNEP United Nations Environment Program
UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
WAICENT World Agricultural Information Centre (FAO)
WANA West Asia and North Africa
WAP Wireless Application Protocol
WARDA The African Rice Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WECANPAR</td>
<td>West and Central African Network for the Promotion of Participatory Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WECARD</td>
<td>West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development (see CORAF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEHAB</td>
<td>Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFS-fyl</td>
<td>World Food Summit-five years later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSD</td>
<td>World Summit on Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML</td>
<td>Extensible Markup Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZADI</td>
<td>Zentrale für Agrardokumentation und Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The theme of the Second Triennial Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) Conference held in Dakar, Senegal, 22-24 May 2003 (GFAR 2003) was Linking Research and Rural Innovation to Sustainable Development. It was a very appropriate theme given the current global focus and attention on sustainable development issues as well as increased research interest in innovation processes. The goal of the conference was to review achievements and take stock of lessons learned during the current triennium (2000-2003), and to identify new and emerging global issues, threats and opportunities of relevance to Agricultural Research for Development (ARD). The outcomes of both exercises were used to develop a framework for ARD activities required to alleviate the threats and build on the opportunities. Approximately 400 participants, representing the seven recognized stakeholder groups of GFAR from all regions of the world contributed towards addressing the above goal through active participation in the various sessions, side events and activities of the conference.

An innovative feature of GFAR 2003 was the two-day pre-conference workshop of civil society organizations (CSOs). One of the objectives of this workshop was to give the CSOs ample time and opportunity to debate and refine their vision of sustainable agriculture, so that they could identify issues of importance to be addressed by the GFAR family, and to develop strategies to actively participate in GFAR 2003.

The President of Senegal, Maitre Abdoulaye Wade, who presided over the opening session, emphasized his deep conviction of the relevance and important place of agricultural research in development, thanks to ample demonstration from the Senegalese national agricultural research institute (ISRA). However, he cautioned that such research must show tangible impact on targeted communities. Representatives of Canada, Italy, the European Commission, FAO and CSOs as well as the
GFAR Chair also acknowledged the central role of research which they also pointed out must be demand-driven, hence the importance of the partnership concept espoused by GFAR. Without exception, all speakers acknowledged the value-added approach of GFAR built on strategic partnerships for ARD.

In order to fully address the goals of the conference, important topics and themes for reflection were provided during the keynote address session chaired by Louise Fresco, Assistant Director General of FAO. Following her introductory remark, Mohammad Roozitalab, the Chair of GFAR, delivered the first formal presentation of GFAR 2003. This was followed by two keynote addresses, the first by Ian Johnson, Vice-President of the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development (ESSD) network of the World Bank, on Outcomes of the Summits and their Implications for Agriculture, and the second by Wiseman Nkulhu, Chair of the NEPAD Steering Committee, on Emerging Global Issues in Sustainable Development and the Response of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD initiative). The two addresses identified new and emerging issues of relevance for ARD and were complemented by a report on the implementation of the GFAR business plan by the GFAR Executive Secretary, Olanrewaju Smith, entitled From Dresden to Dakar: Achievements, Gaps and the Way Forward. The presentation of the business plan summarized past lessons for future use, and was chaired by Kanayo Nwanze, the Director General of WARDA.

The subsequent activities and side events were designed with an eye on the conference goal and expected outputs. First, was a poster session followed by a panel discussion on successful cases of partnerships in ARD. A ten-person panel composed of representatives from GFAR stakeholders groups as well as the general audience were presented with two case studies selected by the GFAR Secretariat after a well-advertised call for proposals. They had the opportunity to discuss and identify essential elements for successful ARD partnerships. Five parallel sub-plenary sessions on global and inter-regional
partnership programs constituted the second set of activities, and continued the debate on partnership issues with a focus on specific topics of research for development which stakeholders could jointly implement. These sub-plenary sessions provided a singular opportunity to strengthen old partnerships, as well as to develop and build new ones around issues of common interest to GFAR stakeholders and of relevance to ARD. Lastly, three side events were organized on the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) regional priority-setting exercise, a global agenda for information communication management (ICM), and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IT-PGRFA) and the Global Conservation Trust.

Periodically throughout the conference participants were divided into homogeneous groups along stakeholder lines or heterogeneous groups in roundtables. Armed with the inputs from various sources, their own experiences, expectations and group interests, participants were given the opportunity to deliberate, brainstorm, exchange views and formulate recommendations, conclusions and guidelines that could be used to design a business plan for the next triennium.

The full and original text of all the presentations made during the various sessions of the meeting including the pre-GFAR 2003 CSO consultation, side events and poster sessions are available on line at www.egfar.org/gfar2003.
PRE-GFAR 2003 CSO WORKSHOP

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

In recent years, national governments have reduced their investment and activities in the agricultural and public sectors. This has paved the way for an enhanced and more extensive civil society involvement in activities previously carried out by these sectors, such as delivering social services, promoting grassroots development, and preventing environmental degradation. It has also resulted in an upsurge in establishment of CSOs, associations and federations with an increased capacity to engage people at the grassroots level. They are intricately involved in the production of public goods and services at the national, regional and global levels.

CSOs play a fundamental role in natural resource management by supporting local innovation, agricultural extension and development, education, and providing health services. They are also increasingly building networks and consortia around thematic and/or geographic interests to increase their impact through the exchange of ideas and information as well as in mobilizing grassroots support.

In the context of research priority-setting, the involvement of farmers and NGOs must be facilitated to ensure that the research agenda is responsive to the needs of the community. This calls for a more proactive CSO involvement in identifying approaches and models for specific development activities, drawing on their close knowledge of local communities and their needs. It is essential to provide opportunities to support citizen participation in advancing research-extension linkages.

It is thus important to ensure that civil society actors participate effectively in ARD at the national and inter-regional levels to ensure that their involvement is widespread and taken into consideration by decision-making bodies at these levels.
levels. This was one of the basic purposes for which the GFAR was established in 1996.

GFAR: FACILITATING THE PARTICIPATION OF NGOS AND FOS IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT

GFAR provides a common meeting place in which all stakeholder constituencies in ARD can participate and bring together their comparative advantages in the research and development process. As such, one of the mandates given to GFAR is precisely to facilitate the strengthening of stakeholder constituencies to ensure equal participation and involvement in various opportunities in ARD. The first GFAR external review conducted in 2000 highlighted the importance of this function:

“A key responsibility of the GFAR Secretariat is to assist stakeholders to further develop their constituencies. This is especially true for Farmers’ Organizations, 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.”

The GFAR external review recommended that both these stakeholder constituencies continue to receive special assistance so as to strengthen their representation in GFAR. With support, FOs and NGOs can be better involved in national agricultural research. This clearly contributes to facilitating the transitions from National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs) to National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS), i.e. from state-led national agricultural research institutions to more open research systems where other stakeholders such as extension services, NGOs and FOs are involved.

---

The GFAR Secretariat has been working in close collaboration with CSOs in order to develop strategies to strengthen their capacity as effective stakeholders in ARD as well as representational mechanisms in decision-making bodies of ARD at the national, regional and global levels.

Pursuing these objectives improves the ability of NGOs and FOs to contribute to setting national and regional agendas. It will enable them to: (1) make their voices heard; (2) stimulate dialogue and reflection amongst themselves and with other stakeholders; (3) give them opportunities to determine roles and responsibilities; and (4) increase their capacity to propose and launch their own initiatives.

OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The Pre-GFAR 2003 CSO Workshop was designed to provide an opportunity for CSOs to meet, discuss and exchange information on important developments in ARD. The workshop served as a means to further the shared goals of: (1) supporting CSO capacity-building; (2) improving communication within and among themselves; (3) enabling them to foster the development of their own mandates and strategic agendas; and (4) enabling them to determine mechanisms for better CSO representation in various governance and decision-making bodies at all levels.

More specifically, NGOs and FOs were given the opportunity to further refine their vision of ARD as distinct groups. NGOs and farmers were asked to reflect upon their distinct roles and responsibilities as well as the present mechanisms for representation. They were also asked to identify relevant ARD issues to be addressed at the conference by other stakeholder groups.

The expected outputs were: (1) an NGO and an FO vision statement of ARD and strategies to attain their vision; (2) articulation of the mandate of NGOs and FOs; (3) proposed mechanisms for better CSO representation; and (4)
prioritization of critical ARD issues for more focused attention by GFAR.

**WORKSHOP PROCESS**

The workshop was formally opened by GFAR Executive Secretary, Olanrewaju Smith, who gave an overview of GFAR, its history and structure. It was followed by statements from Chebet Maikut from the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) and Mariam Jorjadze from ELKANA - Biological Farming Association, FO and NGO representatives to GFAR Steering Committee, respectively. Samuel Bruce-Oliver and Oliver Oliveros from the GFAR Secretariat presented overviews of (1) the GFAR 2003 conference; and (2) the workshop, outlining the objectives and expected outputs.

The workshop was attended by 33 NGO and 15 FO participants from 37 countries representing all regions. The overall format of the two-day workshop was that of an initial presentation from NGOs and from FOs followed by a plenary discussion, followed by working group sessions, and then finally presentations of the conclusions and a discussion of the results in plenary. The first of two plenary sessions focused on issues and challenges to CSO engagement in ARD and the second on articulating an NGO and FO vision and identifying strategies to attain this vision.

In the first plenary session, presentations were made by Clive Lightfoot of the International Farming Systems Association (IFSA) as well as by Patrick Mulvany and Monica Kapiriri of the CGIAR NGO Committee and Aga Khan Foundation, respectively. It was followed by a 30-minute open forum to set the tone of discussion around issues related to consolidating the CSO constituencies. Participants then grouped themselves by region to deepen discussion and to share their experiences on CSO engagement in the ARD process in their region, guided by a set of questions proposed by IFSA.
In the morning of the second day brief statements were made on behalf of farmers and NGOs by David King (IFAP) and Fred Kafeero (Environmental Alert) respectively, on elements that should be considered in the subsequent deliberations in separate stakeholder groups on: (1) their vision statement; (2) factors influencing CSO engagement in ARD and proposed strategies to address challenges related to their engagement in the ARD process; and (3) mechanisms for CSO representation in various governance and decision/policy-making bodies.

WORKSHOP RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

EXPERIENCES IN BUILDING-UP THE CSO CONSTITUENCY AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL

In the afternoon of the first day, participants grouped themselves by region to discuss and share their experience in building up the CSO constituency within their respective regions. The discussion was guided by a set of questions from the presentation made by IFSA. They shared experiences and discussed issues related to four main themes: (1) CSO engagement with research and extension services at the local level; (2) CSO engagement with agricultural research policy fora; (3) organizing the CSO constituency; and (4) facilitating communication among CSOs.

Asia-Pacific

Amidst increasing poverty and degradation of the environment in the region, there needs to be a research agenda that provides a stronger focus on poverty reduction and household food security; emphasizes biodiversity, ecological protection and natural resource management; addresses issues related to management of commons and the growing concern over conflicts over resources. This agenda presupposes a paradigm shift in which research should be undertaken. The shift calls for participatory action research, promotes blending of holistic with technical perspectives (e.g. integration of social with technical science). Of equal importance is to subject
research into field relevance, recognizing that research should be a medium of empowerment and mediation.

There is a need to better organize the Asian CSO constituency in order to improve representation in various decision-making bodies and fora. In past decades, there has been an upsurge in the number of NGOs and this has led to competition amongst themselves (e.g. in mobilizing resources). It also makes consensus building more difficult among CSOs due to diversity of perspectives and interests. This necessitates the importance of improving the skills of CSOs in this respect. Additionally, it is sometimes difficult to identify which NGOs are truly representative and which are merely working for their own interest, thus the need to implement measures to ensure accountability.

Another important step to facilitate and systematize CSO engagement in policy dialogues is to conduct an inventory of initiatives and mechanisms involving CSOs in the region in order to have a clear picture of CSO activities, thematic focus and geographic coverage. It is strategically expedient to identify and build upon existing CSO networks in order to tap into the progress already made.

However, some NGOs and farmers groups are reluctant to collaborate with other stakeholders and there appears to be a mutual hesitancy to share openly. CSOs should recognize the varying viewpoints from other stakeholders, be more open to multiple channels, and forge partnerships that are more inclusive, notwithstanding differences in opinion and preferences. There is a need to break through these barriers and build bridges, formally and informally, among various development actors and maintain policy discussion platforms among stakeholders.

It is likewise important to reinforce grassroots-based activities that focus on addressing human behaviors to bring about lasting change, move beyond polemical discussions, and work towards improving the livelihood of small farmers as agriculture is dependent on their own survival.
Some of the concerns expressed by participants from the Asia-Pacific region are:

- governmental policies that impact on farmers’ rights and interests
- creation of an enabling environment that will promote innovations as well as linkages between on-farm research and extension processes
- opening up of research institutes to involve non-traditional researchers such as extension workers, the private sector, farmers and NGOs
- promotion of the participatory research processes and its integration into the education system
- dissemination of successful practices and scaling-up of successful approaches
- research on natural resource management
- research on research approaches
- need for land reforms and tenurial security.

Central Asia and the Caucasus

The Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC) region has traditionally been agriculture-based, with agricultural research conducted in a highly centralized, isolated manner, characterized by a high degree of specialization. With the majority of the population in rural areas, the agriculture sector remains the main source for employment.

The post-Soviet transition presented many challenges for the agriculture sector. Today, advancement of this sector is hampered by continuing deterioration of the natural environment as a result of ineffective and inappropriate use, slow reform in the agrarian sector and the influx of imported goods in the domestic market. Infrastructures are collapsing, thus forcing scientists and researchers to migrate to other countries. The agricultural knowledge in this region is under
serious threat of loss. As well, there is a lack of coherent and systematic planning and management of agricultural systems. This is aggravated by lack of experience, expertise and knowledge of recent advances in agriculture. The tendency for people to be dependent on humanitarian aid is a self-perpetuating cycle of poverty that has a foothold in this region.

The current situation in the region has paved the way for the emergence of a strong NGO sector. NGOs are presently working towards creation of local fora and in assisting small farmers who constitute the majority of the rural labor force. However, there is a lack of coordination among NGOs in the region.

Some of the concerns expressed by participants from the CAC region are:

- capacity-building activities among all actors at all levels in the region
- creation of farmers’ unions/associations
- empowerment of small farmers
- effective agricultural extension services
- improvement of communications technology and networking.

**Latin America and the Caribbean**

Presently the relationships between CSOs and both researchers and policy-makers are rather weak. Many research centres do not value the input of NGOs and farmers and often offer only a perfunctory endorsement of their views on research activities. One suggested strategy to increase farmer legitimacy in the eyes of research centres is to improve the quality of development proposals by farmers.

In the past, research demand has mainly been driven by market demands, which is not necessarily in the best interest of farmers. While the demands of the market are important, issues related to poverty, environment, food sovereignty and
sustainability must be factored in. Above all, the impetus for agricultural research activities needs to originate from farmers themselves using a bottom-up process.

A historically weak political lobby has limited the control that farmers have in directing the course of ARD. In order to strengthen the influence of CSOs they need to first build stronger relationships between farmers and NGOs with better-articulated roles and responsibilities. The mobilization of public support will also assist in advancing the vision and agenda of farmers.

Farmers and NGOs are complementary stakeholders, but are nonetheless distinct groups in terms of their roles and responsibilities, composition and structure, agendas and mandates. Furthermore, the great diversity of agendas and players within each group also needs to be acknowledged, validated and incorporated in the overall vision and mandate of both farmers and NGOs.

Strengthening the capacity of NGOs and especially of farmers to engage in policy debates, including political lobbying, as well as mobilizing public support are critical in advancing the vision and agenda of farmers in ARD.

Some of the concerns expressed by participants from the Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC) region are:

- capacity-building of farmers, especially in the areas of training, organizational management, and information and technology
- strengthening of the political lobby
- integrating research, extension and farmers
- development of agricultural services for small producers
- micro-credit programs for farmers
- better representation of farmers in decision-making bodies at all levels.
Sub-Saharan Africa

In the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) region, a number of national and regional NGOs and FOs exist; some are commodity-based while others are umbrella organizations whose membership goes beyond national borders. Generally, there are more active networks established in eastern, central and southern Africa, e.g. PELUM (Participatory Ecological Land-Use Management) Association. In West and Central Africa, the West and Central African Network of CSOs for the Promotion of Participatory Agricultural Research (WECANPAR) was formed in October 2002 to serve as a platform for discussion among CSOs in the sub-region. However, there is limited cooperation and communication among them.

Likewise, CSO engagement in various policy fora is not systematic and is often achieved only by invitation from fora or workshop organizers. This obviously has implications in terms of legitimacy and ownership of CSO participation in determining ARD agenda, focus and scope. It is thus important to boost networking among existing organizations in the region to enhance awareness of each other’s activities. This is deemed particularly useful in forging collaboration and building synergy, which naturally contributes to realizing a shared vision on ARD.

Notwithstanding efforts aimed at linking CSOs involved in ARD in the region, a truly multistakeholder African forum/platform is lacking as no effective dialogue among African NGOs and FOs is taking place to date. Such a platform can serve as an interface not only between NGOs and FOs but also with other stakeholders in the (sub-)region. There is also a need to work towards enhancing existing FOs and NGOs and promoting the involvement of all stakeholders in priority-setting, decision-making and planning of research and technology activities.

Improved communication and capacity-building activities among CSOs is key in order to maximize the potential human resources and expertise available in the region. Building a
strong alliance focused on common ground rather than areas of divergence is the way to move forward.

Some of the concerns expressed by participants from the SSA region are:

- enhancement of existing effective CSOs rather than creation of new bodies
- legitimacy and ownership of organizations
- promotion of CSO involvement in priority-setting, planning and decision-making
- construction of alliances among CSOs based on commonalities
- dissemination of success stories to farmers.

**West Asia and North Africa**

In the West Asia and North Africa (WANA) region, NGO and FO representation in institutions involved in ARD at the country level is insufficient. Encouragingly, in the last decade governments in such countries as Libya, Tunisia and Morocco have started to recognize the importance of engaging CSOs in the formulation and implementation of agricultural policies. However, CSO engagement in ARD has yet to be fully adopted as public funds are not sufficient to allow a more engaging process between governments and CSOs.

While public research is working towards addressing national agricultural concerns, it does not always respond to the priority needs of the farmers. Sufficient funding for research and the dissemination of research results need to be greatly improved. NGOs are also hindered by minimal resources to carry out their activities and maintain their core staff.

Given the above situation, CSOs are calling on their respective governments to put in place mechanisms to improve CSO representation in various decision-making bodies in ARD to a significant level. There is a recognized need to lobby for increased public expenditure in ARD. To be able to do this,
farmers and NGOs will first have to: (1) organize themselves as a constituency group in a transparent manner and should carry out their activities in accordance with their respective national laws; (2) coordinate their activities with other ARD stakeholders to maximize resources for greater impact; and (3) build their capacity in the areas of negotiation, communication and leadership capacities, to enable them to establish partnerships with various actors in ARD.

The need for FOs and NGOs to be open and engage in a fruitful dialogue with governments and other actors and build mutual trust and confidence is important in fostering partnerships. FOs and NGOs should coordinate their efforts with governments and local development councils to voice complaints and recommendations regarding research and extension. Toward this end, interactive meetings, workshops and joint learning activities should be organized for the stakeholders to learn from each other, share experiences and discuss priority ARD issues in a participatory manner. The importance of a bottom-up participatory process is critical for the identification of research priorities.

Some of the concerns expressed by participants from the WANA region are:

- capacity-building activities, including enhancing negotiation, communication and leadership skills
- promotion of contract research
- mobilizing researchers and encouraging them to meet farmers’ needs
- strengthening the FO constituency and addressing the issue of their representation and involvement in scientific research
- private sector involvement in agricultural research and extension
- improvement of information and communications technology
• facilitating involvement and training of students in agriculture as well as fostering linkages with researchers, extension workers and teachers.

FARMERS’ ORGANIZATION REPORT

Farmers’ Vision of Agricultural Research for Development

The vision of farmers for ARD is to create a world free from hunger, a world free from poverty and a world where natural resources are managed in a sustainable way. This is a vision that requires a public policy approach and cannot be determined only by the free play of market forces.

Farmers have a central role in realizing the objective of food security, poverty elimination and sustainable management of natural resources, and are indeed motivated to meet these challenges.

Factors Influencing FO Engagement in Agricultural Research for Development

Structure

Farmers need to be considered as equal partners in the development process, along with governments, NGOs, the private sector and other civil society partners. At present, however, farmers are unequal partners. Millions of farmers throughout the world do not have a voice in decisions that affect their lives, including those decisions in the area of ARD.

Therefore, a key demand of the farmers’ groups is that farmers be represented in the decision-making bodies that establish priorities for agricultural research. Farmers should be represented in the governing structures of agricultural research centres, networks and platforms at all levels - community level, national centres, regional and sub-regional networks, IARCs and the international centres of the CGIAR.

It is crucial that farmer representation be done through FOs for legitimacy of the input of farmers. Farmer representatives must be credible and accountable to the people they represent.
The involvement of farmers in setting research priorities is important to ensure a demand-driven agenda for agricultural research, and to avoid farmers simply validating the agenda of researchers. Involvement of farmers is also important to balance the influence of multinational companies who may direct the research agenda in their own commercial interests.

**Partnership**

Effective participation of farmers in research institutions, platforms and networks requires that farmers be organized. It is therefore essential to establish partnerships to build the capacity of FOs. Farmers must be able to express their needs effectively and to do so they must have analytical capacity and leadership skills. If farmers do not have the capacity to contribute in a significant way to research priority-setting, implementation and monitoring, then it is only false participation.

NGOs are valued partners in the capacity-building of FOs. However, in order to secure the sustainability of partnerships, the role and mission of each partner must be defined clearly. The role of FOs is to represent the views of their members on policy issues. The role of their NGO partners is one of facilitation and advice. On policy questions the farmers must speak for themselves.

A principal need of farmers is to link extension services to research. In many countries, governments are no longer providing adequate extension services to farmers and it is becoming the role of FOs to take over these responsibilities for their members. Partnerships are required for the development of such extension services, including farmer field schools, research-user platforms and public/private research centres.

GFAR is a strategic platform where farmers can coordinate with research institutions and other stakeholders at all levels in order to share knowledge, information and new technologies. Farmers should seek ways to actively engage with GFAR in order to benefit from its comparative advantage.
The media should also be embraced as a partner for FOs, communicating views and information from farmers to other groups as well as to the general public. Television, radio and print provide an easy, cost-effective method for promoting and sharing the view of farmers to other stakeholders in ARD and the larger community as a whole.

Government is an essential partner for farmers in the area of agricultural research. Public funding of research is essential to ensure that knowledge remains within the public domain. Farmers are disappointed with the decline in public funding for research, and call on GFAR to join them in advocating the reversal of this decline.

Governments also provide an enabling environment or policy framework within which agricultural research and development takes place. For farmers, it is critical that government policy be coherent, stable and facilitate the development of agriculture in the areas of taxation, land or credit policy, among others. For example, technology will not reach the farmer without credit for technology transfer. However, funding of FOs must be channeled directly to the target group. When channeled through national governments, much of the funding does not actually reach the intended recipients, the farmers.

At the international level, trade policy is important for the development of agriculture in a global and more liberal market environment. Developing countries should be able to protect their agriculture against the dumping of subsidized farm products in their countries and from other negative effects of liberalization that disrupt their local markets.

*Types of research*

Since small-scale farmers make up the vast majority of farmers in the world, agricultural research and development must focus on their needs. Research should seek to improve the livelihoods of farmers and be adapted to their needs. It should build on local knowledge, and add value to local resources.
Farmers are innovators, researchers develop new tools. We need to bring the two closer together.

Research programs should be conceived with a long-term perspective of at least ten years. Furthermore, these research programs should be linked to the vision of the type of agriculture society wants to promote, i.e. what type of research for what type of agriculture?

**Strategies to Attain Vision on Agricultural Research for Development: Recommendations for GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006**

Farmers consider the following priorities critical to the attainment of the vision and addressing the challenges in ARD. They are based on a demand-driven agenda centred on the needs of small farmers. At GFAR 2003 the FO constituency requested that these priorities be included in the GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006. Broadly, they fall into five categories: advocacy and representation, capacity-building, information dissemination, sub-regional activities, and new research areas.

GFAR should actively promote farmer representation in policy-making bodies related to agricultural research, and in the governance structures of national agricultural research institutes, sub-regional and regional networks, and the individual centres of the CGIAR system. To ensure accountability, these representatives should be named by national FOs and international networks. The establishment of a *farmers’ desk* in agricultural research centres and research networks at all levels would provide farmers with a direct entry point into research bodies by which they may address their concerns. The decline in public funding for ARD is another serious concern of farmers and GFAR should advocate a reversal in this decline. GFAR should also lobby all national governments to ratify the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, which grants farmers’ rights, benefit-sharing and protection of indigenous knowledge.
Capacity-building is among the activities that GFAR should feature predominantly in the GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006. The four areas on which GFAR should concentrate on are: (1) leadership training; (2) advocacy and policy representation; (3) information and communications technology (ICT); and (4) extension services including farmer field schools, research centres funded through public/private partnerships, and research-user platforms.

Another aspect that GFAR should focus more attention on is facilitating effective dissemination of information to FOs, including information on developments in modern biotechnologies. This is crucial for farmers to be well informed on the latest developments in ARD and will aid in the networking of FOs.

At the sub-regional level, the next GFAR business plan should include an increased coordination of the activities of national research institutes in addition to exchange visits and study tours for farmers so that they may share best practices.

Three specific new and emerging research areas should receive special attention by GFAR: (1) agriculture and energy; (2) evaluation of the impact of globalization on the livelihoods of small farmers in developing countries; and (3) study of the cost to developing countries of meeting health, sanitary, phytosanitary and traceability requirements for exports of food and farm products to the markets of developed countries.

To facilitate the implementation of these strategies, regional focal points were nominated at the workshop (Box 1). These focal points are expected to play the role of intermediary between GFAR and farmers in their respective regions as well as promote dialogue on issues related to ARD.
**BOX 1. GFAR REGIONAL FARMERS’ ORGANIZATION FOCAL POINTS NOMINATED AT THE PRE-GFAR 2003 WORKSHOP**

**FARMERS’ ORGANIZATION REPRESENTATIVES TO GFAR STEERING COMMITTEE**

- Chebet Maikut (principal)  *(until October 2003)*  
  IFAP  
  P.O. Box 6213  
  Kampala, Uganda  
  Tel: +(256) 41 230705  
  Fax: +(256) 41 230748  
  Email: unfa@starcom.co.ug

- Rafael Alegría (alternate)  *(until October 2003)*  
  Vía Campesina  
  Colonia Alameda, 11 Avenida (Alfonso Guillén Zelaya), entre 3 y 4 Calles, Casa 2025,  
  Apartado Posta 3628  
  Tegucigalpa, M.D.C., Honduras  
  Tel: +(504) 2359915  
  Fax: +(504) 2359915 - 2322198  
  Email: viacam@gbm.hn

**SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: FARA**

**REGIONAL: FARA**

- None as of today

**SUB-REGIONAL: ASARECA**

- Mercy Karanga  
  East African Farmers’ Union  
  Family Health Plaza  
  Mbagathi Way, Off Langat Road  
  P.O. Box 43148  
  00100 Nairobi, Kenya  
  Tel: +(254) 2 608324  
  Fax: +(254) 2 608325  
  Email: knfu@arcc.or.ke
SUB-REGIONAL: CORAF/WECARD

- N’Diogou Fall  *(to be confirmed)*
  Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs (ROPPA)
  B.P. 269
  Thies, Dakar, Senegal
  Tel: +(221) 951 1237
  Fax: +(221) 951 2059
  Email: fongs@sentoo.sn

- Sekou Omar Tall  *(to be confirmed)*
  Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d’Agriculture du Mali (APCAM)
  B.P. 855, Bamako, Mali
  Tel: +(223) 21 87 25
  Fax: +(223) 21 87 37
  Email: apcam@malinet.ml

SUB-REGIONAL: SACCAR

- Ajay Vashee
  Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU)
  P.O. Box 30395
  Lusaka, Zambia
  Tel: +(261) 1 252649
  Fax: +(260) 1 252648
  Email: znfu@zamnet.zn

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE / CENTRAL ASIA AND THE CAUCASUS: CEE–CAC

REGIONAL CEE–CAC

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: CAC

- Ferdinand Grigorian
  Satsil - Association of Seed Producers
  art. 214 str. Tigran Mers, 21
  Vanadzor 377200, Armenia
  Email: satSil_fg@hotmail.com

SUB-REGIONAL: CEE

- Christophe Hémard  *(to be confirmed)*
  Confédération Européenne de l’Agriculture
rue de la Science 23/25, boîte 23
B-1040 Bruxelles, Belgium
Tel: +(32) 2 230 43 80
Fax: +(32) 2 230 46 77
Email: cea@pophost.eunet.be

EUROPE: EFARD
REGIONAL: EFARD
- Franz Josef Feiter  *(to be confirmed)*
  Comité des Organisations Professionnelles Agricoles (COPA)
  23-25, rue de la Science, Bte 3
  B-1040 Bruxelles, Belgium
  Tel: +(32) 2 287 27 11
  Fax: +(32) 2 287 27 00
  Email: shelby.matthews@copa-cogeca.be

WESTERN ASIA AND NORTH AFRICA: AARINENA
REGIONAL: AARINENA
- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: ARAB PENINSULA
- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: MAGHREB
- Ezzaddine Ben Mustapha
  Union Tunisienne de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche
  rue Alain Savary
  Tunis 1003, Tunisia
  Tel: +(216) 71 796 140
  Fax: +(216) 71 797 292
  Email: utap.tunis@mail.ati.tn

SUB-REGIONAL: MASHREQ
- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: NILE VALLEY & RED SEA
- Mohamed Idris  *(to be confirmed)*
  Central Agricultural Cooperative Union
SUB-REGIONAL: WESTERN ASIA
• Bekir Genc  (to be confirmed)
TZOB

ASIA–PACIFIC: APAARI

REGIONAL: APAARI
• none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: EAST ASIA
• none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: SOUTH-EAST ASIA
• Raul Montemeyer  (to be confirmed)
Federation of Free Farmers
41 Highland Drive, Blue Ridge
Quezon City 1109, Philippines
Tel: +(63) 2 931 5773
Fax: +(63) 2 931 5773
Email: freefarm@mozcom.com

SUB-REGIONAL: SOUTH ASIA
• Bhupinder Singh Mann
Kisan Coordination Committee
Angar Mala , Post. Ambethan, Tal-Khed
Distt. Pune 410 501, India
Tel: +(91) 2135 252354 / 25295
Fax: +(91) 2135 252354
Email: gurpartap@hotmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL: PACIFIC ISLANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Jagannath Sami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Cane Growers Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Floor, Cane Growers Building, 75 Drac Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 3848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautoka, Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: +(679) 665 0466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +(679) 665 0624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:jsami@fsc.com.fj">jsami@fsc.com.fj</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: FORAGRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL: FORAGRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• none as of today</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL: PROCIANDINO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• none as of today</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL: PROCICARIBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Wendy Lee Yuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Society of Trinidad and Tobago (ASTT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 A Pembroke Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port-of-Spain, Trinidad W. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: +(1868) 627 3087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +(1868) 623 7797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:leeyuen@tstt.net.tt">leeyuen@tstt.net.tt</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL: PROCITROPICOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• none as of today</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL: PROCISUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cristian Pavez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asociación Nacional de Fomento Empresarial de Organizaciones Campesinas (Agro Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrano 460, Departamento D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos, Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: +(56) 42 413419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +(56) 42 413419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:agrochileag@123.cl">agrochileag@123.cl</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGO Vision of Agricultural Research for Development

The vision of the NGOs is a future ARD led by small-scale farmers and characterized by (1) a strong focus on household food security and poverty reduction; (2) conservation of biodiversity; (3) sustainable natural resources management; (4) reduced/prevented conflicts over resources; (5) effective and inclusive partnerships; (6) enhanced democratization with particular attention to social and gender equity and empowerment; and (7) enhanced good governance.

The focus on small farms and small-farmer households must remain at the core of the NGO strategy. Any future impact on household food security in rural areas is going to come primarily by bringing about small increases across larger numbers of farmers.

In articulating the vision, the following elements must be considered: (1) significant visibility of the central role of farmers and their influence on ARD which also allows for
mutual learning with multistakeholder groups; (2) an ARD that builds on a shared vision by all stakeholders and on existing practices and knowledge; (3) an ARD that stimulates innovation by farmers and natural resource users, and which integrates local and outside knowledge through research-extension-farmer partnerships; and (4) an agriculture that builds better and stronger mechanisms for multistakeholder partnerships in decision-making on the research agenda.

The definition of small-scale farmers includes crop and mixed farmers, livestock keepers, fisher folk and forest communities. At the same time the multifunctional nature of farming - in terms of ecosystems, production and social services - is recognized.

Factors Influencing NGO Engagement in Agricultural Research for Development

Structure

While NGOs are recognized as important stakeholders in agriculture, criteria still need to be developed to ensure legitimacy, transparency and accountability. Representation of NGOs in governing bodies must be increased while feedback mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure effectiveness of representation.

Existing NGO structures should be examined, and in some cases restructured, in a democratic and participatory manner created and recognized by NGOs themselves. Mechanisms for genuine partnerships in decision-making and sharing of information must be built into governance structures.

The identified strategies for improving the legitimacy of the NGO voice are: (1) involvement in GFAR, CGIAR, etc; (2) seek out and incorporate the mandate of civil/social movements; (3) coordinate with NGOs engaging with United Nations processes at the regional level; and (4) foster the development of democratic NGO networks in ARD at all levels.

The NGO constituency as a whole needs to mobilize itself, particularly at the national level, as well as increase links with
other actors and social movements for advocacy. Successful local initiatives must be scaled up and advocated to research institutions to serve as a model for new projects, partnerships or innovations.

The direction of ARD must be driven by the demands of the small-scale farmer, while steps should be taken to ensure inclusiveness, particularly of women, the poor and minority groups. Additionally, it is essential to ensure participation of researchers, extension workers and farmers in a multistakeholder collaboration process, especially at the grassroots level. The end result of this collaboration is that national agricultural research systems will become fully functional systems inclusive of all stakeholders.

Partners

Farmers are at the core of research; nevertheless, farmers cannot work in isolation and partnerships and collaboration among agricultural stakeholders are crucial for a coherent and holistic path towards participatory ARD that is relevant to all those affected. Partnerships can be formed from local to global levels and take many forms. Regardless of the level or form, they must be based on reciprocity and equal interaction by all parties, and be built on mutual trust and learning, as well as on a common vision and methods for working towards that vision. Due consideration of the local situation is vital for forging new and effective partnerships.

There is a need to review and rethink implementation strategies; across the world, civil society is moving away from technology-based, technician-based and centre-based strategies towards farmer-led and people-centred approaches. New opportunities have become available in those countries where local governments have been empowered and where devolution has taken place. The space and potential for partnerships have expanded but such work is not necessarily the easier path, although it is probably the most cost-effective approach to achieve wide impact.
An enabling environment must be fostered that allows for and stimulates innovation by farmers and active multistakeholder learning of farmers’ good practices. This environment includes supportive policies, social recognition and capacity-building.

There exists a wide range of players with which NGOs can forge partnerships, some of whom are already formal stakeholders of GFAR. Identified partners include: facilitating agencies, donors, FOs, research institutes, training and education institutions, governments (federal and local), the private sector, media, intergovernmental agencies, consumers, community-based organizations, networks of NGOs and farmers, etc.

*Types of research*

The challenge of alleviating poverty requires a rethinking of the very role of research itself since many of the conventional approaches will no longer hold. The lack of access to productive assets severely limits choices and decisions about the farmers’ lands, crops and livelihoods. Amidst the growing resource conflicts, agricultural research must now confront and address serious policy questions related to resource reforms, tenurial security and resource management, which impact on the lives of the rural poor.

ARD is a broad topic that comprises multiple research methods performed by a variety of players. Landowners, tenants and landless peasants, small-scale family farmers and small-scale processors both rural and urban, fisher folk, crop producers and livestock farmers among others all make up the patchwork of people involved in farming. Not only do farmers contribute to production, they serve other functions including social services, resource management, training, research and ecosystem services. The future of ARD must be directed by input from these players and others.

Research methods are equally varied; however, particular support should be given to a participatory systems approach, agro-ecosystems and farming systems. Also key is the
promotion of an enabling political, social and economic environment for the less-vocal stakeholders in ARD. In many instances institutional change is a requisite before true progress can be made. At the same time it is important to apply guiding principles that recognize the capacity of local innovation and integrate indigenous knowledge.

Some of the priority issues that have been identified include: good governance management and conflict resolution, institutional change, social capital, market linkages, microfinance, effects of globalization, intellectual property rights, capacity-building and reducing the communication divide.

It is also recommended that the CSO Declaration for Durban, May 2001 be fully endorsed.

**Strategies to Attain Vision on Agricultural Research for Development: Recommendations for GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006**

There is a need for an enhanced social science dimension of ARD. Among the identified research areas which CSOs deem important for GFAR to take into account in formulating the next three-year business plan are:

- support to participatory systems research
- research on governance and management
- institutional change
- conflict resolution over resources
- research on multiple-stakeholder collaboration processes
- inclusion of minority groups in the research process, gender equity and democratization
- market linkages and rural microfinance.

Many extension systems are either being privatized or are decaying from neglect and reduced public funding. Farmer-to-farmer approaches and appropriate social organizations such
as farmer associations may offer the best results. As the conventional systems have failed to protect small farmers, their natural resources and the consumers, more interest is being generated in farmer-to-farmer systems. However, donors and their partners must make investments in alternative systems and capacity-building.

The basic challenge for agricultural research centres is institutional change. With the reduced public spending on public agricultural research, research centres are now forced to raise questions on their continuing relevance, approaches and impact. Research cannot be separated from development questions.

To facilitate the implementation of these strategies, regional focal points were nominated at the workshop (Box 2). These focal points are expected to play the role of intermediary between GFAR and NGOs in their respective regions as well as promote dialogue on issues related to ARD.

**BOX 2. GFAR REGIONAL NGO FOCAL POINTS NOMINATED AT THE PRE-GFAR 2003 WORKSHOP**

**NGO REPRESENTATIVES TO GFAR STEERING COMMITTEE**

- Monica Kapiriri (Principal)
  Aga Khan Foundation
  P.O. Box 125
  Dar-es-Salam, Tanzania
  Tel: +(255) 22 266 7923
  Fax: +256 (22) 266 8527
  Email: mkapiriri@yahoo.co.uk
• Eduardo Sabio (alternate)  
International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)  
Y.C. James Yen Center, Silang  
Cavite, 4118, Philippines  
Tel: +(63) 46 414 2417  
Fax: +(63) 46 414 2420  
Email: Ed.Sabio@iirr.org

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: FARA

REGIONAL: FARA

• Mutizwa Mukute  
Participatory Ecological Land-Use Management (PELUM) Association  
P.O. Box 1059, Mount Pleasant  
No. 4-22nd Avenue,  
Mabelreign-Harare, Zimbabwe  
Tel: +(263) 4 744 509  
Fax: +(263) 4 744 470  
Email: pelum@ecoweb.co.zw

• Assètou Kanoute  
West and Central African Network for the Promotion of Participatory Agricultural Research (WECANPAR)  
c/o ADAF/Galle  
B.P. 3267, Rue Gamal Abdel Nasser, Porte 211, Badalabougou  
Bamako, Mali  
Tel: +(223) 222 00 33  
Email: adafgalle@afribone.net.ml

SUB-REGIONAL: ASARECA

• none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: CORAF/WECARD

• none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: SACCAR

• none as of today
### CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE / CENTRAL ASIA AND THE CAUCASUS: CEE-CAC

#### REGIONAL CEE-CAC
- none as of today

#### SUB-REGIONAL: CAC
- Mariam Jorjadze  
  ELKANA - Biological Farming Association  
  III Delisi Str. Nakveti 16  
  Tbilisi, 0177, Georgia  
  Tel: +(995) 32 536 485  
  Fax: +(995) 32 536 484  
  Email: pr@elkana.org.ge

- Arman Manukyan  
  Agroweb Caucus  
  Orjonikidze 25/36  
  Echmiadzin, 378310, Armenia  
  Tel: +(374) 31 45305  
  Fax: +(374) 31 52651  
  Email: arman.manukyan@agrowebcaucus.org

#### SUB-REGIONAL: CEE
- none as of today

#### EUROPE: EFARD

#### REGIONAL: EFARD
- **CONCORD** *(to be confirmed)*
WESTERN ASIA AND NORTH AFRICA: AARINENA

REGIONAL: AARINENA

- Judeh A. Jamal
  Arab Network for Sustainable Agriculture (ANSAD)
  c/o Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees (PARC)
  P.O. Box 25128 Shu'fat
  Jerusalem, Palestine
  Tel: +(972) 25 833 818
  Fax: +(972) 25 831 898
  Email: judeh@pal-arc.org

- Nabeel Abu-Shriha
  Noor-Al Hussein Foundation
  P.O. Box 926043
  Amman 11190, Jordan
  Tel: +(962) 64 610 140
  Fax: +(962) 65 681 374
  Email: abushriha@mail.com

SUB-REGIONAL: ARAB PENINSULA

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: MAGHREB

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: MASHREQ

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: NILE VALLEY & RED SEA

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: WESTERN ASIA

- none as of today
ASIA–PACIFIC: APAARI

REGIONAL: APAARI

- Nathaniel Don Marquez
  Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC)
  53 Marilag Street, U.P. Village, Diliman
  Quezon City 1103, Philippines
  Tel: +(63) 2 433 7653
  Fax: +(63) 2 9207434
  Email: angoc@angoc.ngo.ph

- Mariut Jatiket
  Attn: Pornkasem Kantamara
  Thai Education Foundation
  28 Piboonwattana 7, Rama VI Road, Sansen Nai, Phayathai
  Bangkok 10300, Thailand
  Tel: +(66) 2 279 1381
  Fax: +(66) 2 279 1381
  Email: thaied@inet.co.th

SUB-REGIONAL: EAST ASIA

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: SOUTH-EAST ASIA

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: SOUTH ASIA

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: PACIFIC ISLANDS

- none as of today
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: FORAGRO

REGIONAL: FORAGRO

- Mario Ahumada  
  Movimiento Agroecológico para Latinoamérica y el Caribe (MAELA)  
  Jackson 900, Turquesa 2, Dpto. 41  
  Viña del Mar, Chile  
  Tel: +(56) 32 673 -064  
  Fax: +(56) 32 504 259  
  Email: maa@ctcreuna.cl

- Romulo Zarauz Chavez  
  Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo (CIED Peru)  
  Buen Retiro 231, Surco  
  Lima, Peru  
  Tel: +(51) 434 2535  
  Fax: +(51) 437 8327  
  Email: romulo@ciedperu.org

SUB-REGIONAL: PROCIANDINO

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: PROCICARIBE

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: PROCITROPICOS

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: PROCISUR

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: SICTA

- none as of today

SUB-REGIONAL: PROCINORTE

- none as of today
NORTH AMERICA: NAFAR
REGIONAL: NAFAR

- Linda Elswick  (to be confirmed)
  International Partners for Sustainable Development
  2100 L Street, NW
  Washington, DC 20037, USA
  Tel: +(1) 202 778 6119
  Fax: +(1) 202 468 9722
  Email: ipsa@igc.org
Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

This is indeed a great pleasure and honor for me as the Chair of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research to welcome all of you distinguished guests and representatives of GFAR constituencies from national, regional and international agricultural research for development communities around the world to the GFAR 2003 conference.

Our special appreciation and profound gratitude are extended to the President of the Republic of Senegal, His Excellency Maitre Abdoulaye Wade, for his kind acceptance of GFAR’s invitation to officially open the conference. Also, I would like to extend our gratitude and sincere thanks to our dear hosts and the Senegalese national organizing committee who welcomed us with open arms and have made excellent arrangements for this important meeting.

After my brief intervention, we will proceed right away with the first keynote address. But before that, allow me, ladies and gentlemen, to look back and reminisce on the birth of what we now call GFAR. The collective effort of a number of visionary and like-minded people representing various regional and international institutions led to the creation of GFAR in October 1996.

In May 2000, the first GFAR conference was held in Dresden, Germany, with the theme of Strengthening Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development in the Context of Globalization. The main highlights of that conference were the adoption of a global shared vision on agricultural research for
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development and the emergence of Global Partnership Programmes (GPPs) on strategic issues.

Madam Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, since the Dresden conference, GFAR has facilitated and supported a number of key activities that provided an enabling environment for a stronger multistakeholder involvement in agricultural research for development by formulating and implementing a three-year business plan. The GFAR Executive Secretary will later on today present an analysis of how well we have collectively implemented the business plan.

I would like to re-emphasize the fact that GFAR strongly believes agricultural research for development needs to be continuously reviewed considering the threats and opportunities posed by:

- the increasing challenge of poverty and food security faced by the south
- the globalization process, the results of which are beyond the control of southern stakeholders
- the ever-changing institutional environment, including liberalization in the agriculture sector
- the increasingly important roles being played by the neglected partners in agricultural research such as civil society organizations including FOs and NGOs.

It is our strong belief that scientific advances, in particular in the fields of natural resources management, information and communication, and biotechnology, must lead to a sustainable development benefiting all ARD stakeholders in an equitable manner.

Madam Chairperson, the GFAR 2003 conference - which is being organized in a developing country and in a region which is now facing the formidable challenges of food security, poverty alleviation, and sustainable use of natural resources - rightly deals with the important theme of Linking Research and Rural Innovation for Sustainable Development. This could not
have taken place at a better time than when African countries are embarking on a grand partnership initiative of NEPAD, to achieve sustainable development for the continent.

Agricultural research and rural innovation processes are not isolated activities. They are interlinked with many stakeholders and operate within agricultural knowledge systems. It is within such knowledge systems that both agricultural research and rural innovation emerge as a result of the dynamic participation and interaction among all ARD stakeholders. This diversity of actors leads to diversity of knowledge systems, which may be conflicting but also complementary.

Sustainable agriculture can be economically, environmentally and socially viable. There are resource-conserving technologies, local institutional structures and enabling external institutions that are all known to work. But until recently, there have been few policies known to be effective. Therefore, another challenge will be the reform of policy processes themselves with more focus and emphasis on participation and mediation, if the complexities and uncertainties of sustainability are to be continually and effectively addressed.

Ladies and gentlemen, over the next two and a half days, as stakeholders of GFAR, you will elaborate and provide suggestions, recommendations and directives, which will form the cornerstones of a framework for our next triennial business plan. I would like to draw your kind attention to the GFAR Secretariat’s effort to ensure an active participation of the civil society organizations at this meeting. A pre-conference civil society consultation took place over the last two days to enable CSOs to be actively involved, as a stakeholder group, in GFAR activities. We consider this an effective way of addressing one of GFAR’s objectives, that of facilitating the involvement of the less vocal stakeholders in agricultural research and development. As well, I have to underline that during this GFAR conference, there are time slots allotted for stakeholder
consultations, so that each GFAR constituency can meet, exchange and clarify its expectations.

During the conference we will also review the progress made in recent years with regard to the contribution of agricultural research and rural innovation to sustainable development. We expect new emerging areas of global and regional partnership will be identified in the following parallel sub-plenary sessions:

- Rural knowledge systems and innovation processes
- Agro-based small and medium-sized enterprises and markets in developing countries
- Agriculture-livestock integration
- Organizational partnerships for agricultural research
- Innovative policy directions and approaches for sustainable agricultural development.

The outcomes of the plenary and sub-plenary sessions as well as the working group meetings will undoubtedly contribute to redynamization of the various stakeholder groups and emergence of new global and regional partnerships and alliances among ARD stakeholders.

Let me now list the activities that we will undertake over the next two days: keynote addresses, roundtable brainstorming sessions, side events, stakeholder consultation meetings, Regional Fora discussions and thematic working group meetings. All of these events will contribute to the formulation of the next GFAR business plan.

Madam Chairperson, I would like to once again express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the Senegalese National Organizing Committee, GFAR’s Conference Working Group, the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa and the GFAR Secretariat for their hard work, exciting programs and excellent arrangement of this conference. Also, I would like to sincerely thank the facilitating agencies, FAO and IFAD and the donors
of GFAR during the last three years and those who have financially supported the GFAR 2003 conference. In addition, I earnestly request the other donors to come on board and give full backing to GFAR.

Finally I would like to extend, on behalf of all GFAR stakeholders, our profound and sincere gratitude to our host the government of Senegal, especially the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, for their commitment at the highest level to support our conference for the first time held in a developing country. Last but not the least, our sincere appreciation and thanks are extended to you, the stakeholders and participants in GFAR 2003 conference, for your invaluable presence in this meeting. Without your active support and encouragement, GFAR will not be able to achieve - in close partnership with regional and international organizations - its noble goals and mission to collectively meet the challenges of global food security, alleviation of poverty and sustainable utilization of natural resources in the 21st century, with the emphasis on priorities and needs of small landholders and the rural poor.

Thank you and may God bless you all
OUTCOMES OF THE SUMMITS AND THEIR IMPLICATION FOR AGRICULTURE

IAN JOHNSON

Let me open my address, Madam Chair, by saying that I am delighted to be here in Senegal. This is also my first GFAR meeting and one that I am looking forward to enormously. I would like to thank GFAR and Mohammad Roozitalab for the invitation and congratulate Mohammad on his chairmanship of GFAR, noting also that he plays a very positive and helpful role in the CGIAR for which I am deeply grateful. And of course let me also thank the government of Senegal for so generously hosting this meeting. I think that it is very important that this meeting is in a developing country, and it is also very important that this meeting is here in Africa.

The theme of my talk today will be the role that international summits have played in helping shape agendas and of providing the space for articulating our concerns. I want to try to tie these in with the relevance of the issues of agricultural research that you will be debating over the next three days. However, in doing so you will realize that I recognize the link between agriculture per se and agricultural research. Putting agricultural research on the agenda means that we must also place agriculture firmly on the agenda.

Let me start off by saying that in the last ten years or so we have seen an enormous growth of international treaties of one kind or another. Some are of direct consequence to agriculture, others of indirect, but all of them have a bearing on what you do in GFAR, and what do we together. If I look at the last few years we of course have the Johannesburg Summit, the Doha Round on Trade and the International Treaty on Plant
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Genetics, which clearly all have direct concern to agriculture. But we have also seen the Millennium Summit and the Millennium Development Goals, which were announced a few years ago. We have seen the global environmental conventions on climate change and their associated protocols: the Kyoto Protocol in the case of climate change, treaties on biological diversity, and recently the Kyoto Water Summit, which was an out-of-government summit but which nevertheless had the characteristics of a summit, but did not have a treaty at the end of it. All of these are of indirect but nevertheless have important relevance for agriculture. And today what I am going to try to do is make the case to you that these meetings, while they can be lengthy and bureaucratic, also help shape big ideas of great moment to our future. Sometimes, because they seek out consensus, their solutions tend to be drawn down to the lowest common denominator, so it is very easy to be cynical about such summits and treaties. However, as I have said, I want to make the case that they can help shape big ideas, and in shaping big ideas, they can and do influence the way that we do our business in development, and the way we in GFAR do our business in agricultural research and development.

And what I am going to do is suggest that these treaties provide a canvas, but they do not provide the paint and they do not provide the artist; their work is left for us to fill in. However, they do set a framework, and they do set the terms of reference for strategic engagement on key issues. In my view there have been five big ideas that have been promoted at Johannesburg, and these issues also emerge from some of the other conventions and treaties. These five ideas are: poverty reduction, the need for a new institutional framework, the importance of the long-term agenda, the WEHAB acronym and the need for special attention to Africa. I am going to briefly discuss some of these ideas and then talk about one more idea, in my view a big idea that did not emerge as a key issue from these summits and treaties, and has unfortunately been somewhat overlooked. However, it is of profound importance,
and that is the transformational role that science and technology can play in society.

Let me now return to my five points emerging from these treaties, particularly the Johannesburg Summit, which is the most recent and perhaps the most important in many respects. I think that the first notion that the climate change debate and others have put on the table is that poverty and poverty reduction is a global moral issue whose time has come. And it must be attacked and it must be attacked as quickly as we can. To leave the number of poor people alone and to have that number increase over the next 10 to 40 years is not only an untenable economic issue, it is also an untenable moral issue. Now we are at a point where the debate and the discourse about poverty is an engagement strategy, which is not just about development aid, but is also about bringing in all stakeholders to believe that reducing poverty will produce a sustainable and survivable planet for us all.

In that regard we have seen the emergence of the Millennium Development Goals which focused on key aspects of poverty on water and sanitation, where a billion people today do not have decent water and two billion people do not have decent sanitation. We have seen the emphasis on income and the need to reduce the number of people in absolute poverty, the 2 billion people who earn less than two dollars a day, and 1 billion who earn less than one dollar a day. Therefore wealth creation in the poor countries is a central and pivotal part of our common future. It is critical to the discussions in the MDGs on gender and gender issues, on health issues, on nutritional issues, and to the 800 million people who go to bed hungry every evening. I think that helped shape and propel the issue of poverty, and it was interesting to listen to Mr. Chirac on the television yesterday talking about the forthcoming G8 Evian meeting, in which poverty is very central to the proposed G8 debate. I do not recall when last that was the case. So I think that we are seeing the implications of the debate on poverty extend far beyond the development community and the UN.
Even regarding climate change, vulnerable, poor countries and poor people are adversely affected. The Doha Round is about equality. Surely if the Doha Round on Trade does anything it will not only put agriculture on the map, it will say the playing field is not level for developing countries and it needs to be. The Johannesburg Summit really pulled it all together and talked about poverty reduction being at the heart of sustainability and planetary survivability and we will not have either if we do not reduce poverty.

And so we have to say, what does this mean for us? What does this mean for agriculture? We have to recognize that 70% of the poor in this world live in rural areas. Many are poor farmers, a disproportionate amount are women, and for their benefit we know that agriculture can have a profound effect on achieving the MDGs. And I preach this over and over again, even within my own organization, that agriculture is at the heart of addressing the Millennium Development Goals. We simply will not get economic growth in poorer countries if we do not get agriculture moving. There is no doubt about that. And, if we do not get economic growth going, we will not meet the first MDG of alleviating the low income dimension of poverty. The evidence that agricultural productivity has a profound impact on poverty is overwhelming. I remember reading an article by Peter Timmer, who was a former professor of mine, and I think a very sound and very good agricultural economist. He did a survey, if I recall, of 35 low-income countries, which estimated that every 1% increase in agricultural productivity gave a 1.6% increase in income in the lowest quintile of the population. Agriculture is central to the MDGs, whether on food security, income, health or gender issues. And I think that we need to keep that at the forefront of our minds.

The second big issue that I think Johannesburg teased out, and in some sense this meeting is symptomatic of that, is that there is a search for new institutions, as there is a realization that the institutions we have today are not doing the job we need. Here I do not mean just organizations; I mean the relationships between stakeholders, shareholders, between people and
organizations. We are struggling with finding a new definition of the institutional framework to meet this new age, which is a new age of transparency, a new age of inclusion. The question that I think we will have to ask ourselves (and I ask it all the time in what we do in our policy work at the World Bank, or what we do in the CGIAR or what you are doing here in GFAR) is how can we move in a way that is both fully inclusive on the one hand, and efficient on the other? How do we marry efficiency and inclusion? How do we ensure multi-sectoral approaches and multi-disciplinarity are brought to bear? How do we ensure increasing levels of accountability to the general public and civil society, increasing levels of transparency? How do we experiment with third party validation and social responsibility? And in a world that is globally interconnected, how do we differentiate between local, regional and global institutions? I think that these are going to be some of the great challenges of the next decade and your business in GFAR is right at the heart of many of them. The potential for global interconnectivity means where you are matters less than what you do. The issues of participatory research mean that who you engage and how you engage them in decision-making and in shaping your agenda are profoundly important. So I think that this GFAR meeting in its design in bringing stakeholders from developed and developing countries, from universities, from national and international agricultural systems, civil society and NGOs, the private sector and Farmers’ Organizations together to debate and discourse on these issues is extremely important.

When we think about these summits and the influence they have on institutions, I am reminded that when the Stockholm conference on environment was put together a little over 30 years ago, there was not a single ministry of environment in existence. However, it was the ability of that summit to propel forward the issue of the environment and the need for institutions that would care for the environment, so that within ten years or so, virtually every country had a ministry of environment. Today it is hard to conceive of a country that
does not have a ministry of environment! You can trace that momentum to Stockholm and that conference. It is my belief that one of the lasting achievements of the Johannesburg Summit will be that it will likewise propel us to develop a new set of institutions and a new set of institutional relationships. I also think that our activities in GFAR together with those of the CGIAR in promoting broader partnerships and through increasing accountability will be very much a part of these new institutional relationships. This will be a lasting legacy of the Johannesburg Summit.

The third issue that I would draw your attention to is what I think summits do very well, and Johannesburg did extremely well: they put the long-term on the agenda. It is very easy for many organizations - my own, the World Bank, included - to become increasingly tied into the five-year cycle. However to resolve our CGIAR issues, your GFAR issues, issues of climate change, issues of sustainable development, five years is far too short a time horizon. Fifty years is more appropriate, 100 years if referring to climate change. But in any event, whatever time horizon we choose we have to recognize that the long-term is very important. Furthermore the returns from our work are not measured in months or even in five-year periods, they are measured in much longer-terms. It was a useful exercise in Johannesburg to focus on the long-term. As we talk about our children's future, we begin to see new issues emerging such as issues of migration or natural resource degradation. As we look at the longer-term, we can examine what it might mean for economic growth and what it might mean for the kind of economic structure the planet will need in 20 to 40 years. To give you an example of this, if we look at meeting the MDGs, developing countries will have to grow at an average rate of about 5.3% per capita per annum, and that is for the next 15 years, which will get us, if we are lucky, to the position where the job is still only half done. So it is not unreasonable to think about a 3% growth rate to the middle of the century, by when we will have conquered the issues of absolute poverty, if not sooner. If we then extrapolate that to the middle of the century,
we will add in broad orders of magnitude 100 trillion dollars to what is today a 37.5 trillion dollar economy globally. So we will increase by 100 trillion over and above the current 37.5 trillion. How will we manage that? What is the breakdown between developed and developing countries at the moment? At the moment it is a woeful 20% holding 80% of the world’s income; that surely must be unsustainable. If that is the same in 2050, with an economy that has added another 100 trillion to the present 37.5 trillion, we are going to be in deep trouble. Our children are going to be in deep trouble wherever they live. So equality is going to have to be a guiding principle, production and consumption patterns will have to be carefully reviewed. A long-term perspective is needed to provide us with the answers.

Let us now just look at the issue of the long-term for the agriculture sector and for your work in GFAR. We have, today, aggregate food security. It does not mean that everybody is food-secure, in fact 800 million people are food-insecure. While in aggregate terms we are a relatively food-secure planet, distribution is our problem. However, if we look 40 to 50 years ahead, the estimates suggest that food demand will double. It will double partly because of per capita income changes of the kind I just spoke of, which switches into higher-value food, and partly because we will have added 2 billion people to planet Earth during that time. We will have to imagine a world where doubling of food demand will have implications on livestock management, the environment and public policy choices. Where we move in that direction will, I think, be very important. So when taking the longer-term view, it means that the food issue and food security are very central issues to GFAR’s business. Agriculture land use and population will clearly put pressure on our natural ecosystems, which even today are in a fragile state. We have 1.4% of the land mass of the world supporting about 60% of the terrestrial species and much of that is under threat. Agriculture is going to be central to wealth creation in poorer countries on the one hand, but it is also going to be central to ecological management on the other.
In that period when we have a global economy 100 trillion dollars larger, one can only imagine the pressures on our fragile world. Agriculture will either be the problem or the solution. Of course every person in this room wants it to be the solution to the long-term sustainability of our natural ecosystems.

There is also the question of the provision of the goods and services that agriculture must provide to drive the economic growth that will be necessary. So we are going to enter a world where agricultural productivity is going to be central to sustainability. There are some who believe that agricultural productivity has not needed to be as prominent in the last few years as it was perhaps 30 years ago. But it is my view that, quite the reverse, we need a major increase in agricultural productivity. This has to be a new kind of productivity: productivity that is environmentally and socially responsible and contributes to responsible growth. A growth that is more equal, of higher quality, addresses the issues of poverty, and can contribute to this 3% per capita growth that I mentioned earlier. Agriculture, it seems to me, is incontrovertibly central to achieving our goals.

The next issue I would like to suggest is that Johannesburg in particular gave us impetus and focus on some critical issues. The Secretary General spoke of an acronym, WEHAB, on which I have a reservation, as I think it is missing one ‘E’. However, I do not think that we could have called it WE-E-HAB, to accommodate the ‘E’ that in my judgment is missing, which stands for education. However the five issues rightly focus on water, energy, health, agriculture and biodiversity. As you examine every one of these issues, and I do not need to spend much time on this because you know this far better than I do, you will find that your business in GFAR is at the core of virtually all of these. The case for water is quite clear, as 70% of the world’s water is used in agriculture. If we look to the projections of the future and the demand for drinking water and industrial water, and of course the demand for water for agriculture, there is no doubt we must become more efficient.
Research will help us define that efficiency gain; there is no doubt about that. There will be huge returns to agricultural research in water use in the future. Energy invokes the link with fuel wood and its use by many poor people who have no choice but to go into forests and use fuel wood, sometimes inefficiently, for their heating and cooking energy needs. So the issue of forest management will lie at the heart of energy. Indeed agriculture may very well provide some, but not all, of the solutions in terms of biomass for energy. Health is another obvious issue, with nutrition and food security at the heart of good health. Equally what lies at the heart of good health is having a decent household income, and that is going to be driven by economic growth, which is going to continue to be driven in many countries by agriculture. Agriculture is already on the map, so I am delighted that the United Nations put agriculture as one of the five pillars of WEHAB. Finally, biodiversity: whether it is the impact of domesticated or wild biodiversity, whether it is the issues of ecological landscape management and their coexistence with agriculture, the issue of biodiversity is certainly on the map, as are forestry and fisheries. So in other words, I think that the WEHAB concept has actually given us an awful lot of impetus and direction that we can build on in terms of our work plans in the post-Johannesburg period.

The final big issue for me, and it is one that I know you will listen to in a moment from my distinguished colleague from South Africa, is that Africa was put on the map in Johannesburg. The fact that the meeting took place in Africa was so important for our common future and is echoed by your having your GFAR meeting here in Senegal. NEPAD - the New Program for African Development - has emerged with great promise and great hope for a new beginning. NEPAD heralds a new journey for Africa towards wealth creation, towards poverty reduction, towards better natural resource management and towards reducing the detrimental health impacts that besiege us. To me this was a very important and profound statement of global significance. I will not say more.
than that because I know that you will be next hearing from my distinguished colleague, Wiseman Nkulhu, on this subject.

However, I think that there was one critical issue that was missed in all these summit meetings and treaties, and I think that we have to revisit it. This is the role of science and technology, but let me focus particularly on science. Science can play a central role in shaping and defining our common future. The history of science and scientific innovation surely points to this. Even in the recent past we have seen the transformational powers of science. Thirty-five years ago there was huge talk of famine. India would never feed itself. I read some interesting documents that Professor Swaminathan once showed me, which showed some of the editorial articles of the time, 30 to 40 years ago, when India was held up as a complete basket case that could never feed itself. Today India has a problem, but the problem is that it does not have enough warehouses to store the food it is producing. The whole situation has turned around, and India is self-sufficient and could export. There may be other reasons why it is not exporting, but it could do so. This has all been largely transformational because of a combination of increased investment in science, the green revolution, and enlightened public policy. In the last ten years we have all seen the electronic and communications revolution. It still amazes me that I can pick up a little piece of plastic and call Washington and have a conversation. Could you imagine doing that 20 years ago? None of us can, yet all of us do it today. Such scientific and technological progress has completely transformed the economies of some countries such as Finland, Ireland and southern parts of India for example. Science can indeed be transformational, which I do not believe is well understood in many quarters. It is, of course, well understood by every person in this room. However, we must encourage Ministers of Finance to see science as transformational. We must encourage the general public to see science as transformational, and not regard it as a threat but rather see it as an opportunity.
Moreover I think one of the big issues we have to tackle is to assess the role that science and technology can really play in a new responsible growth era. In this regard, the World Bank, working closely with FAO, is undertaking an international assessment of science and technology in agriculture. We are promoting this idea because we believe, just as happened with the deliberations of the international panel on climate change, that placing scientific issues in the public domain for discourse and discussion can in fact increase opportunity and lower distrust. I think that we must recognize that in many quarters there is distrust of science, so I am convinced that one of our main challenges in GFAR and the CGIAR is how to turn that around. So any role that GFAR and you as individuals can play in helping engineer the needed transformation, for civil society and policy-makers to trust science and scientists, will be welcome, and indeed is vital. In my own country, England, for the last decade it has become evident that many people do not trust the scientific community, particularly the scientific community within the government. Building trust for what science can offer is going to have a tremendous impact. Furthermore we have to move to a new age of science that is scientifically sound, environmentally responsible and socially accountable. I think that if we do so we will make the case, which is the centerpiece of my concluding comments, and that is the case for emphasizing the critical transformational role of science and technology in agriculture, and in securing poverty alleviation and a sustainable future.

There is a strong case for the advancement of science and technology in research and development, and I believe that the case is even greater today than it was 30 years ago. I also think that we have to see how we leverage and how we move our agenda up the public policy ladder. Yet the enabling environment has shifted, and therefore the case for more funding for research in agriculture, and in my view significantly more funding, is really compelling. Yet, paradoxically it is the hardest sell. It is hard to sell it to people who write the *cheques* - not the many donors in this room, who
have been great supporters of national, regional and international research - but when you go to ministries of finance or to treasuries to try to get money it is very hard. I think that what we have to do, and I leave these thoughts with you, is we really have to put agriculture high on the agenda, and it is happening; I am delighted to see that it is starting to happen. When we put agriculture firmly on the agenda, we will clearly see the case for agricultural research because the returns to agriculture research are enormous. I remember that the International Food Policy Research Institute did some research on this some years ago, and if I am not mistaken I think the rates of return were 70 or 80%. We must make the case that the scientific divide is as big as the digital divide and it is as important as the digital divide. Everywhere you go people will casually talk about the digital divide; they also have to start talking about the science divide and the promise that science can bring. We have to reshape our agenda, we have to retell our story, we have to gloss it up. We have to really reshape our agenda in a way that appeals to those who finance us: ministries of finance, the donors, treasuries, foundations, etc.

There is also an increasing emphasis on results and one has to respect that this can be very difficult to clearly document in research. Some research produces huge returns, other research inevitably will not. So how do we make the case on the basis of results? I think the issues of programmatic coherence are becoming more and more important and by that I mean the value chain of research. Not just research itself, but the link between the laboratory, farmers and markets at the field, national, regional and global levels and back again. I think we have to make that value chain while focusing on the issues that are of importance to us, recognizing the programmatic context. Then there is the call for new institutions that I mentioned earlier, and this will rest on varying forms of partnerships, which have always been a key concern of GFAR. This involves engagement of the public and private sectors, international and national, government and non-government, of institutions and
academia. This GFAR forum is a very good forum for discussing such issues. We will also have to look at leverage. Where do we use leverage? Are there new instrumentalities? Are there new innovations in the way we do research? We are trying in the CGIAR to develop Challenge Programs, paralleled by your GFAR Global Partnership Programmes, which we hope can be portrayed as something new and innovative, capturing not only new money but new partnerships. It will involve new knowledge and new money coming in to upgrade and increase the overall impact. We also have to look at transparency and accountability mechanisms including participatory research. Here I would ask that you think about participatory research, and not only its opportunities, which are manifold, but also its limitations. We also have to think about openness on issues such as intellectual property rights when we deal with the private sector.

So in conclusion I think the case for promoting science and technology is greater than ever. I think GFAR can play a key role in helping shape our common agenda. It can help the NARS, in both developed and developing countries, and together with the international efforts such as those of the CGIAR, jointly shape our common agenda and demonstrate that we are part of one big jigsaw puzzle. However, we need one another to fit so that we can perform much better collectively than by our own individual efforts. So I think that you in this audience can stress the centrality of agricultural research to the future of agriculture, and in doing so to helping sustain our common future on this planet. I think that if we can make this case well, we will have made a very useful effort to putting agriculture on the agenda. So, Madam Chair, Mister Chair of GFAR, I wish you very well in your deliberations.

Thank you very much
EMERGING GLOBAL ISSUES IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE RESPONSE OF THE NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICA’S DEVELOPMENT (NEPAD)

WISEMAN NKUHLU

Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Despite substantial socio-economic gains in many African countries over the last 30 to 40 years, hunger and poverty remain a major threat to many people, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Over 300 million Africans live on less than $1 a day. About 200 million people in Africa are chronically hungry, 30 million require emergency food and agricultural assistance in any one year and in 2003 about 14 million people are on the brink of starvation in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) alone.

In 1998-2000, more than a quarter of the population of Africa was chronically undernourished (202 million people). It is expected that the number of undernourished people in Sub-Saharan Africa will increase from 180 million in 1995/97 to 184 million in 2015. This stands in stark contrast to the millennium goals of halving hunger and poverty by 2015.

The statistics show that Africa is in crisis. Approximately 2.4 million Africans die from AIDS every year; over 28 million Africans live with HIV/AIDS; over 150 million Africans are affected by conflict; 1 million Africans die of malaria every year; 1.2 million Africans die of pneumonia every year; 800 000 African children die of diarrhea before their fifth birthday; 600 000 Africans die of tuberculosis every year; 500 000 African children die of measles each year, and 48 million African children are not in school.
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It is this horrific reality that caused African leaders assembled in Sirte, Libya in September 1999 to agree to a paradigm shift in the way Africa conducts its affairs. Deliberations on the need to approach the G8 countries on the issue of African debt developed into a robust discussion about the nature of the challenges facing Africa. The conclusion was that debt cancellation alone, or the tackling of any one issue in isolation, or even a group of issues in an uncoordinated manner, will not solve the problems. What was needed was a holistic, integrated and coordinated agenda for the regeneration of the African continent.

The task of elaborating this idea of a new development agenda for African renewal was assigned to President Mbeki of South Africa, President Obasanjo of Nigeria and President Bouteflika of Algeria. They were later joined by President Wade of Senegal and President Mubarak of Egypt. What finally emerged from their deliberations was the NEPAD base document, i.e. the strategic framework document.

The acceptance of the vision, principles, objectives, goals and priorities outlined in the NEPAD base document by the African heads of state and government at the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Summit in Lusaka, Zambia in July 2001 ushered in a new era in African development. It may not have appeared significant at the time, but the initiators of NEPAD knew that it was not going to be business as usual any more, particularly as this coincided with a move from the OAU to the African Union (AU), with NEPAD becoming the socio-economic development program of the AU.

Through the NEPAD policy framework, the African leaders jointly accepted responsibility for eradicating poverty and placing their countries, both individually and collectively, on a path of sustainable development and growth. At the same time, they committed themselves to principles, values, priorities and standards of governance that are in line with international best practice. Furthermore, they committed
themselves to people-centred, participatory development processes.

The international community is dealing with major challenges through a global agenda now focused on poverty and sustainable socio-economic development. These issues were addressed at recent international meetings, such as the UN Millennium Summit 2000 (MDG to cut hunger and poverty in half by 2015), World Food Summit in Rome 2002, Financing for Development Conference, Mexico 2002, and World Summit on Sustainable Development, South Africa 2002.

NEPAD identifies a number of priorities in order to address the crisis mentioned in line with the issues that have emerged internationally.

Realizing that Africa can only take its proper place in the international community if it gains economic strength, African heads of state and government have set an ambitious target of 7% annual growth rate in GDP over the next 20 years to eradicate poverty, achieve food security and build the foundations of sustainable economic development on the continent.

NEPAD, which seeks to complement other African initiatives and to use existing frameworks for action, concentrates on priorities organized under two broad themes: (1) Peace, security, democracy and political governance; and (2) Economic and corporate governance. Within these themes, the priorities are: (1) agriculture and food security and intra-African trade; (2) health and education; (3) human resource development; (4) environment; (5) access to markets; (6) infrastructure; (7) science and technology; (8) capital flows (ODA, debt, investment); (9) regional integration; and (10) reversing Africa’s marginalization.

NEPAD views agriculture as the key sector for achieving economic advancement and poverty alleviation in Africa because agriculture provides 60% of all employment, it constitutes the backbone of most African economies, and in
most countries it is still the largest contributor to GDP and the biggest source of foreign exchange, accounting for about 40% of the continent’s hard currency earnings. It is also the main generator of savings and tax revenues.

However, there was a progressive growth in food imports in the last years of the 20th century, with Africa spending an estimated US$18.7 billion in 2000 on imports. Part of Africa’s imports is food aid, with the continent receiving 2.8 million tons of food aid in 2000.

Within the overall vision of NEPAD, the vision for agriculture seeks to maximize the contribution of Africa’s largest economic sector to achieving the ambition of a self-reliant and productive Africa that can participate fully in the world economy. The NEPAD goal for the sector is an agriculture-led development that eliminates hunger and reduces poverty and food insecurity, thereby opening the way for an expansion for exports. This is expected to put the continent on a higher economic growth path within an overall strategy of sustainable development and preservation of the natural resource base.

The vision for agriculture is that the continent should, by the year 2015:

- Attain food security (in terms of both availability and affordability and ensuring access of the poor to adequate food and nutrition)
- Improve the productivity of agriculture to attain an average annual growth rate of 6%, with particular attention to small-scale farmers, especially focusing on women
- Have dynamic agricultural markets among nations and between regions
- Have integrated farmers into the market economy including better access to markets, with Africa to become a net exporter of agricultural products
- Achieve more equitable distribution of wealth
• Be a strategic player in agricultural science and technology development

• Practise environmentally sound production methods and have a culture of sustainable management of the natural resource base (including biological resources for food and agriculture) to avoid their degradation.

How do we end the food crisis and kick-start African agriculture? The African ministers of agriculture and rural development at the World Food Summit-five years later (WFS-fyl) endorsed the NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) on 9 June 2002, as a blueprint for renewal and recovery of the continent’s agricultural sector. The program is in line with the WFS and the WFS-fyl and it sets out how best, within the NEPAD framework, the African agriculture sector can contribute towards the achievement of one of the Millennium Development Goals that of halving poverty and hunger by 2015. To achieve these goals, the action plan presents broad themes of primary opportunities for investment to reverse the crisis situation facing Africa’s agriculture, which has made the continent import-dependent, vulnerable to even small changes of climate, and dependent excessively on food aid.

The four pillars that form the basis of CAADP are: (1) Extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems; (2) Rural infrastructure and trade-related capacities for improved market access; (3) Increasing food supply and reducing hunger; and (4) Agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption. A summary of the potential for investment in agriculture is shown in Box 3.

**BOX 3. POTENTIAL FOR INVESTMENT IN AGRICULTURE**

The CAADP document presents preliminary estimates which suggest that required investment between 2002 and 2015 would comprise a total outlay (including operations and maintenance) of US$251 billion.
Converting these estimates to reality will involve the formulation of specific bankable projects, a task for which NEPAD may wish to involve its external partners as it pursues implementation. The funding requirement is apportioned as follows:

- **US$68 billion**: Extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems: Including increasing the area under irrigation to 20 million ha and improving land management (of which US$37 billion is for investment and US$31 billion for operations and maintenance)

- **US$128.8 billion**: Rural infrastructure and trade-related capacities for market access: of which US$89 billion for infrastructure (US$62 billion for rural roads alone), US$37 billion for operation and maintenance, and US$2.8 billion for trade-related capacities for improved market access

- **US$49.6 billion**: Increasing food supply and reducing hunger. Of this, US$6.6 billion is for raising the productivity of 15 million small farms through improved technology, services and policies; US$1 billion is for regional support to food security; and US$42 billion is for a sub-pillar for emergencies and safety nets

- **US$4.6 billion**: Agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption.

This implies an annual investment in core activities under the four pillars of US$17.9 billion. As can be seen, the CAADP pays attention to safety nets and emergency-related food and agriculture. CAADP Action Plan intensifies NEPAD’s focus on ending hunger in Africa with the inclusion of a wide-ranging program under Pillar 3: Food Crisis Emergency Preparedness and Response Program. This program is receiving urgent attention and is in the process of being implemented.

It is believed that an important part of funding can come from beneficiaries themselves and from domestic resource mobilization. Africa’s own commitment to funding agriculture should be seen against a background of re-emerging international recognition that funding agriculture is vital for sustainable development. Financing for agriculture under the NEPAD–CAADP is therefore based on the dual assumption that Africa itself will increase its level of investment and that its external partners will come forward and support it.
The NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) has been prepared by FAO in cooperation with the NEPAD Steering Committee. It offers guidance to member governments on a wide range of aspects of operationalization and action to revitalize African agriculture. The proposed initiatives focus on investment in three pillars that can make the earliest difference to Africa’s agricultural crisis, plus a fourth long-term pillar for research and technology. The fundamental mutually reinforcing pillars on which to base the immediate improvement of Africa’s agriculture, food security and trade balance are: (1) extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems; (2) improving rural infrastructure and market access including inputs and finance; (3) increasing food supply and reducing hunger; and (4) agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption.

In April this year, under the auspices of NEPAD, an action plan was developed by the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and their development partners, i.e. FAO, WFP, IFAD, DBSA, FARA, ISNAR, the Millennium Hunger Task Force and development banks, to address the food crisis and kick-start African agriculture.

Africa’s heads of states have designated the RECs to coordinate the implementation of all NEPAD-related programs and projects of sub-regional nature. The African Union has clearly recognized these organizations as the building blocks for the integration of the continent. These regional groupings are already involved in many ways, such as in the consolidation of democracy and good political and economic governance, as well as macro-economic convergence and trade and integration. A sub-regional approach takes advantage of economies of scale and can reach a critical mass that would drive productivity and income growth at both the country and regional levels. It also contributes to enhanced efficiency through increased competition and reduced transaction costs. It is instrumental to stabilize national policy frameworks and thus is favorable to investment.
More specifically, regional organizations would be responsible for identification, preparation and appraisal of bankable projects within their member countries and for coordinating their implementation. However, implementation of these operations would solely remain the responsibility of national governments and the private sector.

The CAADP presents a plan of action that provides the path towards the implementation of CAADP. The plan of action has laid out a foundation for a framework and process of NEPAD program/project implementation. This includes the development of criteria for selection of programs/project, the program approach mechanism, and the timetable for the implementation. More specifically, as a head start, the document presents selected program/project profiles as NEPAD projects, under the four pillars of CAADP, and defines a calendar for the implementation process of these flagship projects.

In the first round, it was considered desirable to identify some projects as short term and others for the longer horizon. Among the short-term ones are initiatives for which programs and projects have already been prepared or those where such preparation is imminent or urgent. So far 17 flagship projects have been presented by RECs (projects from CEN-SAD and AMU are forthcoming). See Table 1 for a summary of these projects and the amount of investment required. Tentatively, it is estimated that flagship projects would cost US$15.7 billion over their implementation period of 6 to 7 years. The detailed individual Project Profiles and Concept Notes are available upon request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Tentative project cost (US million)</th>
<th>Lead agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAADP Pillar 1. Extending the Area under Sustainable Land Management and Reliable Water Control Systems</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>Three RECs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Irrigation Development Project</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>COMESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Irrigation Development and Water Management Project</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Socio-Economic Development Program for Oncho-Freed Zones of West Africa</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Irrigation Development and Water Management for Food Security</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP Pillar 2. Rural Infrastructure and Trade-related Capacities for Improved Market Access</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Three RECs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Regional Agricultural Trade Promotion and Food Security Project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>COMESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Promotion of Regional Agricultural Trade and SPS Standards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Promoting Regional Agricultural Trade and Harmonizing SMS Standards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP Pillar 3. Increasing Food Supply and Reducing Hunger</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>Five RECs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Agricultural Intensification and Diversification</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ECCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Production and Commercialization of High Yield Seeds and Planting Materials</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ECCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Promoting Sustainable Crop and Livestock Production in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>IGAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Strategic Food Reserve Facility</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Cassava Development Initiative for Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>ECOWAS ECCAS COMESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Disaster Prevention and Emergency Response Food Crises Program</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>ECCAS ECCOWAS COMESA IGAD SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 De-mining Lands for Agricultural Production</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ECCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP Pillar 4. Agricultural Research, Technology Dissemination and Adoption</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Four RECs NEPAD FARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Agricultural Research and Technology Transfer for Strategic Crops</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development interventions are required immediately and for the long-term. As a matter of urgency NEPAD is developing a Disaster Prevention and Emergency Response Food Crises Program to address the food crisis in cooperation with the World Food Program, FAO, the African Development Bank and the Regional Economic Communities. This program will:

- Strengthen the immediate response to the crisis including relief efforts, and strengthen early warning systems currently in place

- Address the food insecurity and HIV/AIDS, which should be seen as core to the food crisis and hence requiring focused interventions

- Address the question of food reserve systems, including the undertaking of special studies for each of the regions to explore what systems(s) would work, or would be most appropriate for each region or country

- Strengthen NEPAD’s capacity in leveraging financial and political support as well as advocacy work with key partners in addressing both the short- and long-term food requirements for Africa.

Over the past two decades there has been an overall decline in support of agriculture, by both national governments and the international donor community. NEPAD is committed to mobilizing African resources from governments as well as from the private sector. We would like to, specifically, call on
governments in Africa to increase their investment in the agricultural sector.

NEPAD is aware of the central role that civil society organizations, particularly farmers’ associations, will play in the renewal of Africa’s agriculture. With the assistance of the International Fund for Agricultural Development and in consultations with the RECs, NEPAD will mobilize the African farmers’ associations and other civil society organizations to participate fully in the implementation of NEPAD’s agricultural vision.

NEPAD recognizes the important role of research and technology in stimulating agriculture production in Africa. NEPAD will in this regard be delighted to explore innovative ways of cooperation with the various international research organizations gathered here, to explore how best to stimulate agriculture production. In particular NEPAD is currently focusing on the expansion of Nerica rice and cassava in West Africa and the transfer of these crops to Southern and East Africa. NEPAD is also looking into the expansion of banana tissue culture in East Africa as well as the transfer of this technology to Southern Africa and subsequently to the rest of Africa.

In the long-term, NEPAD sees the international research community participating in the long-term agricultural development agenda in Africa through the continuing search for new innovations for small-holder producers. Along with various international organizations, NEPAD wishes to explore some of the following agricultural initiatives with a view to enhancing livelihood opportunities for small-holder producers:

- promoting small-scale water-harvesting techniques
- school feeding programs that focus on locally produced food
- soil fertility restoration through agroforestry and mineral fertilizers
- seed multiplication
• engendering and democratizing agricultural production
• facilitation of micro-financing, enhancing and diversifying livelihood opportunities for vulnerable groups including youth and women.
FROM DRESDEN TO DAKAR: ACHIEVEMENTS, GAPS AND THE WAY FORWARD

OLANREWAJU B. SMITH

The Global Forum on Agricultural Research was founded in October 1996 by representatives of several institutions including National Agricultural Research Systems that share a common view of the important contribution agriculture could make to sustainable development. They also shared the view that in order for agriculture to meet the legitimate expectations placed on it, it must rely rather heavily on research and that for research to deliver, stakeholders needed to pool their knowledge, expertise, human and financial resources together by forming partnerships and alliances charged with carrying out the required agricultural research for development activities. They concluded that it is only in this way that they could obtain the much sought after positive impact on the livelihoods of people as well as their environment, because of the benefits of the economies of scale that come from working together in cost-effective partnerships.

All of us here today represent one or the other group of the stakeholders who got together on that historic occasion to found GFAR, and I believe that we all still share that vision of agricultural research contributing meaningfully to sustainable development.

Although GFAR was founded seven years ago, it was only three years ago, at the Dresden meeting in 2000, that you firmly put the GFAR initiative on the global agenda, when you elaborated and shared your vision of a knowledge-driven agriculture, in addition to developing a formal business plan.
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that identified thematic areas of research within which the group would initially confine its activities.

Dresden, therefore, constitutes a valid and important starting point from where we look forward in order to identify important lessons learned over that period of time, build on our achievements and correct our shortcomings, so that we can move forward in a more focused way and more effectively than we were able to do a few years ago. Hence the title of this presentation: From Dresden to Dakar: Achievements, Gaps and the Way Forward.

Another important landmark or point de repère from which we can look forward was the first GFAR external review, carried out in 2000. The reviewers made some important observations and recommendations, which we can examine to see how well we responded and what still needs to be done. These two elements - the business plan formulated in Dresden in 2000, and the outputs of the first external review of GFAR made available in 2001 - constitute the baseline for the identification of achievements to build on, and gaps to fill.

The last business plan contained four elements on which GFAR was to focus: (1) promotion of research partnerships; (2) contribution to global knowledge pool on ARD; (3) strengthening and contributing to capacity-building of the weaker GFAR stakeholders; and (4) facilitating information exchange and knowledge flow amongst stakeholders and with the outside world.

The green light was given in Dresden during the GFAR 2000 conference to identify ongoing activities on which Global Partnership Programmes could be built, and/or to develop new ones if partners showed sufficient interest for such a collaborative endeavor. GPPs constitute the privileged instrument that GFAR uses to foster research partnerships around problems of critical importance to its goal of contributing to the development of a productive and sustainable agriculture. They are collaborative programs, projects or activities initiated, developed and implemented by
recognized GFAR stakeholder groups, and which remain open to participation by other stakeholders as and when they find a suitable niche. They exploit the comparative advantages of participating stakeholders, do not reinvent the wheel and are implemented at the most effective level (local, regional or global). In other words, they must reflect and demonstrate the GFAR guiding principles of complementarity, additionality and subsidiarity respectively.

A number of such ongoing activities and new ideas were presented in Dresden out of which four were developed as GPPs: (1) Direct sowing, Mulch-based systems and Conservation agriculture (DMC); (2) Commodity Chains (CC); (3) Underutilized Species; and (4) Promotion of Local Innovation (PROLINNOVA). Seven others are in various stages of development. Tables 2 and 3 provide details of the institutions involved in these GPPs.

Table 2. Ongoing GPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPP</th>
<th>Sectoral focus</th>
<th>Lead institutions</th>
<th>Other participating institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMC</td>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>CIRAD</td>
<td>IAPAR, CIMMYT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized Species</td>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>FAO, IPGRI, ICUC, IFAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC–PROMusa</td>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>INIBAP</td>
<td>NARO-Uganda, CARBAP–Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROLINNOVA</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>ETC-Ecoculture</td>
<td>ACDEP-Ghana, Environmental Alert-Uganda, ECASARD–Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. GPPs under development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPP</th>
<th>Sectoral focus</th>
<th>Lead institutions</th>
<th>Other participating institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and Access to Markets</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td>PhAction FAO/AGST</td>
<td>To be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture–Livestock Integration</td>
<td>Crops–livestock</td>
<td>ILRI ITC</td>
<td>To be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Partnerships for Agricultural Research</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>To be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Knowledge Systems</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>CIAT CABI</td>
<td>ENDA-TM ISNAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Policy Directions for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td>FAO/SDAR IFPRI</td>
<td>To be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trypanosomosis</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>CIRAD FIOCRUZ (Brazil)</td>
<td>Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Information System in ARD</td>
<td>Crosscutting</td>
<td>WAICENT GFAR Sec.</td>
<td>Regional Fora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These may appear to be an acceptable number of activities in a three-year period, given the complexity of developing these partnership activities. Nevertheless, the rate of developing and implementing GPPs appears rather slow, especially as some
effort has been put into identifying bottlenecks that may slow down the process during an IFAD-funded workshop on Methodologies, Organization and Management of Global Partnership Programmes held in October 2001. A low level of awareness amongst stakeholders may be one of several reasons for this slow pace, and we invite you to reflect and make recommendations on how to improve the pace of developing and implementing GPPs.

At another level of analysis, we examined the two groups of GPPs, both ongoing and under development, in terms of the sectoral focus and observed that over two-thirds or 60% of the GPPs are focused on crops, livestock and some form of crop-livestock integration, with the remaining one-third addressing crosscutting issues. No activity specifically targeted forestry, fisheries or their integration into crops and livestock research. Yet it is clearly stated in the GFAR global vision for ARD that GFAR stakeholders envision the development of an agriculture including crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry. In other words, there is a noticeable gap or shortcoming that needs to be examined and corrected.

We therefore flag the issue for discussion during roundtable and stakeholder consultations for feedback to the following question. Do we as GFAR stakeholders still accept and subscribe to the concept so clearly enunciated in the global vision that our agricultural development activities should include crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors, while striving to address these components in an integrated manner? If positive, then what strategies can we put in place to ensure that we develop a balanced portfolio of projects? If negative, why, and what strategies can we suggest to address the two neglected sectors of forestry and fisheries?

As indicated earlier, the thematic areas of inquiries in which GFAR would confine its activities were identified and defined in Dresden and comprise: Genetic Resources Management and Biotechnology (GRM&B) Natural Resource Management and Agro-Ecology (NRM&AE), Commodity Chains/Underutilized
Species, and Policies Management and Institutional Development (PM&ID). We cross-matched our portfolio of GPPs with these thematic areas to see how well we tackled the various themes (see Tables 4 and 5).

**Table 4. Matrix of ongoing GPPs and thematic areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPPs</th>
<th>Thematic areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRM&amp;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMusa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROLINNOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Matrix of GPPs under development and thematic areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPPs</th>
<th>Thematic areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of SMEs and Access to Markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture–Livestock Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Partnerships for Agricultural Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Policy Directions for Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trypanosomosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Information System in ARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The older GPPs seemed to have neglected policy issues, while the ones currently under development move away from the management of genetic resources and biotechnology, and concentrated on policies and institutional development. Overall, we may conclude that the observed spread is acceptable, and that given the dynamic nature of contemporary global issues, the apparent imbalance may correct itself over a period of time. Nonetheless, in view of the pressing issues of sustainable development raised by the keynote speakers and which may become critical in the near future, we ask you to reflect on whether we should privilege one or the other of these thematic areas in the near future.

We believe that GFAR is in a good position to contribute to the global knowledge pool in ARD, in order to influence people and policies. The external review recommended that GFAR identify issues of critical importance to ARD and organize and facilitate discussion around such issues.

The goal of course is to take advantage of the collective wisdom, knowledge and expertise in the group and elsewhere, to tackle topical issues and provide information and knowledge that clarify these issues where they are unclear or controversial. The expectation is that ordinary people, researchers, decision-makers at all levels and governments become better enlightened and could then make informed decisions, take or change a position, adopt new approaches, methods and ways of doing things, improve, formulate and implement policies and so on. In order to achieve these outputs, however, not only do we have to carefully select the topical issues, debate, discuss and work on them, but also share the outcomes with targeted audiences. We believe there is a gap in this regard, because as a group we have not effectively addressed this recommendation.

We could have tackled any one of a long list of issues such as: (1) essential elements for public-private collaboration in ARD; (2) the biotechnology revolution in the service of ARD - responding to opportunities and managing risks; (3)
mainstreaming gender in different cultural settings - the way forward; (4) the doubly green revolution - myths or realities; (5) bridging the biotechnology divide; (6) essential elements for organizational partnerships in ARD; (7) access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; and (8) good versus right research - responding to farmers’ demands.

The challenge for us therefore is to map out how we should address this element in the next business plan. We urge you to suggest a list of issues and suggest mechanisms that could be used to stimulate fruitful exchange of ideas on them, followed by effective and targeted dissemination of the outputs in order to have some impact on the global agenda for ARD.

The seven-stakeholder strong GFAR chain has three weak links: the NARS represented by their RF/SRF, NGOs and FOs. Aware of the truism that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, we as a group decided that strengthening the weak links in the interest of the chain is an important issue, and incorporated the idea into our last business plan. The idea was endorsed by the external review panel with strong recommendations that special attention be paid to providing institutional support to these stakeholders. Evidently, organized farmer groups or common-interest NGOs would have a much higher bargaining power that could be used in a variety of ways, leading to improved production and better access to markets, and to decision-making processes, where they can further influence policies that affect their lives, livelihoods and natural resource endowments. By the same token, stronger RF and SRF are better able to identify regional priorities and coordinate responses to them at the NARS level, so that large numbers of countries sharing similar problems could benefit from the outputs of collective regional endeavors.

Over the last three years, as a group we have addressed this issue mainly through inter-stakeholder collaboration supplemented now and then by input from the Secretariat
through some of its facilitating activities such as regional priority-setting exercises.

Table 6 provides some examples of inter-stakeholder activities from the various regions, but I will only elaborate on two of them: the FORAGRO-FONTAGRO-PROCIs connection, and capacity-building at the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa.

Table 6. Inter-stakeholder collaboration in the regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia–Pacific</td>
<td>Establishment of Asia–Pacific Biotechnology Network; involvement of seed associations in APAARI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>FORAGRO–FONTAGRO–PROCIs connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>FARA–IARCs collaboration in the development of an African Challenge Program; opening up of CORAF to CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia and North Africa</td>
<td>Development of AARINENA Regional Agricultural Information System (RAIS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first example of an inter-stakeholder collaboration comes from Latin America, and amply demonstrates the power of partnership between a donor consortium and RF/SRF. FONTAGRO, the regional fund for agricultural technology in the Latin America and the Caribbean region, was set up by several stakeholders in the region as a sustainable funding mechanism of agricultural research of cross-country interest to the LAC region. The sub-regional programs for cooperative agricultural research (PROCIs), and the regional forum for agricultural research and development (FORAGRO), benefit from this initiative as they participate in and facilitate the participation of several NARS in the competitive funding mechanism set up by the fund for priority research areas jointly identified by the beneficiaries (NARS, PROCIs, FORAGRO). Some of the outputs of this exemplary inter-
stakeholder collaboration are: (1) a steady flow of resources for regional agricultural research activities, (2) increased ability of the region to meet research challenges especially where the necessary scale of operations and skills are not available in any single country; and (3) strengthening the regional forum in decision-making processes within the context of the global agricultural research system.

A second interesting example of inter-stakeholder collaboration comes from Africa. In 2001, the fledgling organization FARA decided to compete with other proposers and submitted its own Challenge Program (CP) for CGIAR funding. The exercise promised to be a rather difficult one because FARA did not at that time have adequate financial and human resources required to carry this out in a timely manner. The International Agricultural Research Centres and some donors came to the rescue, and together the three groups of stakeholders, they were able to meet the very high standards and tight deadlines set for various stages of the competitive exercise, with some measure of success. The FARA African CP is now in the final stages of the competition, and if it clears the last hurdle, will constitute the first major program that would enable FARA to put action behind Africa’s vision for agricultural research, and will doubtless contribute to FARA’s ability to effectively carry out its coordination role and facilitation mandate for ARD in Sub-Saharan Africa.

At about the same time and at the sub-regional level, CORAF decided to establish and fill two positions for CSO representatives on its Executive Committee. The CSOs in the sub-region responded to the gesture, and organized a consultative process where they selected their representatives who now sit on the CORAF Executive Committee. This institutionalization of CSO representation at the decision-making level will provide the CSOs an opportunity to influence ARD in the sub-region and make the voice of the less vocal heard. It will also enhance the capacity of the selected organizations, which now have to go through a reorganization process so that they are in a better position to fully reflect and
articulate the views and needs of their constituent base. This exemplary case should be replicated in other RF and SRF that have not yet taken this important step.

The second strategy that GFAR has used over the last several years to address the second component of its business plan is regional priority-setting. The rationale for setting ARD priorities at the regional level is so that under the guidance of RF/SRF, problems common to a large number of countries in the region can be identified and addressed collectively, especially for those issues where the required skills and human resources are not available in any one particular country. The outputs of such joint endeavors would benefit a large number of countries from the region and perhaps beyond. The GFAR Secretariat in collaboration with the Technical Advisory Committee of the CGIAR facilitated priority-setting exercises in all five Regional Fora, and a synthesis of the output provided the European Forum for Agricultural Research (EFARD) with some ideas and potential areas of collaboration with the Regional Fora as it prepared to respond to calls for expression of interest by the European Commission’s 6th Framework Program. These types of activities will not only contribute to the capacity-building efforts of participating RF/SRF, but will also provide information that potential donors and funding institutions could use to develop funding mechanisms that respond to the real issues of concern of RF/SRF and NARS.

All of the above examples, and many more that time will not permit me to describe, have in some way contributed to strengthening RF/SRF and CSOs. Are we doing enough? The response from our perspective is equivocal, perhaps yes, perhaps no. But what is clear and unequivocal is that we can do better, and we suggest the following approaches which, if implemented with vigor and dispatch, will improve our performance in this respect.

**Reflecting identified priorities in GPPs.** As indicated earlier, regional priority-setting exercises were carried out in all of the
five southern Regional Fora, and we believe there is a need to ensure that some of these priorities are reflected in the next sets of GPPs to be developed. In addition to responding to some identified needs, this process will also contribute to capacity-building. We suggest that the NARS Steering Committee should play an important role in this respect, and the Secretariat will welcome suggestions and guidance from stakeholder groups, particularly the Regional Fora, on how to proceed with this idea.

**Inter-regional collaboration.** Each of the Regional Fora and Sub-Regional Fora has some well-recognized strengths, which could be shared with others for mutual benefits. We have observed that preoccupied with their own day-to-day activities, Regional Fora and Sub-Regional Fora alike are rarely aware of what is going on in other fora, and thus fail to take advantage of existing expertise in those fora or lend a helping hand to those in need. They necessarily focus on their own activities, and it takes a detached observer like the GFAR Secretariat or other stakeholders to see the bigger picture. We therefore suggest that, in collaboration with other actors, the Secretariat should facilitate a SWOT (Strength-Weakness-Opportunities-Threats) analysis of the various Regional Fora, with the main objectives of highlighting their relative strengths and weaknesses, cross-match the outputs as appropriate and then encourage inter-regional collaboration, linkages, and information and knowledge exchanges. We believe that such activities will not only enhance south-south and north-south collaboration, but they will also contribute to our goal of strengthening the weaker links, so that NARS, FOs and NGOs can effectively contribute to current efforts to improve ARD, at the local, regional or global levels.

**Increased advocacy.** We may need to step up advocacy *vis-à-vis* the RF/SRF, to encourage them to work more consistently with other stakeholders, particularly FOs, NGOs and the private sector. Such an overture towards other stakeholders should include statutory representation of CSOs on the governing bodies of the RF/SRF so that they can influence
policy formulation and implementation. We believe this will address the letter and spirit of GFAR, and lead more rapidly to the much sought after positive impact of the agricultural sector on sustainable development.

Organizational strengthening of NGOs/FOs. Finally we strongly believe that we need to find some formula for strengthening the NGOs and FOs from an organizational standpoint. We have specifically requested CSOs to examine this question and come up with recommendations, but complementary inputs from other stakeholder groups can only help. The task therefore is how to achieve the organizational strengthening of CSOs.

GFAR stakeholders are many and span the globe, hence the need for a communication platform that enables the stakeholders to exchange information and share experiences and knowledge amongst themselves. This need was identified early in the life of GFAR and was strongly endorsed with specific recommendations at various fora. First, at the Rome consultation meeting on Enhancing Global Cooperation in ARD Information in 1999, the GFAR Secretariat was asked to: (1) promote the process of developing an enabling environment for a Global Knowledge System for ARD; (2) support the development of Regional Agricultural Information Systems in cooperation with RF/SRF; and (3) manage EGFAR as a stakeholder-led decentralized information system. Second, in Dresden, a meeting was held to discuss the emergence of Regional Agricultural Information Systems (RAIS). One of the outputs of that meeting was the establishment by the RAIS of a website based in EGFAR, the electronic Global Forum, and accessible through the gateway function of EGFAR. Finally, the need for a strong communication and information exchange platform was once again reinforced by the GFAR external review of 2000, which recommended that the GFAR Secretariat be strengthened so that it can effectively address the issue.

In response to these endorsements, directives and recommendations, the GFAR Secretariat developed a three-
part program of work for the triennium of 2001-2003, which has transformed a static Electronic GFAR (EGFAR) into a dynamic, user-friendly, searchable, regularly updated and interactive communication and information platform for GFAR stakeholders. The range of services that are now available on EGFAR include:

- Information tools such as: events, spotlights, document repository, search engine, access to information on the four themes of GFAR, i.e. a portal function

- Communication tools such as: a quarterly newsletter featuring news and articles from the Secretariat, RF/SRF and other stakeholders; the CSO e-conference on the development of an institutional strengthening proposal, and the AGRIS e-discussion on investigating ways of making AGRIS more compatible with the developing a global information system within the framework of the Global Alliance of the Regional Agricultural Information Systems (GLOBAL.RAIS).

Two new exciting developments that address the subsidiarity and decentralized information management concept, and the support to needy stakeholders, are the EGFAR Back Office (EBO) and the GLOBAL.RAIS initiative respectively.

**EBO.** The EBO is a decentralized input process that allows stakeholders from the regions to manage the EGFAR database and information system as well as its page contents. Two levels of authorized input processes have been developed. The first level is a free insertion of data, events, institutional links and links to e-discussion hosted by a variety of other sites. The second level, which gives a page modification access, is restricted to coordinators of stakeholder groups, of facilitating units of GPPs and RAIS managers who would have access to stakeholder and research partnership sections of EGFAR as appropriate. The EBO can be accessed on the EGFAR site at www.egfar.org/ebo/masterpage.jsp.
GLOBAL.RAIS. The Regional Fora are in different stages of developing their RAIS, and the Secretariat is facilitating this process. The GLOBAL.RAIS initiative takes the process one step further by developing synergies among the RAIS. The goal is to develop compatible systems so that regional and global information systems can collaborate, work together on crosscutting activities, and share technical information via the XML technology.

One can conclude that the response to the universally expressed need for the development of an efficient system of information exchange and knowledge-sharing amongst GFAR stakeholders has been appropriately addressed. Given the dynamic and rapidly changing nature of information communication technologies and their management, there are still some challenges ahead, and we solicit your collective wisdom in answering the following questions: How can we further improve horizontal communication amongst different GFAR stakeholders? How can we enhance the decentralized and subsidiarity aspects of EGFAR, the GLOBAL.RAIS being the first step? What other services can EGFAR offer to further improve access to information and knowledge?

At the end of the Dresden meeting, all stakeholder groups prepared and presented statements in which some specific recommendations and demands were made. Table 7 summarizes how well we have responded to some of those recommendations.

Table 7. Responses to stakeholders’ requests at Dresden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Recommendation/Request/ Demand</th>
<th>Response status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOs</td>
<td>Increase farmers’ groups participation, provide more opportunities for participation during meetings</td>
<td>Adequate steps taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOs</td>
<td>Minimize language barrier to facilitate exchange and dialogue</td>
<td>Adequate steps taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Via Campesina
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FOs IFAP</strong></th>
<th><strong>NGOs</strong></th>
<th><strong>NARS</strong></th>
<th><strong>IARCs</strong></th>
<th><strong>ARI</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Give priority to policy research to tackle such issues as access to NR, food safety, biosafety and marketing  
• Emphasize advocacy role on such issues as public–private funding of research, and farmers' access to local germplasm | • Establish a formal structure and good facilitation to guarantee a balanced stakeholder participation with farmer and NGO reps at decision-making levels from NARS to GFAR Steering Committee  
• Put more emphasis on agro-ecology and NRM research, and establish trust-fund model funding mechanisms with open and balanced competition | • Merge the Global Shared Vision (GSV) and Dresden declaration documents into one, and edit for consistency  
• Review progress made on the GSV and the four thematic areas of focus | • Edit the GSV and the declaration to make clearer and more powerful statements  
• Ensure that the documents clearly state that agriculture includes livestock, forestry and fisheries  
• Improve on NARS representation to avoid dominance by the crop sector | • Clarify the role of GFAR with a plan of action with targets and timetables |
| Being addressed—see new GPPs  
Needs to be addressed | Partially addressed  
Pending | Done  
Not yet addressed | Satisf. Addressed  
Addressed  
Needs more effort | Addressed |

As part of our concluding remarks, we would like to use a well-known evaluation tool to summarize our analysis of achievements and gaps over the last three years and the way forward (see Table 8).
Table 8. GFAR score sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research partnerships</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to global knowledge</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO strengthening</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF/SRF strengthening</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information flows</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to stakeholders</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilan</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our task now is to move that *bilan* to the right in the near future, through our joint collaborative effort, starting with inputs and suggestions from you during roundtable discussions and stakeholder consultations. Inputs and suggestions that should address some of the challenges and questions we raised are summarized below.

- We invite you to reflect and make recommendations on how to improve the pace of developing and implementing GPPs.
- Do we as GFAR stakeholders still accept and subscribe to the concept so clearly enunciated in the global vision that our agricultural development activities should include crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors, while striving to address these components in an integrated manner? If positive, then what strategies can we put in place to ensure that we develop a balanced portfolio of projects? If negative, why, and what strategies can we suggest to address these two currently neglected sectors of forestry and fisheries?
- We ask you to reflect on whether we should focus on one or more of these thematic areas in the near future.
• We urge you to suggest a list of issues and suggest mechanisms that could be used to stimulate fruitful exchange of ideas on them, followed by effective and targeted dissemination of the outputs in order to have some impact on the global agenda for ARD.

• In terms of our efforts to build capacity of RF/RF and CSOs are we doing enough? If not, what strategies, approaches and mechanisms can we as a group implement to improve our performance?

• What strategies and approaches can we use to achieve the organizational strengthening of the CSOs?

• What other strategies can we adopt to further improve horizontal communication amongst GFAR stakeholders, and how can we further enhance the decentralized and subsidiarity aspects of EGFAR? Finally, what other services can EGFAR offer to further improve access to information and knowledge?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, since I arrived at the GFAR Secretariat a little over five months ago, I have come to realize the tremendous amount of responsibility placed on the Secretariat, which serves as the glue that holds the different parts of GFAR together. It monitors its activities, maintains an institutional memory, and ensures that the neutral consultative platform provided by GFAR to its constituent parts is not only available to all, but also functions in an effective and efficient manner. Moreover, it ensures that the various geographically dispersed partners are linked amongst themselves, as well as to the outside knowledge pool. In addition, the Secretariat has been mandated to take a leading role in identifying emerging issues of importance to the global agricultural research systems and to organize brainstorming and discussion sessions around such issues in order to prepare stakeholders to respond to them.

Mr. Chairman, the GFAR initiative is designed to promote and facilitate strategic partnerships amongst stakeholders involved in ARD in order to take advantage of economies of scale.
resulting from a pooling together of expertise, knowledge, human and financial resources. This initiative is working, and the concept is being concretized slowly but surely. The approach is rapidly gaining acceptance, as the GFAR value-added contribution to the global agricultural research system becomes clearer, and we at the Secretariat are the first to know this as awareness and acceptance come with more requests for services and additional responsibilities. The Secretariat therefore appeals to all GFAR stakeholder groups for your continued support and commitment. Each stakeholder group has a role to play in strengthening the Secretariat for the common good, and we shall be approaching each group with specific and targeted requests for sustainable support.

Thank you
ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

The deliberations arising from 17 roundtables during the first day of the conference were synthesized and reported to plenary on the second day. This synthesis tries to capture all the differing themes and proposals emerging from all the roundtables, for input into the GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006 and the Secretariat Plan of Work (PoW) 2004-2006. The work of GFAR, which is represented by the output of all of its stakeholders facilitated by the Secretariat under the direction of its Steering Committee, is encapsulated in a three-year business plan. The work carried out by the GFAR Secretariat supports and facilitates the work of GFAR and is prepared annually.

There was general consensus in all the roundtables on the potential value-adding role that can and should be played by GFAR in supporting ARD globally and in facilitating the work and efforts of the Regional Fora and the respective Sub-Regional Fora and NARS to develop stronger and more integrated agricultural research and development programs and projects. The regional forum in Europe (EFARD) and an emerging one in North America (NAFAR) are both set up to support ARD in developing countries. There is a need, however, for clarity of the role of GFAR as a global entity with its Secretariat vis-à-vis the roles of the RF/SRF to avoid duplication and confusion. In essence both GFAR and the Regional Fora are facilitators, and almost all ARD implementation is conducted at sub-regional and NARS levels and below.

In roundtables, participants were requested to address the following questions, and present their assessments, opinions and recommendations: What should be the goals of GFAR? What should be the strategic priority roles of GFAR? What insights does GFAR have to five key questions: (1) Should agricultural development activities include crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors? (2) In what thematic areas
should GFAR be promoting/doing more? (3) What are the top five priority ARD issues for GFAR? (4) Is GFAR doing enough, in terms of efforts to build capacity of RF/SRF and CSOs? (5) What strategies can GFAR employ for improving horizontal communication among stakeholders?

**GOALS OF GFAR**

GFAR should be a global platform for advocacy, dialogue, information-sharing, fund-raising, policy-making and facilitating the advancement of issues of global concern in ARD, such as intellectual property rights, production of global public goods, impact of globalization (related to equity, trade and marketing), and appropriate use of biotechnology by its stakeholders.

GFAR should promote participatory action research mechanisms through coordination, facilitation and support of capacity-building for all of its stakeholders at community, national, regional and international levels, thereby strengthening NARS and their RF/SRF in the process.

**STRATEGIC PRIORITY ROLES OF GFAR**

GFAR should be seen as a platform for representation and advocacy for ARD at the global level, especially in support of the RF/SRF. Advocacy, and fund-raising, can be attained by establishing or maintaining existing links with political groupings such as G8 and the African Union, and initiatives such as The Hunger Task Force, NEPAD, the Millennium Development Goals and the Convention on Biodiversity. Other organizations with potential for support are all Ministries of Finance, the World Bank and IMF, the Inter-Academy Council and Academies of Science, and UN agencies such as UNDP, FAO, ILO, UNEP, UNESCO and UNICEF. GFAR should also engage with civil society, and assist it to play a role in validating the relevance of priority issues on which GFAR plans to focus.
GFAR should be a forum to bring agricultural scientists and stakeholders from different regions of the world together, to focus on major issues of global importance that influence agriculture. In this context, GFAR should promote sharing of information and experiences across the regions of the world, thereby helping to strengthen the global knowledge pool and furthering the use of ICT. EGFAR can be the gateway, particularly to strengthen the RAIS of the RF/SRF.

GFAR should promote partnership development across disciplines, across institutions and organizations and across regions and continents of the world through all its stakeholders, especially bringing together the public and private sectors.

GFAR should facilitate change in agricultural research worldwide in the context of the new emerging paradigm and objectives of agricultural innovation based on a participatory approach, such as shifting from product to producer focus, from food to nutritional security, from land ownership based programs to holistic community-based programs, and from poverty alleviation to sustainable livelihoods and quality of life improvement.

GFAR should enable the expansion of agricultural research through partnerships with the community, private and public sectors.

**STRATEGIES AND THEMES FOR GFAR**

In order to guide the 17 simultaneous roundtable discussions a number of issues and questions (Box 4) were formulated by the GFAR Secretariat based on the report on gaps and the way forward from the GFAR Executive Secretary. The participants were asked to respond to each of the five questions and the results are summarized as follows:

**Question 1:** Should agricultural development activities include crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors?
**Answer:** Yes, but in an integrated manner and not as independent components. Suggested strategies include: using systems concepts that integrate all these sub-sectors with technical, socio-economic, policy and institutional aspects at all levels (sub-regional, regional, national); using integrated, multidisciplinary approaches that facilitate interactions across all components, and using an agro-ecosystem approach.

**Question 2:** In what thematic areas should GFAR be promoting/doing more?

**Answer:** A wide range of responses to this question was given by roundtable participants, with an emphasis on enabling research on often currently neglected political, social and economic aspects of ARD. GFAR should endeavor to promote participatory planning at all levels to overcome the growing disconnection between research objectives and the heterogeneous needs of farmers. Participatory information-sharing and knowledge-sharing, including utilizing indigenous knowledge, should be encouraged at all levels. Similarly, GFAR should engage more actively in the inclusion of often disadvantaged actors, including women, youth and the elderly, and promote agricultural development through, for example, more study of agriculture as an integral part of the curriculum in basic education in rural areas.

GFAR should continue to focus on water, energy, health, agriculture and biodiversity (WEHAB) thematic areas, and interactions across and between them, and encourage policy debates on issues such as IPRs, biotechnologies, biodiversity and GMOs, particularly in consideration of the consequences of ARD on societies of the future.

A reassessment of current research focus is needed to take into consideration the difficulties that developing countries face with new treaties, issues and regimes such as phyto-zoo sanitary standards, food and biosafety and subsidization of agricultural produce. Related to this is a requirement for more
attention to research on policy analysis, natural resources management and the environment (agro-ecosystems).

GFAR should also promote the integration of small-holder resource-poor farmers into local, national, regional and global markets including fostering regional trade and establishing a more level playing field for north-south trade. This would enable GFAR to respond to the long-term agriculture research challenges posed by increasing poverty in some areas of the world, an anticipated doubling of the population, and equity concerns with 20% of the world’s population having 80% of its wealth.

As for areas in which GFAR should be doing less, it was the opinion of stakeholder participants that GFAR should reduce its involvement in implementation of research projects, and should shift its focus on single-component issues in agricultural research and development to a broader research paradigm.

**Question 3: What are the top five priority ARD issues for GFAR?**

**Answer:** A recurring issue in the roundtable discussions was involvement of all stakeholders in setting research priorities, so that RF/ SRF needs are addressed. It was also felt that GFAR should advocate decentralization of research to enhance its relevance to RF/ SRF. Within that framework, the following specific issues should be given top priority by GFAR: (1) genetic resources management, biotechnology and biosafety, IPRs; (2) natural resource management and agro-ecology; (3) commodity chains and underutilized species from production to consumption with more attention to socio-economic research; (4) policy analysis and management, and institutional development; and (5) sustainable financing mechanisms.
Question 4: Is GFAR doing enough, in terms of efforts to build capacity of RF/SRF and CSOs?

Answer: Some progress has been made but more needs to be done. For example, GFAR should be seen to be proactive in creating the necessary environment for stakeholder engagement in GFAR activities, especially for the currently less involved CSOs and private sector. One suggested activity is for GFAR to develop specific criteria for certain activities, particularly for CSOs and/or private sector partnerships, and in some cases leadership (special grants could be created for this type of partnership).

GFAR should foster more attention and focus on equity issues across regions. This should include the language issue, as well as recognition of special situations across different regions.

GFAR should give special attention to promoting capacity-building, including: (1) addressing the need for a new paradigm for capacity-building; (2) strengthening both the demand and the supply sides of capacity-building; (3) promoting regional collaboration through Centres of Excellence; (4) facilitating access to advanced research facilities to capitalize on inter-regional (south-south) differences in development, modeled on Brazil’s Virtual Laboratory Abroad (LABEX) approach; (5) promoting an enabling environment to reduce the brain-drain and make use of the skills of those who have left; and (6) providing an information exchange/sharing on capacity-building activities across RF, SRF and NARS.

Question 5: What strategies can GFAR employ for improving horizontal communication among stakeholders?

Answer: Good progress is being made, but more focus is required in this area. GFAR should facilitate access to telecommunications for research and development in different regions of the world. This can be done through advocacy, which should include fund-raising for this purpose, at the highest level. EGFAR should function as a gateway to
strengthen links to all the RF/SRF and help build and set standards for all the RAIS. Other regional organizations should be encouraged to join GFAR, and to have their information channels linked to EGFAR. GFAR could use a client-oriented information dissemination approach, adapting information to the local context and specific needs of stakeholders.

**BOX 4. GUIDELINES FOR THE ROUNDTABLES**

The roundtable sessions are designed to maximize interaction among the members of the different GFAR stakeholder constituencies in discussing (a) various perspectives on the contribution of agricultural research and innovation to sustainable development and (b) the emerging priorities around which new lines of action can be developed and articulated in the next GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006.

**PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS**

There will be 17 simultaneous roundtable sessions. The roundtable groups will be designed in order to strike a stakeholder and regional balance, and in recognition of the need to have fairly manageable groups. This will be done through a list, which will be distributed to participants to indicate their roundtable group, its participants, venue and timing.

**ROUNDTABLE MECHANICS**

The management of the roundtables is left to the groups themselves. To facilitate the preparation of a synthesis, the groups must nominate a facilitator and rapporteur.

- The facilitator will ensure that the objectives are met and that all participants from different stakeholder groups will have an opportunity to express their views and opinions. It is important that he/she is able to elicit concrete recommendations from his/her group on each topic discussed.
- The rapporteur will be responsible for capturing the salient points of the discussion. He/she will have to make sure that issues raised and agreements reached are clearly documented.
• All rapporteurs will meet in the evening with the conference organizers to synthesize discussion outputs which will then be presented the following day in Plenary Session III. Facilitators may also join the synthesis session.

A set of questions is given to guide the discussions. As it will be difficult for the synthesis group to analyze and capture the richness and diversity of discussion in each roundtable, it is critical that each group follows the same guidelines and reports the results of its work in the same format.

GUIDE QUESTIONS BASED ON KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

The keynote papers - one from the global, and one from the African perspective - drew conclusions from the many pressing challenges facing us from globalization, liberalized trade, population increase and the Millennium Development Goals. In this context, both papers place particular stress on public private partnerships. Has GFAR done enough to encourage more private sector participation? What more can be done to further encourage private sector involvement in GFAR programmes?

Partnerships must provide a level playing field for contributions by both developed and developing countries on issues such as trade barriers, access to science and technology, and IPRs, so what contribution can or should GFAR make to advancing debates in these spheres. WSSD stressed the WEHAB concept, which will provide action on these five key areas of sustainable development; so what contribution should GFAR make in this regard?

Since a key step to moving towards global sustainable development will be concern for Africa to solve its problems through NEPAD, we need to strongly support this initiative in concert with other new initiatives coming on stream in Africa. The NEPAD paper brings up issues in development and transfer of germplasm, particularly relevant for rice, cassava and banana. Is GFAR doing enough here and are there other commodities from the crop, livestock, forestry or fisheries that might provide big benefits from more attention? Soil and water management are key issues, and not just in Africa; mention is also made of small-scale water harvesting techniques, soil fertility improvement through agroforestry, crop/livestock integration, use of fertilizer and minimum tillage techniques.
Roles of public and private sectors, particularly FOs are mentioned concerning seed multiplication and all aspects of input supply, processing and marketing. There are many institutional and policy concerns in all of the above; and the papers also draw our attention to the more disadvantaged sectors of women and youth.

**SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED**

- Public-private partnerships
- Policy issues on trade barriers, IPRs, seed multiplication and GFAR’s role in WAHAB
- Development and transfer of improved germplasm
- Soil and water management issues, and holistic approach to farming systems, with crops, livestock, agroforestry and fisheries
- Input supply, value added through processing and marketing; and the interface here between farmer organizations and the private sector
- The cross-cutting issue of women and youth.

Both papers raise a number of questions on which we need to reflect, discuss, agree priorities and see where GFAR stakeholders can and should focus in the next business plan, and better collaborate in innovative global or regional partnership programmes.

**GUIDE QUESTIONS BASED ON REPORT OF THE GFAR EXECUTIVE SECRETARY**

1. As GFAR stakeholders, do we still accept and subscribe to the concept enunciated in the Global Vision formulated in GFAR 2000 that our agricultural development activities should include crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors, while striving to address these components in an integrated manner. If yes, what strategies can we put in place to ensure that we develop a balanced portfolio of projects. If otherwise, why, and what strategies can we suggest to address these two neglected sectors of forestry and fisheries?

2. In view of the pressing issues in sustainable development raised by the keynote speakers which may critical in the near future, should we place more emphasis on one or the other thematic area? (What thematic areas should GFAR be promoting more of?)
3. What are the top five priority ARD issues that GFAR should be concentrating on in the next three years? How can GFAR stimulate its various stakeholders to contribute to the global knowledge pool on these issues? How can it facilitate the fruitful exchange of ideas facilitated across regions and across stakeholders, followed by effective and targeted dissemination of the outputs in order to have some impact on the global agenda for ARD.

4. In terms of our efforts to build capacity of RF/SRF and CSOs are we doing enough? What strategies, approaches and mechanisms can we, as GFAR implement to improve our performance? What can be the role of each stakeholder in contributing to this endeavor?

5. What other strategies can we adopt to further improve horizontal communication amongst the different GFAR stakeholders, and how can we further enhance the decentralized and subsidiarity aspects of EGFAR. What other services can EGFAR offer to further improve access to information and knowledge?
POSTER SESSION

GFAR launched a poster competition with the theme *Successful Cases of Agricultural Research and Sustainable Development Partnerships* by sending out a call for proposals via the GFAR stakeholder mailing list. The overall purpose of the competition was to circulate information about successful multi-stakeholder partnership experiences in ARD with the objective of feeding strategic thinking on the mandate of GFAR. Approximately 60 written proposals were received and were then passed through a screening process based on the guidelines as outlined in the next section.

MECHANISMS AND OUTCOMES

The two fundamental criteria for a submission to be considered were the need for a clear focus on the theme of *Successful Partnership in ARD* and the involvement of a minimum of three stakeholder groups recognized by GFAR (i.e. FOs, NGOs, private sector, IARCs, ARIs, RF/SRF, NARS, donors) in the partnership.

The proposal was to clearly indicate: (1) the purpose and nature of the partnership (i.e. why those participants, their respective roles and the advantages they bring to the partnership); (2) a description of the activities of the partnership (i.e. what was carried out, when and where, length of activity); (3) the status of the activity (i.e. ongoing, completed); (4) the outputs and how the partnership contributed to the outputs; (5) the impact of this partnership experience and any spillover effects (i.e. on the partners, beneficiaries, community at large); (6) lessons learned in building and maintaining the partnership and recommendations for involvement in future partnerships; and (7) next steps.

After the screening process by the GFAR Secretariat, 30 proposals were retained to be developed into a full poster to
compete during the conference, and the two best proposals were selected for presentation during Plenary Session II on *Sharing of Successful Regional Fora and Stakeholder Experiences in ARD* (see Boxes 5 and 6).

**BOX 5. CASE STUDY 1: A PARTNERSHIP FOR MILK/MEAT PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGIES DEVELOPMENT IN KENYA**

**INTRODUCTION**

Nutritional deficiencies and lack of food security are quickly becoming serious issues for the nomadic pastoral people in the semi-arid areas of northern Kenya. However, at certain times of the year there can be surpluses of raw livestock resources such as camel milk and good quality meat. Through a partnership project steps have been taken to promote traditional and modern methods of preserving these surpluses for use during times of need thereby increasing food security of the local population. The project was initiated in early 2001 by the Salato Women's Group (a pastoralist community group), PEAR Group, a private sector consultant with expertise in appropriate technology, and Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI). Participatory technology development was used in researching and testing appropriate milk and meat preservation technologies. Initial experiments were conducted on various technologies based on current literature on modern methods and traditional knowledge followed by field experimentation directly involving the community.

**OBJECTIVES**

There were three overall objectives of the partnership project. The first was to establish a link between research and literature on milk and meat preservation techniques and ultimately for pastoralist communities to be able to effectively use this information to generate products that increase food security while generating income. The second was to enhance the capacity of self-help groups to start small-scale milk and meat preservation enterprises at the community level.

---
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Finally, the third objective was to develop suitable improved products through participatory technology development for community processing and use combining modern and traditional methods of milk and meat processing.

OUTCOMES, IMPACTS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Through implementation of this project some broad principles on the nature of partnership were learned by the participants. The value of the partnership itself as well as the role of each partner was recognized. At the same time, the role of each associate must be flexible and evolve according to the needs of the others and the project. If well balanced partnership is forged, all skills needed for the success of the project should be met with all associates bringing a specific comparative advantage to the team. It was noted that all partners are indispensable and that the level of commitment of each must be evaluated before entering into collaboration.

At the community level some very concrete benefits were felt from the implementation of this project. In the Ngurunit Community a dairy and a meat processing facility were established thereby increasing food security and generating income. From the profits of these two facilities grants have been offered for further development of other economic enterprises in the community. Literacy and management training courses were offered to the participants. Upon the request of other communities, the project was expanded and exchange visits organized. Labor saving technologies and new products were developed, along with a new market for these products.

NEXT STEPS

The project is entering into its last phase with a focus on how to sustain the activities indefinitely after the end of the project in June 2004. Quality control and improved skin tanning will also be researched in the upcoming year.

KARI is becoming a tool to assist the population of Kenya to work towards food security and will continue to aid in initiating income generating projects at the village level. PEAR Group is promoting education on nutrition in local communities and will incorporate this into the regular syllabus for adult education. The Salato Women's Group will further integrate the new products developed in the course of the project at the household level.
Considerable interest has been generated in replicating this successful project in other communities in Kenya, and requests for information on specific technologies have been received from Somalia and United Arab Emirates. All efforts will be made to disseminate the information and technologies of this project so as to benefit the wider community.

**BOX 6. CASE STUDY 2: CHINA/CANADA DRYLAND FARMING PROJECT**

**INTRODUCTION**

Due to many factors related to intense crop production the sustainability of the agricultural sector in the lowland plain of Hebei, China is under threat. In partnership with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Government of China co-funded the China/Canada Dryland Farming Project to address this issue of sustainability. The project has been carried out in two phases, the first from 1991-96 concentrated on five research and one agricultural components, and the second is still ongoing and is focused on outreach and extension to improve rural well-being and enhance the ecological sustainability of dryland farming in the region and neighboring regions. Along with the two co-sponsors, researchers and specialists from China (the Ministry of Agriculture, Departments of Agriculture of five provinces, County Agriculture Bureau, Hebei Academy of Agriculture and Forest Services, and village organizations) and Canada (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada) collaborated in the development and implementation of this project.

**OBJECTIVES**

The stated objective of the project is to develop and transfer ecologically sound dryland agricultural technology to improve water-use efficiency, soil and water quality and farming profitability in the Hebei Lowland Plain.

---
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With this overall goal in mind, the project is articulated in six components: 1) improve water-use efficiency; 2) develop sustainable cropping systems; 3) develop integrated pest management techniques; 4) improve environmental sustainability; 5) socio-economic impact and rural development of the project; and 6) improve agriculture extension.

OUTCOMES, IMPACTS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Agriculture extension in China has traditionally been top-down, however this project establishes a new participatory extension model involving many levels of stakeholders. With the assistance of and training from extension workers, farmers are given the opportunity to select and implement the technologies that are most useful for their particular conditions and needs.

This project has provided some significant technical benefits. It successfully tested and developed irrigation methods for winter wheat that improve the overall water-use efficiency while at the same time selecting for more drought-resistant varieties of wheat. The zero till crop production systems for corn, designed to conserve soil moisture, increase yield, improve soil quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, has been adopted by 90% of farmers in Hebei. Farmers are also implementing newly elaborated bio-control systems for both insects and plant diseases thereby significantly lowering the use of pesticides and herbicides. Additionally, progress has been made in the development of balanced fertilization techniques aimed at optimizing yield, reducing the potential for soil and ground water pollution, and reducing costs to farmers.

The second phase of the project elaborated further the benefits related to agriculture extension. A network of extension specialists has been established involving multiple levels of government in China who are involved in technology transfer. Farmer training, field demonstrations and field days were conducted and attended by national and international specialists as well as local farmers. The transfer of technology generated an economic return of -10% to +30%, depending on the technology, when compared to previous growing practices. Direct impacts of the project have been felt by three million farms with an overall economic impact of 1.8 billion Renminbi per year at the provincial level.
NEXT STEPS

Beyond the original 11 extension demonstration sites in Hebei Province, two more sites have been established and an additional four in neighboring provinces. Linkages have also been made to other CIDA-supported projects in the region. The partners will continue to disseminate information and technologies in a similar manner as over the last 12 years while being responsive and flexible to changing needs of farmers.

Authors of the remaining 28 proposals were asked to develop their poster following some common standard in order to facilitate the final judging. The format of the poster had to be A0 (84 cm x 118 cm) with at least two photographs.

A group of seven judges, coming from all GFAR stakeholder groups (Stephen Krall - donors, John Russell - private sector, Romolo Zarauz - NGOs, Esta Kiwazi - FOs, Thierry Mennesson - ARIs, Ajit Maru - IARCs, Enrique Alarcón - NARS), was asked to rate posters during the first two days of the conference and to complete a judging form for each poster, using the following as guidelines:

1. **Stakeholders**: Are their names mentioned? Are stakeholder group delineations clear (can you understand if it is a farmers’ group or an NGO? Or a private company or a public institution?)

2. **Purpose**: Is it clearly expressed?

3. **Activities**: Is the level of involvement of each stakeholder group clear? Are activities detailed enough and, for research projects, presented on a level comprehensible to the non-expert?

4. **Outputs**: Are they clearly defined? Are they detailed enough?

5. **Impact and spillover effects**: Are they clear? Can you recognize the ultimate impact on end-users? Is it obvious who the end-user is?
6. **Lessons learned:** Are they clearly expressed? Are new issues coming out as lessons learned? Are all lessons considered, negatives as well as positives?

7. **Next steps:** Are they clearly defined?

8. How is the balance between text and pictures? Is there too much text? Too many pictures? Can you read the poster easily? Does it attract you at first glance?

9. Are there at least two photos? (because it was required to have at least two photos in the poster, if it does not respect this point the poster could not be selected as a winner poster)

10. What is the general appearance? Is the poster harmonious? Balanced? Are the colors agreeable?

11. Personal remarks.

Questions 1 to 7, corresponding to the guidelines for submission of the proposal, were scored between 1 to 10, while questions 8 to 11 were scored between 1 to 5, thereby placing more emphasis on the content while still giving due consideration to visual aesthetics.

After individual scoring, panel members met to harmonize the output and jointly select the top three posters whose authors together with the two presented in plenary received a merit award.

Awards went to:

- **China/Canada Dryland Farming Project** (case study)
- **Partnership for Milk/Meat Preservation Technologies Development in Kenya** (case study)
- **A Partnership for Enabling Rural Innovation**
- **Seeds of Life - Timor Leste**
- **Protected Agriculture in Yemen Mountain Terraces: More Income for Farmers from Less Water**
In addition to the poster competition, two other display sessions were organized for ongoing GPPs and ICM/ICT activities including RAIS and other stakeholders’ projects addressing global, regional or national level issues. Contributing stakeholders also participated, sometimes as key speakers, in the side event titled Towards a Global Agenda for ICM.

This event had a very positive evaluation and review from the participants, and GFAR intends to repeat this type of exercise on a regular basis. Pertinent information from this session will be published in full.

**PANEL DISCUSSION ON SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIP EXPERIENCES IN ARD**

As indicated earlier, the top two posters selected as having best illustrated successful partnership experiences were presented during a panel discussion session. The first presentation on Partnership for Milk/Meat Preservation Technologies Development in Kenya made by the PEAR Group, which focused on the post-production aspects of adding value to milk and meat products for market demands, identified the following as important elements for building successful partnerships: (1) the need to adopt a holistic approach for technology development; (2) a recognition of the value of the partnership and of each partner so that all partners participate fully to the best of their ability; (3) the need to accommodate a change in emphasis as the needs and roles if partners evolve and change; (4) the capability of partners to be flexible in their roles; (5) access to, and capacity-building for required skills; and (6) the recognition that high levels of literacy and skills sets may speed up the adoption of technologies.

The second presentation of the China/Canada Dryland Farming Project made by researchers from the Lethbridge Research Centre of Canada, identified additional issues judged indispensable for successful partnerships in ARD such as: (1) mutual trust among the partners; (2) patience to accomplish the set goals; (3) understanding of and accommodating cultural
differences in approaches and way of doing things (especially for international partners); and (4) the importance of adequate skills as fundamental ingredients to building good partnerships.

In an extremely fruitful panel discussion moderated by Dominique Hounkonou of African Cradles, Benin, and chaired by Alain Derevier of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representatives from NARS, ARIs, FOs, IARCs and NGOs commented on the examples of successful partnerships and made comparisons with their own regional or stakeholder experiences on lessons learned. Other participants in the audience also had the opportunity to contribute to the discussion. The moderator set the tone of the discussion by suggesting that not all projects qualify as partnerships and urged panelists to focus their comments on what the general prerequisites are for successful partnerships. Along those lines, the question was posed as to which was more important, the technology or the partnership. Generally, the panelists found the meat/milk preservation example an interesting model of partnership because it demonstrated the socio-economic impact of agricultural research (i.e. the livelihood implications of research) and provided two important take-home lessons: (1) flexibility - partners could drop out of the partnership or could change; and (2) recognition and acknowledgement of the interest of different stakeholders in the partnership. The meat/milk preservation case study also received commendation from the panelists for being a community-based initiative, stakeholder-driven, addressing vulnerable groups and containing important sustainability aspects (i.e. being based on the land).

The panelists observed that the China/Canada dryland farming project was more focused on user-driven objectives such as capacity-building, institutional and infrastructural building, but had made a good choice of developing technology that farmers wanted to adopt. It appeared that improving efficiency was the objective driving the project and building capacity was consequently a crucial starting point
before dealing with technology issues. However, the panelists suggested that it was better to create local institutions in-country for long-term training, which also guarantees better retention of qualified people.

A presentation of partnership lessons learned from PROMusa, a global partnership program on commodity chains under the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI), provided a contrast between the added value of collaboration at the global level and the partnership experiences from the two case studies presented. The specific lessons from PROMusa’s global experience were: (1) the real complexity of stakeholder relationships within a commodity chain; (2) the need for an active honest brokers role; (3) strong buy-in by all partners for the good of all; (4) that there is no ideal structure for all programs; and (5) the importance of active coordination and getting action on the ground. The PROMusa intervention also highlighted the difficulty of identifying common problems and distinguishing problems for which global-level treatments are better and which problems are researchable. Partnerships at the global level were also exemplified by the European experience with developing partnerships in ARD with southern partners and the concept of a European research area. From the European experience, key important factors for developing successful partnership are (1) stable environmental conditions; (2) stable governments; and (3) acceptable financial conditions.

General concerns from the panel about ARD partnerships and what they considered required greater attention were: (1) the absence of continuity, i.e. disappearance of activities/groups as soon as the external support was withdrawn; (2) not allowing adequate time for the partnership to be consolidated; and (3) financial and sustainability aspects. The panelists went even further, to suggest that they also would like to see the negative side of projects as lessons learned, not only the positives. According to the panel, there are clear indications that managing partnerships is not the same as managing a project or an institution. It was suggested therefore that successful
partnership initiatives may require the development of new management skills, hence the need for capacity-building efforts which as much as possible should be implemented locally.
SIDE EVENTS

During the GFAR conference three parallel side events took place at the lunch breaks, and provided an opportunity for stakeholders to share information, knowledge and experiences in ARD.

PRESENTATION OF CGIAR REGIONAL PRIORITY-SETTING REPORT

This side event was organized by the interim Science Council (iSC) of the CGIAR. The main purpose of this session was to present a progress report on the ongoing consultative process that will contribute to the development of Centres’ research priorities and program implementation strategies.

SESSION HIGHLIGHTS

The presentation highlighted the need to define common priorities for the increasing number of cross-centre initiatives in large and complex research projects undertaken by the CGIAR Centers, such as: (1) collaborative research projects; (2) system-wide programs; and (3) CPs. Priorities and strategies are also needed to guide the multiple partnerships between the Centres, regional organizations and NARS, including NARIs, private sector, NGOs and producers’ organizations. Donors also need to have an overall view of priorities in order to allocate resources to system and Centres projects.

Compared with the approach previously followed by the CGIAR in establishing priorities, the current approach complements the traditional congruence analysis with a broad consultation with stakeholders and scientists. The consultative approach consists of the following three steps:

1. Consultation with five panels of stakeholders, one for each of the four recognized regions and one global. These panels were set up in consultation with GFAR stakeholders and were asked to identify and prioritize critical issues that require attention by the CGIAR and its partners in a bid to
reduce poverty and hunger, and to enhance sustainability of resource use

2. Open electronic consultation with CGIAR stakeholders to prioritize issues identified by the panels and gathering additional suggestions and comments

3. Brainstorming sessions by a panel of scientists from the Centers, NARS and northern research institutions to translate the identified priorities of stakeholders into feasibly researchable issues under the five CGIAR thematic focus areas: (1) germplasm collection and conservation; (2) germplasm improvement; (3) sustainable production systems and NRM; (4) socio-economic and policy research; and (5) institutional capacity-building.

This consultation is still in progress and some results from the first stage were presented. They are briefly summarized as follows.

Some of the main prioritized critical issues identified in the LAC region were in the area of affordable biotechnology to fight poverty, genetic resources management of crops from the region, water management, particularly in the context of climate change, and pro-poor agricultural policies.

In Sub-Saharan Africa interest was focused on germplasm improvement and the enhancement of traditional African crops. Also considered as priorities were the improvement of sustainable production systems and INRM, policies to improve incentives and access to markets, strengthening NARS and the development of new research tools.

In the Central & Western Asia and North Africa (CWANA) region attention was drawn to issues regarding the utilization of genetic resources, genomic techniques and plant breeding to improve water-use efficiency. The need to foster research to improve the productivity of water in both irrigated and dryland farming, water-harvesting and its quality and efficient utilization, and the intensive integration of crops and animals in mixed farming systems were highlighted.
Finally, consultation in Asia identified the following priorities: (1) collection, conservation and enhancement of germplasm through both conventional approaches and biotechnology; (2) improving the sustainability of production systems; (3) strengthening of NARS and rural institutions; and (4) collection and conservation of germplasm.

The global panel worked towards the definition of cross-cutting priorities among regions. These were identified as the need to: develop research priority-setting methods based on poverty criteria; maintain and improve the efficiency of natural resources management supporting agriculture; enhance knowledge management and the capacity of NARS; estimate the impact of resource use and climate change on agro-ecosystem and wild resource systems over the next 25 years, and, finally, work towards the conservation and utilization of germplasm and raise the productivity and resilience of farming systems.

The issues presented were an early reading of results from the consultations. The overall balance of recommendations, at this early stage of the consultation, would suggest a resource allocation across CGIAR outputs with 35% allocated to germplasm conservation and enhancement, 35% to farming systems and NRM, and 30% to policy research and the enhancement of institutions. The presentation was followed by active discussions and it was concluded that research priorities will be developed in collaboration with the World Bank’s assessment of agriculture, and with GFAR consultation on the role of science. As a follow-up to this side event, the participants were invited to join the open consultation by visiting the website at www.rimisp.org/isc.

TOWARDS A GLOBAL AGENDA FOR ICM

During this side event organized by the GFAR Secretariat, several short presentations were made on ongoing successful ICM initiatives at different levels. All of the presentations highlighted the value of stakeholder involvement and the subsequent impact on these stakeholders and other end users.
Special attention was paid to lessons learned from current partnerships among ICM practitioners. Recommendations for future partnership development strategies were made with the overall goal of identifying elements of a future global agenda for ICM.

**OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL INITIATIVES**

Henning Knipschild presented the EARD-Infosys+ experience in managing the RAIS for Europe, and highlighted the recent development of an extranet tool (PHProjekt at www.isicad.org/intro/) designed to improve information sharing within and amongst various stakeholders in Europe.

Following that, Ahmed Rafea presented the information strategy for the WANA region and some of the key outputs of the AARINENA-RAIS workshop held in Cairo at the end of February 2003 (www.egfar.org/action/stakeholders/aarinena/ictworkshop.shtml), under the umbrella of the GLOBAL.RAIS project, led by the GFAR Secretariat. A special emphasis was put on the presentation of the Management Information System (MIS) as an integrated tool enabling the management of information on institutions, experts and ongoing activities. He drew attention to the expected gateway function and the electronic forum of discussion leading to a Question and Answer (Q&A) function. Special mention was made of the AARINENA website (www.aarinena.org) managed by Taraneh Ebrahimi in Iran.

This was followed by Arman Manukyan who focused his presentation on the new regional website for the Caucasus region, Agroweb Caucasus (www.agrowebcaucasus.org). This website is consistently integrated with the Agroweb portal already functioning for Eastern Europe led by FAO/SEUR from Budapest. The scaling-up of this process to Central Asia was clearly underlined.

And finally, Enrique Alarcón presented the main achievements of INFOTEC (http://infotec.ws/), the RAIS of FORAGRO. The role of portal already played by INFOTEC for the various
regional programs (called PROCIs) was clearly demonstrated as well as specific contents of the website such as the *market place for available technologies*.

**OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL INITIATIVES**

Irene Onyantcha, from FAO Headquarters in Rome, presented the healthy portfolio of the activities led by FAO in ICM. Capacity-building activities, a resource kit for the management of electronic documents and the AGORA program - an electronic access to published journals - were reviewed, but a special emphasis was put on the new AGRIS strategy (www.fao.org/AGRIS).

Fulvia Bonaiuti presented the GLOBAL.RAIS project led by the GFAR Secretariat and funded by the European Commission. The key principles of this project such as the bottom-up and decentralized approaches were highlighted. The main achievement will be the building-up of a global agenda in ICM for ARD through a set of five regional workshops and an inter-regional workshop expected to be held in January 2004.

**OTHER SUCCESSFUL INITIATIVES IN ICM**

Marc Bernard from ZADI presented the RUN project (www.runetwork.de) as a successful ICT tool that farmers could use to solve concrete problems. He described the website of e-journals, the Q&A service provided through this platform and the manner in which the demand from farmers is supported rather than the offer by service providers. Further developments were made on SMS or WAP platforms, very similar to services already available, for instance in Senegal.

Ajit Maru from ISNAR presented the iNARS e-discussion (www.dgroups.org/groups/iNARS/) as a platform for sharing information and experiences within a worldwide community of ICM professionals. The recent achievements were presented, focusing on the role of ICT and the specific requirements to use ICT. This list of discussion was clearly perceived as a very useful tool for all the information and communication managers in ARD.
GENERAL DISCUSSION

After the presentations participants highlighted some concerns and made the following recommendations: firstly the need to raise awareness of the various initiatives and maximize the opportunities they offer in order to benefit from economies of scale and the resulting synergies, secondly the need to strengthen RAIS through the sharing of experiences at the intra- and inter-regional levels, and thirdly the need to define a global agenda for ICM, through a bottom-up approach, by connecting activities and stakeholders.

Finally, a proposal was endorsed to continue with this discussion under the umbrella of iNARS.

INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND THE GLOBAL CONSERVATION TRUST

This side event was promoted by the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in collaboration with the Global Conservation Trust of IPGRI. The first GFAR Conference adopted the Dresden Declaration on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, which urged governments to complete the revision of the International Undertaking in Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The declaration allows for the effective implementation of a multilateral system for facilitating access and benefit-sharing for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, recognizing farmers' rights in plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, and promoting implementation of the Leipzig Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

SESSION HIGHLIGHTS

The negotiations for the revision of the International Undertaking were successful. On 3 November 2001, the Thirty-first Session of the FAO Conference adopted the binding International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IT-PGRFA). The Treaty will enter into force ninety days after ratification by forty states.
During this side event, José T. Esquinas-Alcázar, the Secretary of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, presented the Treaty noting that it was being ratified quickly and likely to come into force in early 2004 with the ratifying governments making up its governing body. At the first meeting, the governing body will address important questions such as the level, form and manner of monetary payments on commercialization, a standard Material Transfer Agreement for plant genetic resources, mechanisms to promote compliance with the Treaty, as well as the funding strategy. Countries may therefore consider it important to be among the first to ratify, so as to ensure that their national interests can be taken into account at the governing body’s first meeting, he therefore urged countries to ratify the Treaty rapidly. A Dakar Declaration on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture was adopted by acclamation during the GFAR 2003 closing ceremony (Box 7).

Emile Frison, incoming Director-General of IPGRI, made a brief presentation on the Global Conservation Trust, a CGIAR/FAO initiative designed to establish an endowment fund, with an initial and immediate target of US$100 million in 2003 and a longer-term target of US$260 million. The Trust will provide a flow of funds in perpetuity for _ex situ_ conservation by national and international institutions, and for relevant capacity-building. It would also operate in the framework of the IT-PGRFA, and be an essential element of its funding strategy. The overall policy guidance for the Trust would come from the governing body of the Treaty. The FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture fully supports the initiative and has appealed to donors to assist in the establishment of the Trust, which would attract new and additional funds from a wide range of donors. The meeting participants warmly welcomed and supported the Global Conservation Trust.
1. In May 2000, in Dresden, Germany, participants in the Global Forum on Agricultural Research, representing national agricultural research systems, regional and sub-regional organizations, universities, advanced research institutions, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, Farmers’ Organizations, multilateral and donor agencies, and international agricultural research centres, unanimously adopted the Dresden Declaration on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. We recognized the crucial importance of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, which have been developed by farmers and their communities over thousands of years, for food security and that all countries are now interdependent for accessing these plant genetic resources, on which food security and agriculture depend. This is the basis for Farmers’ Rights.

2. We endorsed the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, which was adopted by 150 countries in Leipzig, Germany in 1996, as the basic and comprehensive framework for undertaking those technical activities essential for effective conservation, development and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture in the FAO global system. We expressed concern that coordinated implementation and associated financing of the plan had not been realized.

3. When we last met, the negotiations within the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture for the revision of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, subsequently crowned by success with the adoption of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture by consensus at the Thirty-first Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, on 3 November 2001, were at a crucial stage.
4. We therefore urged governments to complete the revision of the *International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*, thereby allowing for the effective implementation of a multilateral system of facilitated access and benefit-sharing for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, recognizing Farmers’ Rights in plant genetic resources matters, and promoting the *Global Plan of Action*.

5. Now, three years after we adopted the *Dresden Declaration*, and one and a half years after the adoption of the *International Treaty*, we, the participants in the Global Forum on Agricultural Research in Dakar, Senegal:

- Warmly congratulate the governments of the world for having negotiated and adopted, through the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the *International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*, which addresses the special nature of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, their distinctive features and problems, and provides distinctive solutions.

- Urge countries from all regions to ratify and accede to the *International Treaty* as rapidly as practicable, so that it may come into force as the agreed international framework for the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and the sharing of the benefits derived from this use; for the realization of Farmers’ Rights; for implementing the Multilateral System of Access and Benefit-sharing, and for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*. The *International Treaty* will enter into force after it has been ratified or acceded to by 40 countries. The governing body will be composed of those countries that have ratified or acceded to the *International Treaty*. Its first meeting will take decisions on many crucial matters, such as the development of provisions for access, including matters related to intellectual property rights; benefit-sharing, including the amount and ways for sharing of the monetary benefits obtained from commercialization; compliance, and the funding strategy. We believe that it is therefore crucially important for countries and regions to be among those that constitute the first governing body, so that their national and regional interests may be fully taken into account.
• Urge the effective implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*, including through national action and international cooperation, to provide a coherent framework for capacity-building, technology transfer and the exchange of information, including through the funding strategy of the *International Treaty*, which will mobilize funding for priority actions, plans and programs, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

• Call on national governments to take early measures to fully realize Farmers’ Rights, as foreseen in the *International Treaty*. 
SUB-PLENARY SESSION ON GPPS AND INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

Five parallel sub-plenary sessions were organized and designed to maximize interaction among the members of the different GFAR stakeholder constituencies in discussing emerging themes around which potential GPPs could be developed. The themes, selected on the basis of some of the initiatives currently under development by some GFAR stakeholders, include the following: (1) Rural Knowledge Systems and Innovation Processes; (2) Agro-based Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and Markets in Developing Countries; (3) Agriculture-Livestock Integration; (4) Organizational Partnerships for Agricultural Research; and (5) Innovative Policy Directions and Approaches for Sustainable Agricultural Development.

A non-exhaustive list of issues for discussion prepared by the Secretariat, was made available to each sub-plenary session as guidelines in order to stimulate discussion (Boxes 8 to 12).

RURAL KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS AND INNOVATION PROCESSES (RKS & IP)

Among the activities that the GFAR Secretariat is facilitating are those related to rural knowledge systems and innovation process (RKS & IP). Broadly, these include efforts aimed at addressing mutual learning and sharing of agriculture-related information, technology and knowledge among various stakeholders in ARD in a participatory way so that these can be made accessible to communities in forms which they can utilize. RKS and IP are deemed important in empowering local communities and improving their livelihoods.
SESSION STRUCTURE

The sub-plenary session was chaired by Raghunath Ghodake, Director-General of the Papua New Guinea National Agricultural Research Institute, with Paul Engel, Director of the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) as key speaker, Nathan Russell of CIAT as resource person, and Ann Waters-Bayer of ETC-Ecoculture as rapporteur.

PRESENTATIONS

Five presentations were made during the sub-plenary session. The main presentation was by Paul Engel on Knowing for Development. His presentation covered the concept of knowledge as a domain of inquiry and how knowledge systems thinking changes over time, i.e. from planning for innovation in the 1970s to social inquiry and learning in the 1990s. He also presented some issues and insights related to governance of knowing for development. He concluded his presentation by posing researchable questions related to a global research effort on the governance of knowledge systems and innovation: What approaches do work? Why do they work? What conditions are to be met to make them work?

Complementary presentations on ongoing initiatives related to RKS&IP were made by the following participants: Monica Kapiriri (Aga Khan Foundation-Tanzania) on Promoting Local Innovation-PROLINNOVA, and Bert Lof (ETC-Ecoculture) and Cecile Broutin (GRET-Senegal) on InterSard/InterDev: Partnership for Sharing Information and Knowledge. Finally, Mark Holderness from CAB International presented the concept note on a new initiative on rural knowledge partnership called Putting Knowledge to Work.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The presentations were followed by a discussion session on the concept of knowledge and innovation, which generated the following observations. Firstly that innovation is a process of social interaction that provides new knowledge for the
stakeholders. Secondly that evidence exists that most farmers and communities construct knowledge without interaction with scientists, because more often than not, scientific innovation systems and institutions deny farmers pride in their own knowledge and learning systems. Hence the need for scientists to learn how to contribute to the wider societal process of learning. Finally the importance of sharing credit and benefits equitably amongst contributors to knowledge generated was emphasized.

Given the above observations, participants agreed on the need for a platform for global learning on local innovation systems to improve their efficacy and enhance the contribution of formal science to them. The participants agreed that this platform described as a Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP) should: (1) build on current initiatives; (2) generate some synergy by bringing together different disciplinary and philosophical approaches; (3) derive organizational, institutional and policy principles of promoting innovation systems (such as international public goods); and (4) advocate for an innovation systems approach to research thereby facilitating the translation of lessons learned into policy. Participants also recognized the potential of EGFAR as a means for people faced with local problems to access useful ideas and innovation from a global pool.

Some indicative and appropriate researchable issues that could be treated under this GKP are described below. The cultural sociology and economic policy of successful innovation, including enabling environment, policy and power linkages associated with RKS & IP. Socio-cultural differences in the way people learn at individual, community and institutional levels as well as factors that hinder and favor synergy among diverse learning communities.

Approaches for facilitating linkage between indigenous and scientific innovation systems as well as effective ways, tools and devices of developing mutual social learning to link indigenous and scientific innovation systems in order to
encourage interactive learning processes between farmers and scientists. Competences needed to manage and facilitate interactions between knowledge systems as well as institutional mechanisms for scaling-up principles and good practices in participatory innovation processes. An understanding of how farmers conduct their own research, innovate and learn, including what stimulates social behavior among farmers to seek out new information, to combine this information with their own knowledge, to experiment, to innovate, to have sufficient pride and confidence in their own tradition and culture to use this as the fertile ground for growing outside ideas.

Two other researchable issues identified were firstly the need to examine documentation and subsequent diffusion of rural knowledge and innovation, especially local means of preserving and passing on knowledge. The challenge here is how rural realities can be documented from local perspectives which are socially constructed and embedded in a complex cultural whole. Democratizing tools for handling information and giving people opportunities to document their own experiences as a means of learning for themselves and for others is another research issue that needs attention.

Secondly, the need to look into the inertia of donor-driven innovation, measuring the impact and efficacy of mutual learning processes in improving livelihoods, and the effects of external factors such as trade on the success of innovation processes.

**NEXT STEPS**

As follow-up to the discussion, participants agreed to provide feedback on the draft sub-plenary session report to be circulated by the GFAR Secretariat. An electronic discussion will also be launched to further the interaction on the topic as well as to explore institutional interests and potential contributions in the development of the GKP. As well a workshop was proposed to define global partnership on RKS & IP in more detail.
BOX 8. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: RURAL KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS AND INNOVATION PROCESSES

The purpose of this sub-plenary session is to have an understanding of the knowledge-poverty nexus and to discuss how this can be translated into concrete partnership programs in ARD.

THE KNOWLEDGE-POVERTY NEXUS

• What is a knowledge system? How can the mutual recognition, interaction and utilization of various knowledge systems contribute to poverty alleviation?

• What are the general trends and global strategic issues in rural knowledge systems and innovation processes? Why the sudden interest in the theme?

• What are the related concepts, methodologies and principles that contribute to the transformation of researchers, development agents and farmers and their organizations, institutions, norms, behaviors and relationships?

• What are the capacities (knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior) needed to enable the above transformation, and the effective generation, access and use of knowledge?

• How to demonstrate the direct impact/relationship between poverty alleviation and improved knowledge systems, for example increased capacity of vulnerable groups to deal with complex issues while improving their resilience to rapid change in their livelihood systems (e.g. market) and their natural environment

PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

• What type of partnerships and what implementation mechanisms are needed to promote research partnerships in this area? What are the ways of incorporating knowledge management and innovation processes into ARD?
• What are the qualitative and quantitative costs and benefits of knowledge-sharing using criteria from different knowledge systems from a sustainability perspective? How to sustain information flows and who pays for it? Does the benefit of having access to a global pool of knowledge outweigh individual benefit?
• What are the roles and responsibilities of researchers and communities in utilizing and managing knowledge systems to facilitate the agricultural innovation process?
• What are IPR issues related to knowledge management? How will they impact on local communities and small farmers? How can these impacts be mitigated?
• What is the role of modern ICT in this area?

AGROBASED SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES (AGRI-SMES) AND MARKETS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The challenges posed by globalization are particularly acute for developing countries, where small-scale producers, processors and traders face increasing competition and market volatility. With the objective of identifying priorities for action in ARD, GFAR recently facilitated an RPS exercise and organized in collaboration with AGST, five regional workshops on the status of the post-harvest sector, from both an institutional and a stakeholder perspective. Both activities have clearly outlined the importance of a market-oriented approach in solving the problems of agricultural development. More specifically, it was highlighted that the objectives of poverty eradication and food security cannot be reached simply by increasing food production through the development of appropriate technologies and therefore marketing activities need to be further expanded.

For these reasons, while remaining cognizant of regional and sub-regional background differences, a market approach in ARD can offer a tool for improving the livelihoods of the rural poor, for example by diversifying the range of products that can be produced and by satisfying increasing consumer demands related to food availability, quality and safety. Within
In this context, the development of agri-SMEs directly addresses the issues of adding value and employment generation thereby substantially contributing to social and economic development.

**SESSION STRUCTURE**

The session was chaired by Rodney Cooke, Director of the Technical Advisory Division, IFAD. The keynote address was delivered by Ade Freeman from ICRISAT, Kenya. As resource person Giséle d’Almeida, President of Interface, Senegal, also made a presentation. The rapporteur was Nerlita Manalili, Program Head of the Agro-Industrial Development Program of SEARCA, The Philippines.

**PRESENTATIONS**

The first presentation by Ade Freeman on *Agrobased SMEs and Markets: Challenges and Opportunities for the Poor* outlined the importance of advancing agrobased SMEs in fostering economic and social development. He noted that the contribution of SMEs to rural development is increasingly recognized and is backed by a clear and convincing set of data.

He then concluded by raising five key issues to guide the subsequent discussions: (1) the challenge of upgrading SMEs through capacity development, training and increased efficiency in production; (2) how to foster competitiveness of agri-SMEs through better access to resources such as information, creating more stable macro-economic policies, increasing the provision of financial and non-financial services, and addressing the key issue of unfair market trade; (3) the need for a better understanding of the market particularly through the sustainability of innovations, the changing nature of market structure, and cases to draw lessons from; (4) the importance of partnerships between the private and public sectors and NGOs; and (5) the critical role of science and technology in such areas as determining quality standards.

The second presentation, by Giséle d’Almeida, stressed the need to concentrate on the adoption of a rural innovation approach - an increase in productivity or competitiveness of a
given product as a consequence of an improvement in either production or marketing technologies or know-how. She also shared the recommendations made by the private sector to the FARA plenary on research priorities which stressed the importance of facilitating access to information and the transfer of advanced technology to the private sector and adopting a stronger market-oriented approach in agricultural research.

**DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

Following the five guide questions provided by Ade Freeman, subsequent discussions raised issues on the need for provision of appropriate financial services (e.g. a better access to credit) and the need to create better linkages between microfinance institutions and banks. Some participants highlighted the importance of enhancing north-south collaborations to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and improve the links between research centers and end-users.

Other issues specifically related to market and trade aspects were (1) the competitiveness of products and the need to concentrate on domestic markets (i.e. imported products are often less costly than those nationally produced thereby outplacing the local producer); (2) the effects of non-tariff barriers; (3) market information; and (4) corruption as a constraint to competitiveness.

It was also stressed how foreign aid policy needs to be more supportive towards local market development. In particular, investments in developing countries are too often directed at upgrading local small-scale farmers to produce for export, subjecting them to a high grade of volatility and at the same time oblige producers to comply with very strict international quality and safety standards. Participants discussed the need for more attention to how enterprise development impacts the environment and how gender concerns can be critical to agri-industrial development.

Participants agreed that agro-enterprise development can be seen under the general theme of enterprise development and in
this way it is necessary to draw lessons from existing enterprise development literature.

The discussion was then concluded by identifying key cross-cutting researchable areas to be further analyzed and developed for concrete action.

• Partnerships - How can partnerships foster the development of agri-SMEs? For example, by broadening the nature of partners or enhancing the role of NGOs and farmers thereby increasing the exchange of information and knowledge sharing.

• Markets - How are markets changing the nature of demand? There needs to be a better understanding of the market particularly with regards to market information and access to services. In particular, it was suggested to intervene on the certification of quality standards.

• Science & Technology (S&T) - How can S&T foster SME development? For example, by improving the cost of production and quality standards to increase competitiveness and lessening the impact on the environment. It is generally recognized that S&T plays a crucial role in development issues; but how can we best use it, and which are the most appropriate ways to transfer and develop efficient and quality know-how?

• Training - There is a need to identify the types of training that can best contribute to the development of agri-SMEs. For example, some participants outlined the need to transfer knowledge to the farmers with the aim of improving their business skills.

• Rural finance - How can we develop a sustainable funding strategy for agro-industrial development? The provision of credit is essential for Agro-based SME development. To often rural poor are faced with difficulties in accessing sustainable financial services.
NEXT STEPS

Given the great number of issues raised and discussed in this sub-plenary session there is an increasing need to continue discussions on this subject. As a follow-up it was suggested to coordinate a workshop on the theme of Linking Farmers to the Market, to be held at FAO Headquarters in Rome in October 2003. This event is being co-organized by the GFAR Secretariat, FAO/AGST and PhAction Network, and will take into account the outcomes of the GFAR conference. The aim is to move forward towards the formulation of a GPP on this subject.

BOX 9. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: AGROBASED SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES AND MARKETS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The importance of a market-oriented approach in the solutions of problems related to agricultural development is central. This is clearly highlighted in the regional priority-setting (RPS) exercise facilitated by GFAR, as well as in the results of five regional workshops on post-harvest conducted by the FAO.

Keeping in mind regional differences, it is important to highlight how various market approaches can play a role in fostering agricultural development through, for example, product diversification, responding to the growing consumer needs and ensuring food quality and safety, among others. Within this context the development of agri-SMEs will have an important contribution to make in eradicating poverty and attaining food security.

GUIDELINES FOR THE DISCUSSION

Importance of agri-SMEs development for rural development:

- Role of agri-SMEs in linking production and market
- Emerging markets for agri-SMEs in developing countries
- Importance of market information.

The role of partnerships in enhancing the development of agri-SMEs:

- Collaborations between research centres and universities, institutional bodies, NGOs and the private sector
- Networking to facilitate information-sharing and regional exchange of experiences.

Lessons learned:
- Concrete examples of successful partnerships in agri-SMEs development, highlighting success factors
- Constraints/bottlenecks/difficulties in establishing SMEs and possible ways by which these can be addressed
- Obstacles in gaining market shares.

AGRICULTURE–LIVESTOCK INTEGRATION

One of the priority issues that needs to be addressed in alleviating rural poverty and promoting environmental protection is that related to crop-livestock integration. This includes topics on animal diseases and their impact on productivity, ensuring food security and safety, reduction of diseases transmitted from animals to humans, and livestock and animal husbandry policies that enable the rural poor to overcome their poverty. Thus, GFAR is promoting greater involvement of all ARD stakeholders, notably veterinarians, extensionists, donors, women and farmers in implementing ARD partnership programs in this area.

SESSION STRUCTURE

The sub-plenary session was chaired by Philippe Vialatte, EC Senior Administrator, with Kwaku Agyemang Director General of the International Trypanotolerance Center as key speaker, Ndiaga Mbaye, WECARD Executive Secretary, as resource person, and Alberto Davila of FIOCRUZ, Brazil as rapporteur.

PRESENTATIONS

The key speaker, Kwaku Agyemang, presented an overview on agriculture–livestock integration in the context of the developing world with emphasis on Sub-Saharan Africa. The presentation focused on mixed farming systems in developing countries and on global trends such as market access and
consumer demand. Policy and technology issues were the main constraints identified as impediments to agriculture-livestock integration. He concluded that mixed farming systems are probably the most environmentally desirable systems, and should be the prime focus of agricultural planners and decision-makers. Ndiaga Mbaye then provided additional information on animal health and production research in West and Central Africa, and presented a rationale for a GPP on agriculture-livestock integration.

In the discussion session, two participants gave additional presentations: John McDermott from the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), gave an update on the potential GPP on Trypanosomosis control. He described the lessons learned and the practical experiences of the group of stakeholders involved in the development of the GPP and concluded that the Trypanosomosis control is a theme that can be part of the livestock-agriculture integration mechanism. In addition, he reported that the GPP formulation has been a complex and long exercise and that the decision-makers have not been involved from the very beginning. Another participant, Ian Maudlin from DFID, presented an initiative on public-private partnerships for animal health products and described the potential importance of private companies for funding of research activities in the developing countries.

**DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

One important concept that came out of the subsequent discussions is that the livestock-agriculture integration system is a mechanism that can respond to poverty reduction and food security in different agro-ecological regions, economies and social contexts. Hence the importance to follow a system approach that includes livestock. Research initiatives should focus on improving the efficiency of diverse systems, and it is clear that in the livestock-agriculture integration thematic area, there are no templates that cover all regions.

The participants also shared ideas on what they considered as important needs and targets in ARD from the agriculture-
livestock integration standpoint. Among these include the need for a synthesis of research results, experiences, and methodologies including socio-economic impacts; exchange of experiences between regions including technology transfer; identification of market opportunities and prospects; and designing GPPs cognizant of relevant policy issues.

The participants also agreed that partnerships should include farmers, private sector and policy-makers from the beginning, and it is necessary to be pragmatic when developing GPPs.

**NEXT STEPS**

In the subsequent discussions the participants agreed that the GFAR Secretariat should (1) follow up these discussions (via electronic communications) and help the stakeholders to identify issues and gaps as entry points to develop a possible future GPP on the subject; (2) engineer mechanisms for understanding of GPPs, partnership development (including the private sector) and advocacy; (3) find common solutions and crosscutting issues for the elaboration of GPPs (call for interest), through consultation with the scientific community, the regions and sub-regions; (4) promote a balanced involvement of the stakeholders, encouraging south-south partnerships; (5) facilitate the dialogue between the stakeholders to identify their roles and responsibilities for GPP proposals including dialogue between the research community, donors and the private sector (e.g. drug companies) to attract funds; (6) facilitate the identification of emerging issues on the subject of global impact; and (7) take a leadership role on the above by creating specific task forces.

**BOX 10. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: AGRICULTURE–LIVESTOCK INTEGRATION**

The purpose of this sub-plenary session is to have an understanding of the agriculture-livestock poverty nexus and to discuss how this can be translated into concrete research for development partnership programs.
Tentative questions for discussion:

- What are the general trends and the global strategic issues in agriculture and livestock integration systems? What do we know about agriculture–livestock integrated systems? How can these integrated systems respond to the poverty reduction? Is there any need for additional research?

- Towards a GPP: what type of partnerships and implementation mechanisms are needed to promote research partnerships in this area?

- What are the roles and responsibilities of collaborating stakeholders in GPP development and implementation, including the role of GFAR Secretariat as facilitating mechanism?

- What are the next steps and milestones for GPP proposal development?

ORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

A major thrust of the work of GFAR is the facilitation of agricultural research partnerships at the global level among its multiple stakeholder groups to adequately respond to the challenges of food insecurity and poverty. In this context, GFAR needs to both understand and identify factors responsible for producing more productive partnerships more effectively, and also to think strategically about how to enhance existing partnerships and forge new ones, especially involving new or less vocal stakeholders. Although there are many generic recommendations on how to develop successful partnerships, scientific research on how to successfully manage and gain from these relationships from a national or regional perspective has been given little attention. This session was organized to contribute to focusing attention on this issue, with the following objectives: (1) review methodologies and synthesize lessons from ongoing or completed partnership structures; (2) recommend guidelines for establishing and maintaining more effective partnerships; and (3) identify actors ready to work on organizational issues and partnerships.
SESSION STRUCTURE

The sub-plenary session was chaired by Emil Javier of the CGIAR interim Science Council, with Clayton Campanhola, Director and President of EMBRAPA, Brazil as the keynote speaker. Heike Michelsen, Senior Research Officer at ISNAR, was the resource person, and Njabulo Nduli, the Deputy Director of the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs of South Africa, was the rapporteur.

PRESENTATIONS

The first presentation was the keynote paper on *EMBRAPA’s Successful LABEX Experience* by Clayton Campanhola. This was followed by Heike Michelsen research paper on *Improving Benefits from Transnational Partnerships*.

Clayton Campanhola started with an overview of EMBRAPA, the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation, which collaborates with over 150 institutions and international organizations located in 50 different countries. Its pioneering project aimed at increasing inter-institutional cooperation, was the creation of LABEX - *EMBRAPA Virtual Laboratories Abroad*. The first was in partnership with ARS/USDA and its 100 centres in the USA in 1998, and the second with Agropolis, in Montpellier France in 2002. It consists of placing Brazilian scientists in the research centres of the host nation for two to four years, with dozens more short-term scientist exchanges both ways to collaborate on research topics of mutual interest. LABEX does not have the physical and support resources typical of a conventional laboratory, but is based on sharing the facilities of their host country partner scientists. It was funded initially by a loan from the World Bank, and a loan from IDB may follow, but they plan to fund it themselves in future. It is based on researching topics of common interest and concern to both partners, developing synergies for mutual benefit. The rest of the paper gave more details of the program, and outputs from different topics researched principally with the USA, since the link with France is new. Another such link with Japan is now being considered and EMBRAPA is now
opening its own doors to developing countries with weaker programs, starting with Colombia, but discussion is on-going with Guatemala, Costa Rica and the Portuguese-speaking countries of Africa.

In her paper Heike Michelsen first outlined the factors that have contributed to the exponential growth of institutional partnerships over the past decade, and went on to identify issues and lessons learned. She then elaborated on a proposal to develop a framework for cataloguing partnerships, analyzing reasons for their success or failure, and developing guidelines for the future, initially to be based on three case studies from Africa. The objective is to improve the utility of transnational partnerships for NARS, with the expected impact that their clientele, primarily farmers, will be better served by gaining access to a wider array of technology relevant to their needs. The rest of the paper outlined the research methodologies to be used, stakeholders concerned and collaborating institutions involved. It projected a budget of Euro 1.7 million over a three-year period. The paper closed with a list of potential contribution to GFAR’s goals and operations.

**DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

Following Clayton Campanhola’s presentation, participants agreed that the main motivation for such experience is to maximize mutual benefit on issues of common interest. In terms of partnerships with CSOs, it was highlighted that partnership with private sector, is mainly local at the national level and very little beyond. He also highlighted on-going partnerships with FOs and NGOs; although some more effort is needed to strengthen partnerships with the latter.

One important lesson learned from this experience is the very clear need to develop good proposals before seeking funding, which is one of the strengths of LABEX. Participants suggested to develop more LABEX-type initiatives, and EMBRAPA intends to do this in LAC through FORAGRO and the PROCIs, but will also open up to Sub-Saharan Africa.
In general, it was agreed that other strong NARS should use a model similar to LABEX to help strengthen weaker ones, but there still has to be common interest and mutual benefit, as well as financial commitment from both partners.

Following Heike Michelsen’s presentation, it was agreed substance rather than form is key to partnership. While context and timing are important, motivation is critical, meaning that both partners must contribute and embrace joint ownership but they also need a good understanding and depth of knowledge about the aims, ethos and working procedures of their partner(s).

GFAR must look more systematically at partnerships and in this sense a conference every three years is inadequate. For RF/SRF there should be more frequent meetings/workshops.

Partnerships must evolve to become more multidisciplinary, multistakeholder and multi-institutional, moving from the individual to the institution. Capacity-building should always be a key goal - learning by doing - as well as building critical mass and establishing platforms to share research facilities.

Finally, the following recommendations were made by the participants. Encourage the creation/strengthening of multidisciplinary and multistakeholder research units as building blocks of partnership at NARS level; FARA to commission a study to understand evolution of partnerships in Africa. Finally, that GFAR should facilitate more frequent meeting of stakeholders, to develop studies to analyze partnership experiences and translate them into a global action plan for further development and to solicit donor funding for this.

The ISNAR proposal presented by Heike Michelsen was generally endorsed but needs to take on board concerns expressed at this meeting including making it more global.
NEXT STEPS

The participants agreed on the following next steps: (1) further consider how we manage demands for creation of new partnerships; (2) review the choice of investment, risks, transaction costs and perform cost-benefit analyses; (3) reflect on how partnerships go beyond information- and knowledge-sharing to development of new products; (4) initiate a GPP based on the proposal presented by ISNAR; and (5) develop other studies on partnerships, and secure donor funding for them.

---

BOX 11. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: ORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

A major thrust of the work of GFAR is the facilitation of agricultural research partnerships at the global level among its multiple stakeholder groups to adequately respond to the challenges of food insecurity and poverty. For GFAR to continue to invest in brokering international and multistakeholder partnerships and for such initiatives to gain momentum and enjoy continued support, we need to: (1) understand and identify factors responsible for producing more effective partnerships with increased collaborative advantages and efficiencies; and (2) think strategically about how to enhance existing partnerships and forge new ones with new and less-vocal stakeholders.

The notion and practice of partnerships in ARD have both witnessed unprecedented growth and importance. Presently the working definition of partnership is a long-term purposeful collaborative relationships between two or more institutions, involving exchange or sharing of resources to attain a common objective. The way in which the concept of partnership has actually deepened and extended its role in agricultural development with the promise of better institutional performance and institutional learning, empowerment and transformative development of national institutions and their clientele farmers, suggests a dire need for scientific efforts to: (1) better understand institutional partnerships; and (2) find the key to their successes and failures.
Although there are many generic recommendations on how to develop a successful partnership, scientific research on how to successfully manage and gain from these relationships from a national perspective has been given little attention. International partnerships have indeed the potential of increasing technological options more rapidly than possible within a particular country’s own limited resources. But the problem is that not all international partnerships are working well for national institutions due to high transaction costs, benefits going to other partner organizations or individual staff members and not to the institution, and engagement in non-priority research rather than on immediate national needs. Suggested criteria for evaluating partnerships from the perspective of the national institutions include: (1) contributions to the performance of partner institutions (i.e. effectiveness and relevance, efficiency and sustainability); (2) contributions to learning and institutional capacity and building of social capital; (3) added value through the relationship; and (4) the allocation of net benefits among partner organizations.

The goals of this sub-plenary are to:

- review methodological efforts and examine future partnership needs in the research-development continuum
- synthesize the lessons from GFAR, ISNAR and other selected institutions with partnerships experiences and highlight the added value of the partnerships and the main factors that led to success or failure
- review how to increase the opportunities for NARIs to manage and benefit from international partnerships and cooperative arrangements with sub-regional, regional and international institutions
- (re-)examine the roles and possible contributions of new and less vocal stakeholders to partnerships in ARD
- recommend guidelines for establishing and maintaining effective partnerships for ARD and capacity-building
• identify partners interested in working on organizational partnership issues, the expertise required to develop and implement a GPP on organizational partnerships as well as the appropriate institutional arrangements to facilitate and implement such a program.

**BROAD GUIDELINES FOR KEY SPEAKER**

• Present the key issues around the partnership concept and process, including a typology and an overview of theoretical approaches to partnerships (e.g. transaction costs, economics, resource dependency theory, strategic management, etc). Key questions to address would be related to: (1) why collaborate (purpose and motivating factors); (2) who is collaborating (profile of partner institutions); (3) what is the collaboration about (function, scope, structure, ownership, management, governance, formality, topics of relationship); and (4) how does the relationship develop over time?

• Present operational elements and steps to developing effective partnerships in ARD

• Identify cases of successful inter-institutional partnerships in ARD and discuss the particular attributes/characteristics for success are

• Discuss issues related to the evaluation of partnerships at the generic level and the reasons for success or failure.

**BROAD GUIDELINES FOR RESOURCE PERSON**

Appropriate presentation to feed and direct the debate on international organizational partnerships by filling the gaps remaining from the keynote presentation. At the end, it is hoped that the resource person would have contributed to moving the initiative along towards finalization for submission to donors for funding.

**EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF SUB-PLENARY SESSION**

• Get more specific information on partnership issues by first agreeing on a definition of partnerships and developing a typology
• Address the problem of why international partnerships do not always work well for partner institutions (i.e. high transaction costs, benefits going to other partner organizations or individual staff members and not to the institution)
• Increase organizational learning, develop social capital and institutional capacity of organizations in national research systems to gain more from their involvement with regional and international organizations by more efficient use of their resources
• Development of a framework/guidelines for assessing institutional performance within international partnerships
• Identification of some successful international partnerships, including factors contributing to their success and noting any need for improvement
• Development of guidelines for use by other national institutions that want to improve their benefits from international partnerships
• Define what criteria should be used to examine and better understand successful international partnerships.

INNOVATIVE POLICY DIRECTIONS AND APPROACHES FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The topic addressed in this sub-plenary session is connected to Action 4 of the GFAR 2001-2003 Business Plan approved in Dresden, Germany (i.e. Policies and Institutional Frameworks). However, as underscored by the GFAR Executive Secretary, it is precisely on this topic that GFAR needs to strengthen its actions and build multistakeholder partnerships in order to effect change towards an effective paradigm for sustainable agriculture and rural development.

SESSION STRUCTURE

The sub-plenary session was chaired by Papa Abdoulaye Seck, Director General of ISRA, with Alain de Janvry of the University of California at Berkeley as key speaker. Marcelino Avila, Project Coordinator of the Rural Institutions and Participation Service (SDAR), FAO, and Joachim von Braun, Director General of IFPRI, Washington DC were resource
persons, and Alain Derevier, Senior Adviser of the Research for Sustainable Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France as rapporteur.

Over 50 participants representing a mix of GFAR stakeholders attended the session. The Chairman opened the session by explaining the main objectives and expected outputs. This was followed by presentations from the key speaker and the two resource persons. There was a short discussion after each presentation followed by an extended discussion session at the end of all three presentations.

PRESENTATIONS

Alain de Janvry presented a paper entitled *Achieving Success in Rural Development: Toward Implementation of an Integral Approach*. He prefaced his talk by empirically analyzing four key issues: (1) the increased attention on rural development to reach the MDGs; (2) the reasons for ineffectiveness of the integrated rural development approaches; (3) new opportunities for success in rural development; and (4) the lessons learned from experience with new approaches. He proposed an integral rural development (IRD) approach based on five important lessons: (1) an understanding of rural poverty in terms of the actors and institutions involved; (2) the well-being of rural people and households is multidimensional; (3) household assets are heterogeneous but complementary; (4) the value of assets for income generation depends on the context; and (5) there are several roads out of poverty. He then went on to elaborate on four entry points for policies, strategizing and investing in IRD (i.e. programs to increase access to assets, programs to improve the quality of the context where assets are used, transfer programs for social protection, and programs for the social incorporation of the poor). In conclusion, he stated that the transition to IRD must create or generate five essential ingredients to effectively reduce rural poverty: capabilities, citizenship, opportunities, political support and knowledge.
Marcelino Avila made a presentation highlighting five major issues for discussion: (1) the range of policy interventions that should be considered for sustainable agriculture and rural development; (2) the long-term dimension of sustainability by citing the objectives and results of the FAO 2015-2030 world agriculture study; (3) an FAO typology of countries based on agriculture/food security priority and the level/scope of ongoing policy analysis in 89 countries surveyed; (4) the FAO/World Bank project on globalization and assessing its impact on small-holders in four countries in Sub-Saharan Africa; and (5) the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development-Farming Systems Evolution (SARD-FSE) project with case studies in Mali, The Philippines and Honduras as an option for promoting and supporting global collaboration on policy/institutional analysis, methodology development and capacity-building.

Joachim von Braun focused on the question of what kind of world would be sustainable in 2050. If we can answer this question, then we can elaborate an appropriate agricultural policy research framework. He identified three important gaps/deficiencies in the current policy discourse which require research: (1) an understanding of the rural-urban linkages and interactions taking into account that nearly 80% of the world population in 2050 will reside in large cities; (2) the optimal devolution and decentralization vis-à-vis the role of the state and other emerging actors; and (3) the future vision, roles and potentials of small-holders in a more globalized and market-oriented environment.

In concluding the presentations, the chairman shared with participants the recent experience of his institute, ISRA, in articulating the vital roles and merits of research and the difficulty in convincing political leaders of the contribution of research to national policy objectives. This example demonstrates perfectly the need for in-depth work on innovative policy dimensions in the GFAR 2004-2006 Business Plan.
DISCUSSION SUMMARY

In the rich discussion that followed the presentations, a number of important issues were debated:

- Effective policy, institutions and empowerment of people in the policy process are crucial for dealing with the urgent rural poverty and development problems, in particular for the poor and the small-holders.

- There is diversity in the level of priority attributed to agriculture and rural development, diversity in institutional capacities for policy research and action, and diversity in the ability to mobilize political and financial support for agriculture and rural development.

- Human population dynamics, migration and the concomitant demand for public goods and services (i.e. health, education, infrastructure, cultural values, etc) require careful analysis, planning, investment and development in order to, for example, create employment and income-generating opportunities in agriculture and rural sectors, especially for the youth. Otherwise, even education can have negative impacts on local rural development since educated youths have to emigrate to improve their livelihood, as described in the case of Malawi.

- There are valuable lessons and principles for integral rural development that can be drawn from past rural development approaches, from experimentation with new approaches, and from the emerging roles of NGOs, FOs and other actors in the field.

- The lack of effective communication and distribution of relevant information and options from researchers, scientists and technicians to policy-makers, donors and other high-level authorities is hampering the necessary dialogue with and possible support from the higher echelons of power.

- Understanding the bigger picture and the global context (e.g. MDGs, CAP in the EU, the Farm Bill in the USA, Agenda 21 of WSSD and the SARD Initiative) is imperative.
for mobilizing and leveraging political, institutional and financial support for agriculture and rural development.

- GFAR, within its facilitation mandate, should play a proactive role, develop a clear understanding of the priorities and engage in a concrete plan of action with respect to policy and institutional improvement nationally, sub-regionally and internationally.

Suggestions and recommendations of the session can be classified into three major groups: (1) targeted researchable issues; (2) basic elements of a GPP on policy dimensions and approaches; and (3) potential partners identified and roles of participating institutions.

Concerning the first group, it was clear that identification, analysis and synthesis of valuable lessons on effective policies, strategies and tools relevant to integral rural development, sustainable agriculture, and/or poverty reduction are needed, particularly in terms of improving: (1) the context or enabling environment; (2) access to assets such as land, education, social capital; (3) the creation of sustainable, productive and income-generating options; and (4) the provision of social protection and reduction of vulnerability of the poor and small-holders.

Research on the long-term agricultural and rural development implications of three strategic gaps in policy/institutional framework is also a critical issue. These strategic gaps are: (1) an understanding of the rural-urban linkages and interactions; (2) the optimal devolution and decentralization strategy vis-à-vis the role of the state, private sector, NGOs and other emerging actors; and (3) the future vision, roles and potentials of the small-holders in a globalized and market-oriented environment.

Concerning the second group, participants identified as basic element for a GPP the mutual exchange of basic knowledge, methodologies and lessons for policy and institutional analysis, reform, management, etc and, in particular, for developing a
framework for effective dialogue and balanced participation of all stakeholders at the local, territorial and national levels.

Capacity-building on leading, designing and implementing sustainable agriculture and integrated rural development for poverty reduction, with particular focus on programs to improve the quality of the context, access to assets, creation of productive and income-generating options, and social protection and vulnerability reduction of the poor was also identified by participants as basic element for a GPP.

The third basic element identified was the mobilization of political commitment and support by effectively participating in global fora (e.g. SARD Initiative for Agenda 21, UN Committee for Sustainable Development, the upcoming ECOSOG, and WTO committees) and regional bodies or mechanisms (e.g. NEPAD, ASEAN, ACP).

Concerning the third group, potential partners identified were: IFPRI, FAO and IFSA.

IFPRI, whose mission is to identify, analyze and disseminate policies for sustainably meeting the food needs of developing countries. Its research concentrates on economic growth, poverty alleviation and sound management of natural resources that support agriculture in low-income countries.

FAO through its Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development-Farming Systems Evolution (SARD-FSE) Project and the Policy Assistance (and Training) Program; the SARD-FSE Project could serve as a catalyst for a GPP within the GFAR framework.

The third potential partner was IFSA, representing seven regional associations of the developed and developing worlds, whose mission is to make a difference in the lives of small farmers and the rural poor by expanding multistakeholder partnerships for, inter alia, effective agricultural and ecosystems research for sustainable development, small farmers and gender empowerment, and democratization of policy management. IFSA proposes to take the initiative in the
international dialogue, for example through the SARD Initiative.

NEXT STEPS

On the basis of this session outcomes, it is recommended that the GFAR Steering Committee should provide direction in terms of the general proposals for further development.

The GFAR Executive Secretary should request elaboration of specific proposals from potential institutional collaborators such as IFPRI, FAO, IFSA and others. The proposals would also include possible partnership arrangements involving national, regional and international types of institutions.

After receiving proposals, the Executive Secretary should dialogue with GFAR stakeholder groups to solicit feedback (e.g. suggestions for improvement, interest in participation, commitment of support, etc).

BOX 12. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: INNOVATIVE POLICY DIRECTIONS AND APPROACHES FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Interest in understanding the essential conditions for sustainable agriculture and rural development has increased in recent years, along with the growing recognition of the dynamic and complex nature of the challenges facing rural areas and their communities. This is against the backdrop of an ever-widening gap between rich and poor, the world’s poorest being found predominantly in the rural areas, some 800 million people going to bed hungry every night and the level of investment in agriculture and in the rural areas reaching an all-time low, far below what is needed to change the present course for the foreseeable future.

There is an acknowledgement that the agricultural sector, particularly in developing countries, is well placed to contribute to sustainable development.
However, this promise has so far mostly gone unfulfilled. Now more than ever, there are urgent demands as well as significant opportunities for developing and spreading the unrealized potentials of currently available agricultural research results and rural innovations. The single most important constraint lies in the domain of the policy environment (i.e. policy directions, measures and incentives that determine to a large extent the decisions of farmers and rural people). Without addressing these policy constraints, the potential for technology adoption and impact is severely limited.

Currently the means of assessing policy change and future policy options is often lacking for decision-makers operating at the micro-, meso-, national and regional levels. This is particularly acute in developing countries which are often confronted with shrinking resources and dramatic demands to increase food production and productivity and to reduce hunger and poverty, while conserving the natural resources and the environment. Furthermore, since ministries of agriculture have been weakened as a result of government restructuring and privatization programs, the national capacity for policy analysis, coordination and advocacy is conspicuously absent.

Policy statements may exist on paper, however it their translation into policy measures, laws and programs is what gives them meaning and impact. Policies affect different groups in different ways; hence the crucial importance of monitoring and evaluating their impact on small-holders, marginalized and other groups of concern. In addition to simple access, the capacity to apply effective methodologies, best practices and decision support tools for policy analysis (i.e. diagnosis, design, implementation and evaluation) are absolutely essential for government institutions and their partners, through participatory interactions, interfacing macro- and micro-stakeholders across sectors, in order to enable agricultural research and rural innovations to succeed in securing sustainable objectives.

BROAD GUIDELINES FOR KEY SPEAKER

Some of the key policy areas to be addressed to guide governments of developing-country in using appropriate policy instruments, providing economic incentives in their interventions and programs to achieve sustainable agricultural development, are:

- macro-economic/fiscal policies (i.e. investment, interest and exchange rates)
• agricultural and rural finance policy
• land tenure and rights to other resources
• international trade, water management, agricultural prices, agricultural technology
• rural infrastructure and communication
• access to and capacity to apply effective methodologies, best practices and decision support tools for policy analysis.

BROAD GUIDELINES FOR RESOURCE PERSON
The resource person is expected to, based on his/her knowledge of GPPs, complement the key speaker’s presentation by filling in important areas he/she considers gaps or relevant issues that should feature in the GPP. His/her exposé should help guide and modulate the ensuing discussion in the sub-plenary such that the expected outputs are achieved.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF SUB-PLENARY SESSION
• Analysis of current policy constraints for sustainable agricultural development, particularly as it pertains to small-holder and marginalized producer groups in developing countries.
• Identification of success stories and/or emerging successful policies for the achievement of productive/sustainability objectives (e.g. through the improvement of governance, enhancement of farmers’ assets, improvement of equity and gender issues, and/or improved policies of developed country and international partners).
• Identification of effective strategies and mechanisms to dialogue, engage and influence national policy-makers and politicians in terms of food security, economic competitiveness and/or environmental conservation objectives.
• Suggestions and analysis of the key priorities for international/regional collaboration (north-south and south-south partnerships) for future policy analysis, capacity-building and networking for sustainable agricultural development, with particular emphasis on the small-holder farmers in developing countries.
Ensuing discussions in this group should lead to: (1) an elaboration of how we could develop a GPP to address the key policy issues, constraints and challenges in achieving sustainable agricultural development; (2) the production of an indicative list of the type of expertise required to further develop and implement such a GPP; and (3) agreement on the possible institutional arrangements for the facilitation and implementation of the GPP.
STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

In the afternoon of the second day of the conference, stakeholder groups deliberated on their future contribution to GFAR, particularly on issues that each constituency group deemed critical for inclusion in the GFAR Business Plan 2004-2006 and in which they propose to be actively involved in the coming three years. The seven stakeholder groups were asked to provide some feedback on emerging issues outlined by the keynote speakers, and to suggest ways on how to improve their involvement in ARD activities at the sub-regional, regional and global levels. They also deliberated on strategies to improve their representation in various decision- and policy-making mechanisms at these different levels. Comprehensive terms of reference outlining the above discussion issues and others were provided to participants (Boxes 13-17 and 19-21).

BOX 13. GUIDELINES FOR THE STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETINGS

The GFAR stakeholder group consultation sessions provide a unique opportunity for the stakeholder constituencies to discuss and prepare for the full range of topics that have been or are to be addressed during the conference, and to evaluate the outcomes of the conference from a specific stakeholder perspective.

The three specific objectives of these sessions are to:

- allow each constituency group to evaluate the conference organization and outputs
- formulate a stakeholder statement which will be delivered by a person designated by them at the closing session
- discuss a range of issues that the constituency group deems critical for the development of the next GFAR business plan in which the constituency proposes to be actively involved in the coming three years.
PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

- Grouping in this session will be strictly by stakeholder group and participants are only allowed to join the stakeholder group to which they belong.
- Each group will be assigned to meet in a given room which will be announced during the conference.

ROUNDTABLE MECHANICS

With the exception of the NARS, management of the groups is left to the groups themselves as no pre-assigned facilitators will be provided. However, to aid in the preparation of a synthesis, the groups must nominate a facilitator and rapporteur. The Chair of GFAR will lead the NARS stakeholder consultation, and no facilitators will be provided. However, the group must select a rapporteur.

- The facilitator will animate the discussions and ensure that the objectives are met and that most participants have the opportunity to express their views and opinions on the subject. It is important that the facilitator is able to elicit concrete recommendations on the subject.
- The rapporteur will be responsible for capturing the salient points in the discussion. He/she will have to make sure that issues raised and agreements reached are documented. All rapporteurs will meet in the evening with the GFAR Management Team to synthesize discussion outputs which will then be presented the following day in Plenary Session III. Facilitators are welcome to join.

A set of issues for discussion will be provided by the GFAR Secretariat for the consideration of the groups. Background documents, if any, will also be made available.

It will be difficult for the synthesis group to analyze and capture the richness and diversity of discussion in the groups. In order to capture the main contributions of the participants, it is critical that the rapporteurs follow the attached guidelines and report the results in the same format.
EXPECTED OUTPUT AND PLENARY SESSION REPORTS

The expected outputs of these sessions include:

- Stakeholder assessments of the conference as a constituency
- Stakeholder statements to be presented at the end of the conference, with mention of the specific points of importance to their constituency and identification of some GFAR activities that they suggest be in the GFAR business plan for the coming three years. These are activities in which they want to be actively involved, and possibly take a leading responsibility in their implementation.

NARS AND THEIR REGIONAL AND SUB-REGIONAL FORA (RF/SRF)

The representatives of RF/SRF of the NARS participating in the GFAR 2003 Conference conveyed their congratulations to the GFAR Secretariat, the local host agencies and the Senegalese government for a successful event. The NARS were very pleased with the outcome of the conference, especially the opportunity provided for all stakeholders to review and strengthen alliances and partnerships and to share successful partnership experiences in ARD and other relevant information.

On the subject of reinforcing the role of the NARS Steering Committee, the NARS continue to be fully convinced that to achieve a strong and relevant GFAR, there must be strong NARS and strong RF/SRF. Therefore, the NARS believe that reinforcing the role of the NARS Steering Committee within GFAR will make the NARS stakeholders more proactive and more involved in working to ensure the strengthening of the NARS and their RF/SRF to enable them to contribute greatly to the effectiveness of GFAR. The NARS Steering Committee should continue to promote and enhance partnerships and contribute to the global knowledge pool for ARD. To ensure that partnerships will flourish and achieve relevance and effectiveness, the NARS recommended that GFAR give priority to the following:
1. GFAR should develop itself as an effective and strong advocacy and advisory body for promoting ARD issues at the global level. It should be able to sensitize and influence policy-makers in governments of the weaker NARS for an increased investment in agricultural research. To be able to do this, it should strengthen its political dimension by closely linking with the World Bank, donor agencies and political bodies.

2. GFAR should promote and strengthen inter-regional cooperation on institutional innovations to serve as the venue for information exchange and sharing of priority-setting experiences among NARS and RF/SRF. For example, the NARS in South Asia have initially agreed to organize the Southeast Asian Forum for Agricultural Research and establish a centre for an Agricultural Research Database (SEAFAR-CARD). This is an excellent example of how institutions can become more effective in addressing the needs of our farmers. The NARS need the full support of GFAR together with the existing RF/SRF in this initiative.

The NARS recommended that GFAR give emphasis and priority attention to addressing two common concerns which should be considered as a focus of discussion in the next triennial conference.

1. Weak research and extension linkages - Many technologies have been generated by research institutions but have not reached and benefited the target clientele. Linkages between farmers, research and technology transfer institutions need to be strengthened at the local, national, regional and international levels by establishing effective mechanisms and modalities.

2. Need for impact assessment on agricultural research and research outputs - This is an expressed need to enable NARS to achieve relevance and effectiveness.
The NARS concurred and expressed the feeling that it should be opened up to new stakeholders including extension agents/workers, representatives from national extension systems and experts. They should be more represented in GFAR undertakings as well as in RF/SRF activities. This is considered an effective way of bridging the gap between research and extension.

No issue raised on the topic of the RPS exercise and this was regarded as a positive indication that the outcomes are acceptable. The NARS agreed that they must develop long-term or master plans guided by their own set of priorities. The plan must be a product of grassroots consultation and with the widest possible participation of all stakeholders. The plan should be periodically reviewed vis-à-vis new emerging priorities and relevance. The RF/SRF should then take cognizance of the NARS priorities, which should be brought to GFAR’s attention for possible sourcing of funds.

The NARS felt they were in various stages of capacity-building advancement. One commonality was that they all need strengthening in one way or another and in various aspects. Some of the more urgent capacity-building needs that the NARS would like to have addressed include (1) the establishment of a functional information system at both the national and local levels to provide easy access to technologies and important information for farmers and scientists; and (2) a more systematic and effective priority-setting methodologies and decision support tools to be established and easily used by the NARS.

Lastly, the NARS expressed their commitment to work closely with other GFAR stakeholders for stronger partnerships and strategic alliances aimed at more effectively tackling global issues and concerns related to poverty alleviation, food security and promotion of sustainable natural resource use.
BOX 14. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: REGIONAL AND SUB-REGIONAL FORA OF THE NARS

There is a general feeling at the level of the GFAR Secretariat that the NARS Steering Committee could be more proactively involved in determining what GFAR could do in strengthening the RF/SRF of the NARS and conversely what the RF/SRF could do in ensuring a better-functioning and more effective GFAR. During the NARS consultations, it is requested that the NARS stakeholders discuss how they would like to see the NARS Steering Committee re-engineered to play some of these important programmatic functions. Some of the pertinent questions for discussion are:

- How can GFAR benefit from the biennial gathering of such considerable expertise on ARD from the developing countries of the south?
- What should be the contribution of the NARS Steering Committee to the development of the GFAR’s business plan?
- What kinds of requests should the RF/SRF address to GFAR?
- What kinds of support should the RF/SRF expect from GFAR and vice versa?

OPENING UP THE RF/SRF OF NARS TO NEW STAKEHOLDERS

Researchers constitute only one group among the various stakeholders that are involved in ARD. Some of the major clients that researchers service in addressing the challenges of poverty, hunger and sustainable development are women’s groups, fisher folk, livestock owners and farmer groups. There is often a disconnection between researchers and some of these groups as the latter are often inhibited from fully participating in policy formulation, decision-making, identifying problems, seeking solutions and identifying areas for action. Compelling empirical evidence suggests that partnerships can bridge the gap between these groups. The expectation is that discussions will identify the new stakeholders and determine how, when and where to bring them on board as part of an expanded NARS and their RF/SRF.
FOLLOW-UP OF RPS EXERCISE

All five of the RF/SRF have been involved in cataloguing what their priorities are. Are the outcomes of the RPS satisfactory and what are the next steps? Bearing in mind that priorities change over time, NARS stakeholders need to discuss: how often they would like to review these priorities for present-day relevance? What activities and actions should be put in place in response to the real priorities? How their true priorities are reflected in the activities of GFAR?

CAPACITY-BUILDING

The NARS and their RF/SRF are in various stages of development. One commonality is that all need strengthening in one way or another (institutional, infrastructural, fiscal). What are some of the more urgent capacity-building needs that the NARS would like to have addressed?

FARMERS’ ORGANIZATIONS (FOS)

FOs acknowledge and appreciate the effort to pay particular attention to farmers' needs, and urge other stakeholders to recognize that small farmers are in fact the principal and most important rural developers. As such they must be supported and empowered to be effective partners in the development process.

Farmers request assistance in capacity-building in the following three areas: (1) leadership - to ensure effective representation; (2) advocacy and policy formulation - primarily to reverse the decline in funding of agricultural research; and (3) ICT - to improve communication and dissemination of information.

They stress the importance of farmer participation in priority-setting and decision-making processes, particularly at the grassroots level. However, particular attention needs to be taken in order to ensure legitimacy of representation and accountability to the constituents. Representatives must be chosen by FOs themselves and not simply appointed by other stakeholders, governments or research bodies.
Extension, the link from researcher to farmer, needs to be more effective, and the results of agricultural research need to be more accessible and user-friendly for the average farmer. FOs suggest that GFAR can play an important role in facilitating information exchanges between researchers and farmers, and between farmers themselves. Farmers want better access to research results and at the same time want to build on local knowledge. This can be achieved through coordination of the activities of NARIs and exchange visits/study tours for farmers at the sub-regional level.

The new areas of research the FOs would like to see GFAR give attention to are: (1) agriculture and energy - better supply and greater efficiency in use; (2) agriculture and globalization - evaluation of the impact of globalization on the livelihood of small farmers; and (3) agriculture and health - study the cost to farmers in meeting health, sanitary, phytosanitary and traceability requirements for export of food and farm products.

Additionally, the FO stakeholder group urges GFAR to endorse and promote the declaration of the side event on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Regional and sub-regional farmer focal points were nominated at the meeting (Box 1), and they will endeavor to work closely with GFAR in the future on issues of importance to farmers. Their status as representatives will be confirmed at the 13th GFAR Steering Committee Meeting in October 2004, Nairobi, Kenya.

**BOX 15. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: FARMERS’ ORGANIZATIONS**

NB: This session should be seen as part of and follow-up to the two-day Pre-GFAR 2003 CSO Workshop held on 20–21 May.

GFAR invites FOs involved in ARD to deliberate their future contribution to the GFAR initiative, and would like to solicit specific feedback on the following issues:
- emerging issues of relevance to ARD, that should be given priority in the GFAR business plan as outlined by the keynote speakers and where FOs can best contribute to the advancement of these issues
- specific questions and challenges raised by the GFAR Executive Secretary in his analysis of achievements, gaps and the way forward
- the needs and concerns of FOs that should be addressed in the GFAR business plan such as, but not limited to, capacity-building needs, improving communication systems and strengthening links between farmers-extension workers-researchers
- specific comparative advantage of FOs in their collaboration with and contribution to GFAR
- comments on the conference in general and suggestions for workshops or follow-up activities that are considered priorities for the next business plan
- suggestions on how to improve the representation of FOs at SRF, RF and GFAR levels, which must stem from stronger involvement of FOs in NARS themselves, and how this may be best fostered
- any other issue of relevance to GFAR.

Naturally these are suggestions of issues that could be discussed, therefore please add any other issues you feel are of relevance to GFAR as you deliberate and consult amongst yourselves. Your conclusions and recommendations should be such that we can use them as components of a framework for the next GFAR business plan.

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOS)**

NGOs shared their vision of ARD that is led by small farmers and characterized by a stronger focus on household food security, poverty reduction and sustainable use of agriculture. These small-scale farmers include monocrop and mixed farmers, livestock keepers, fisher folk and forest communities. They also define farming as having multiple functions, including an ecosystem function, a production function and a social services function. ARD should also be geared towards the management and conservation of natural resources and biodiversity in a way that is sustainable and that minimizes, if
not totally prevents, conflicts over these resources. As such, this type of ARD should be anchored on effective and inclusive partnerships that are socially viable, gender sensitive and promote local empowerment.

NGOs also underscored the need for an enhanced social science dimension of ARD. Among the identified areas which they deem important for GFAR to take into account in formulating its business plan for the next three years are: (1) support to participatory systems research; (2) research on governance and management; (3) institutional change; (4) conflict resolution over resources; (5) research on multiple-stakeholder collaboration processes; and (6) inclusion of minority groups in the research process, gender equity and democratization. This stakeholder group also proposed that GFAR should include market linkages and rural microfinance in its agenda.

NGOs nominated two representatives to the GFAR Steering Committee as well as regional focal points for GFAR-related activities (Box 2). They also have formulated an action plan that aims to strengthen and mobilize the NGO constituency.

**BOX 16. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

NB: This session should be seen as part of and follow-up to the two-day Pre-GFAR 2003 CSO Meeting held on 20–21 May.

GFAR invites NGOs involved in ARD to deliberate their future contribution to the GFAR initiative and would like to solicit specific feedback on the following issues:

- emerging issues of relevance to ARD, that should be given priority in the GFAR business plan as outlined by the keynote speakers and indications of where the NGOs can best contribute to the advancement of these issues

- specific questions and challenges raised by the GFAR Executive Secretary in his analysis of achievements, gaps and the way forward.
the needs and concerns of NGOs that should be addressed in the GFAR business plan such as, but not limited to, capacity-building needs, improving communication systems and strengthening links between farmers–extension workers–researchers

• specific response to issues highlighted by FOs

• specific comparative advantage of NGOs in its collaboration with and contribution to GFAR

• comments on the conference in general, and suggestions for workshops or follow-up activities that are considered priorities over the next business plan

• suggestions on how to improve the representation of NGOs at SRF, RF and GFAR levels, which surely must stem from stronger NGO involvement in NARS themselves, and how this may be best fostered

• any other issue of relevance to GFAR.

Naturally these are suggestions of issues that could be discussed, therefore please add any other issues you feel are of relevance to GFAR as you deliberate and consult amongst yourselves. Your conclusions and recommendations should be such that we can use them as components of a framework for the next GFAR business plan.

ADVANCED RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS (ARIS)

The group meeting was attended by eleven representatives ARIs in Europe, North America and Asia-Pacific. The stakeholder group appreciates GFAR as being a valuable instrument that has come a significant way in implementing its principles and is progressively finding its way forward since the Dresden conference. The group encourages GFAR to continue along these lines and wishes to reconfirm the commitment of ARIs to the GFAR process.

The stakeholder group unanimously agreed that the notion of Advanced Research Institutions has become redundant, and that the industrialized north should participate in GFAR through Regional Fora composed of a similar broad group of stakeholders (see Box 18 for more details). Since the Dresden conference, Europe has strengthened EFARD, while the North
American institutions will look at similar ways to enhance their involvement with GFAR by reactivating NAFAR and are strongly supported in this endeavor by their European counterparts. The stakeholder group also encourages GFAR to seek ways to stimulate more active involvement by China, as well as to strengthen involvement from the Asia-Pacific region, e.g. by encouraging the creation of Sub-Regional Fora in that region.

The focus of the northern fora that take over the former role of the ARIs in GFAR will be on ARD in the south, with the explicit understanding that these northern fora will also take account of the consequences for developments in the south of both the policies of the north and the agricultural research conducted in and for the north.

The northern fora see their primary responsibility in the fields of information exchange, capacity-building and scientific partnerships of relevance to the south. Whereas ARIs see the role of GFAR primarily in the field of policy advocacy on behalf of ARD in the south and in exchanging information and capacity-building that can lead to more effective and efficient south-south, north-north and north-south collaboration. GFAR also provides a mechanism through which Regional Fora interact to set their priorities.

The stakeholder group encourages exchange of information that can lead to a more coordinated, efficient and demand-driven development of Centres of Excellence combining research and higher education through the formation of inter-institutional research and education units. The stakeholder group also encourages the regions to closely monitor the LABEX experience (i.e. small units of researchers from one region based in laboratories in other regions for an exchange of specialized expertise, facilities and equipment) and to see how this model can be further developed. LABEX-style partnerships could also be a first step in the development of the inter-institutional research and education units as intended above.
BOX 17. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: ADVANCED RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS (ARIS)

Both the participation and involvement of ARIs in GFAR were expected to contribute to three specific sets of activities: information and knowledge-sharing, capacity-building facilities, and scientific partnerships. It has been to conduct a review on what has been achieved in each of these activities since the inception of GFAR and how these functions can be improved upon in the future.

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

GFAR invites ARIs involved in ARD to deliberate their future contribution to the GFAR initiative, and would like to solicit specific feedback on the following issues:

- emerging issues of relevance to ARD, which should be given priority in the GFAR business plan as outlined by the keynote speakers, and where ARIs can best contribute to the advancement of these issues
- specific questions and challenges raised by the GFAR Executive Secretary in his analysis of achievements, gaps and the way forward
- the perception of ARIs of their current contribution to GFAR and its priorities
- concrete suggestions to improve the contribution of ARIs to GFAR
- comments on the conference in general, and suggestions for workshops or follow-up activities that are considered priorities for the next business plan
- suggestions on how to improve the representation of ARIs at SRF, RF and GFAR levels, and how this may be best fostered
- any other issue of relevance to GFAR.
Naturally these are suggestions of issues that could be discussed, therefore please add any other issues you feel are of relevance to GFAR as you deliberate and consult amongst yourselves. Your conclusions and recommendations should be such that we can use them as components of a framework for the next GFAR business plan.

**BOX 18. OVERVIEW ON ARIS**

**BACKGROUND**

The term ARIs - Advanced Research Institutions - was used by the original GFAR design team to define research institutions from industrialized countries as one stakeholder group. Presently, in the GFAR Charter, three seats are allocated to the ARIs in the GFAR Steering Committee: one for North America, one for Europe and one for Asia-Pacific.

There are many topics which could be discussed to improve the contribution of ARIs in the GFAR process, however it is suggested to focus discussions on three crucial topics:

- past experience and future representation of ARIs in GFAR
- roles of ARIs in GFAR
- modes of cooperation between ARIs and southern Regional Fora.

**PAST EXPERIENCE AND FUTURE REPRESENTATION OF ARIS IN GFAR**

Before reviewing the current situation and making suggestions for the future, it is important to clarify the terminology used and its implications.

**TERMINOLOGY**

The acronym ARIs, referring to research institutions from the north, could falsely suggest that there are no advanced research institutions in the south. Furthermore, it specifically targeted research institutions of the north and not the whole community of advanced research institutions involved in ARD.
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This could also be interpreted as promoting a different model for the north than the one used for the south, i.e. the Regional Fora approach. Based on the lessons learned since the launching of GFAR, it would be a valuable exercise to re-examine the possible misinterpretations.

REVIEW OF THE CURRENT SITUATION

Representatives of the three ARI zones could elaborate on what is briefly described here but, in short, the current situation is as follows:

- **Asia-Pacific**: APAARI is rather unique in the sense that it includes members from developed and developing countries. Currently however, not all countries of the region are members of APAARI. The main justification for GFAR to allocate a seat to the ARIs of this region was mainly to include Japan and New Zealand (Australia is an active member of APAARI) and to keeping the door open to China. Initially, Japan had a representative in the GFAR Steering Committee but this is no longer the case and New Zealand has never shown clear interest in the GFAR concept. Consequently, at present no mechanism is in place for industrialized or emerging countries (non-APAARI) to be represented in GFAR and there is an available seat for the ARIs in the GFAR Steering Committee.

- **Europe**: European countries were already organized at the donor level to promote a coordinated approach towards the CGIAR which was then extended to cover all ARD issues, called the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD). In addition, European countries decided to adopt the regional forum model and to mobilize all categories of stakeholders, both at the national level via national fora and at the regional level via a newly established European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development (EFARD). An EFARD Charter is currently under finalization. Additionally, some research organizations were already organized the European Consortium on Agricultural Research in the Tropics (ECART). Similarly, universities involved in ARD were also members of an association called NATURA (Network of European Agricultural and Tropically and Sub-tropically Oriented Universities and Scientific Complexes Related with Agricultural Development). Currently, under the 6th Research and Technology Development (RTD) Framework Program of the European Commission, these different
Coordination mechanisms are working together to develop and promote the ARD component of the European Research Area (ERA). The European ARI seat is occupied by the chairperson of EFARD.

- North America: since the launching of GFAR, the North American ARI seat is occupied by the same representative from an American university with an alternate from Canada. Over the last few years, a significant effort has been made to mobilize the American scientific community to dialogue with GFAR and the North American Forum on Agricultural Research (NAFAR) is under construction. However, no true consultative mechanisms of ARD stakeholders in the US and Canada are yet in place.

POSSIBLE FUTURE REPRESENTATION OF ARIS IN GFAR

Considering that APAARI members belong to developed, emerging and developing countries and that different categories of stakeholders are beginning to be mobilized behind the GFAR concept, the ARI distinction is no longer relevant for this region. Priority should be given to developing the Sub-Regional Fora for the Asia-Pacific region (e.g. SEAFAR was recently established) and involving more countries as well as improving the representation of the different stakeholders at all levels. It may also be worth considering an exception status for China by giving it a seat in the GFAR Steering Committee (possibly as a temporary measure), if its scientific community is willing to join GFAR.

Clearly, Europe has decided to follow the regional model proposed by GFAR and has put in place a EFARD, similar in terms of composition and objectives to the other Regional Fora. Consequently, all ARD stakeholders are represented in the GFAR Steering Committee via the Chairperson of EFARD, and not via an ARI representative.

It would also seem logical to adopt a regional approach in North America involving different ARD stakeholders, even if there is still a long way to go to reach this goal. The establishment of NAFAR is moving in this direction and such an ambition could well mobilize new forces in the region, accelerate the process, and increase significantly the inputs of North America in GFAR.
A recommendation of the ARIs could be to abandon the terminology of ARIs and to officially establish two new Regional Fora, one for Europe and one for North America. Additionally, dialogue should be established with China to seek their interest in joining GFAR.

If adopted, this recommendation will be a significant step forward in the building-up of GFAR, through a true bottom-up approach from national to Sub-Regional, and Regional Fora involving all categories of stakeholders at each level.

**ROLES OF ARIS IN GFAR**

The participation and involvement of ARIs in GFAR were expected to contribute to three specific sets of activities: (1) information and knowledge-sharing; (2) capacity-building facilities; and (3) scientific partnerships. It is suggested to review what has been achieved in each of them since the inception of GFAR and how these functions can be improved in the future.

**INFORMATION AND SHARING**

Within GFAR, this function was mainly foreseen and organized at the sub-regional and regional levels. Priority was given to the establishment of EGFAR and the planning and launching of the RAIS. European countries, through EIARD, have established an information system called EARD-Infosys+ based on information provided by national nodes. More recently, the North American ARIs have started to design the NAFAR website as a gateway to the information and knowledge on ARD in the different universities. Some specific regional information systems such as APARIS in the Asia-Pacific region and INFOTEC in the LAC region exist, however more work has to be done to network them.

It is still too early in the GFAR establishment process to have evidence of significant exchange of information and knowledge through these computer-based tools. So far, the most significant exchange of information and knowledge has been through the different face-to-face meetings organized by GFAR.

**CAPACITY-BUILDING FACILITIES**

This is one of the main advantages that ARIs can offer to the Regional Fora from developing countries. Within GFAR, ARIs can and should contribute to build the capacities of the NARS and of their RF/SRF.
As of today, there is not yet enough training events and/or exchange of staff which could better target the real needs of developing countries. A possible exception is in the field of ICM. This is probably because the GFAR Secretariat has no specific funds or programs earmarked for capacity-building activities.

**SCIENTIFIC PARTNERSHIPS**

So far, this is the most significant contribution of ARIs to GFAR. ARIs are increasingly participating at the regional and sub-regional meetings and priority-setting exercises. The best evidence is the level of participation of ARIs at the FARA general assembly. Some ARIs are also playing an increasing role in the formulation of GPPs and in hosting/supporting their facilitating units.

**MODES OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN ARIS AND SOUTHERN REGIONAL FORA**

Clearly, the partnerships between ARIs and southern Regional Fora should be of mutual benefit. A few suggestions are made in this paper but should be enriched by the discussion.

**PRIORITY-SETTING EXERCISES**

One of the main achievements of GFAR was to assist the RF/SRF to revisit and better define their research priorities. The ARIs and the CGIAR centres were closely associated with these exercises and currently the CGIAR centres are using the results of these consultations to build their new research programs.

Similarly, the ARIs would benefit highly from this type of exercise and should enter a dialogue with the RF/SRF when setting their own research priorities. A request of this type has been proposed to GFAR by CIRAD. Modalities for such a dialogue are under discussion.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE IN THE SOUTH**

The scientific community considers the sub-regional level as probably the most efficient and effective level for scientific collaboration. ARIs should therefore assist the NARS in strengthening or building sub-regional and regional *Centres of Excellence* to address their own priorities. This will allow for reaching critical mass of scientists addressing key and complex multidisciplinary issues. Such centres will obviously favor knowledge exchanges but should also play a critical role in capacity-building.
Accordingly, universities and higher education institutions, from both the south and the north, should be closely associated with the establishment of these centres. CIRAD, along with some of its partners (Cameroon, Congo, Madagascar, Mali, Senegal and Vietnam) is currently testing this approach of what they call Pôles de Compétence en Partenariat. Some European ARIs have already indicated their interest in participating in such pôles and could be joined by others as well as by universities.

ESTABLISHMENT OF VIRTUAL LABORATORIES IN THE NORTH

LABEX, initiated in Brazil, was first implemented in the USA and more recently in France, to facilitate its access to other scientific communities. A few other countries like Mexico and India are considering projects along the same lines. The basic principle of the virtual laboratories is to establish a few senior scientists in an agricultural research institute of an industrialized country (Agropolis, in the case of France). This approach is cost effective as it clearly accelerates the exchange of information, knowledge and staff, and facilitates the formulation and implementation of joint research programs or projects.

PARTNERSHIPS TO CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE AND AMBITIOUS RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Since its inception, GFAR has promoted the concept of GPPs and has facilitated the implementation of four programs by different stakeholder groups. As part of its reform process, the CGIAR is currently launching some CPs based on the principle of competitive funds open to mixed research teams. Clearly, ARIs and NARS should closely collaborate and build research teams which may compete on these calls for proposals.

Similarly, the ARIs should be proactive and involve more NARS scientists in the formulation and implementation of research programs funded by their own countries or regions. The best example is the recently launched 6th RTD Framework Program of the European Commission which, for the first time allows the participation of the scientific community from all over the world in most of its programs.
INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES (IARCS)

The statement from the IARCs stakeholder group was a response to seven questions posed in the specific terms of reference prepared for this group.

In response to the question of emerging issues related to a new GFAR business plan, the IARCs fully endorsed an advocacy role in ARD as a top priority for GFAR on top of its traditional facilitation and catalytic functions.

The IARCs endorsed the areas identified by the keynote speakers as priorities (i.e. sustainable financing mechanisms, long-term perspectives and sustainability considerations). The IARCs confirmed that they could provide information by sharing their research results and data, and form partnerships to support the advocacy role of GFAR. IARCs can also contribute to an advocacy role through their networks e.g. the Future Harvest Foundation.

The IARCs expressed their agreement with the GFAR Executive Secretary’s analysis of GFAR’s achievements and gaps, and suggested increased emphasis on an advocacy role for GFAR.

The IARCs agreed to some of the issues raised by FOs and suggested that GPPs are insufficient to address adequately the concerns raised by FOs. Additional research is required to address these issues and the IARCs can contribute.

The IARCs cited several areas in which they had a comparative advantage, namely: (1) strategic research on broad global issues. (2) capacity to implement complex research and development programs; (3) substantive knowledge in specific areas; and (4) experience in capacity-building at institutional and individual levels.

The IARCs suggested that GFAR could contribute to IARCs through the advocacy role of farmers. GFAR also provides a platform for IARCs to interact with other stakeholders.
The IARCs commented on the GFAR conference and actions for follow-up by suggesting that GFAR facilitate the establishment of partnerships with other sectors relevant to rural development (e.g. water, health, energy). To improve future GFAR meetings, the IARCs proposed increasing time allocation for discussions and using ICT to facilitate timely and broad consultation to design the next conference, and to start preparations a year in advance.

Regarding suggestions to improve IARC representation within GFAR, the IARCs were quite satisfied with their current level of representation in the RF/SRF, and in GFAR. However, they recognized the need for further improvements in IARC interaction with RF/SRF and GFAR. They will accordingly explore avenues for this and will enhance internal mechanisms to inform IARC staff.

The IARCs recognized that RF/SRF are becoming increasingly strong and effective and that GFAR will need to identify its niche to add value as this process evolves. The latter should create new opportunities for GFAR.

**BOX 19. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES**

The GFAR initiative is a jigsaw puzzle in which the component parts must find their exact niche and fit perfectly for it to run smoothly, efficiently and effectively as a whole. As one of its stakeholders, IARCs are an important piece of the puzzle, with recognizable niches and crucial roles to play.

Specifically, GFAR sees them helping to address and carry out two GFAR guiding principles:

- First, they fulfill the principle of complementarity, i.e. positively exploiting the comparative advantages of partners working on a common problem. The comparative advantages of the centres are clear and easily discernible (excellent research facilities, first-class researchers, well-tested technologies ready for scaling-up, and funding advantages, etc).
Other GFAR stakeholders can benefit from these advantages when they forge alliances with appropriate centres.

- Second, GFAR expects its programs and projects to add value to what each partner can accomplish individually. IARCs are very knowledgeable and proficient; however, in collaboration with other stakeholders, superior results with less duplication can be achieved faster thereby moving more quickly towards the goal of improving the livelihood of people through agricultural research and development activities.

This GFAR meeting could not have come at a better time as the centres are going through some defining moments. It is the era of CPs, and we are aware of the ongoing efforts of the interim Science Council (iSC) to set the stage for the development of a forward-looking research agenda for the system.

We invite IARCs to deliberate on and identify their niche within the GFAR initiative, and what IARCs can contribute to enhance the overall performance of the initiative.

**POINTS FOR DISCUSSION**

GFAR invites IARCs involved in ARD to deliberate their future contribution to the GFAR initiative, and would like to solicit specific feedback on the following issues:

- emerging issues of relevance to ARD, that should be given priority in the GFAR business plan as outlined by the keynote speakers, and where IARCs can best contribute to the advancement of these issues
- specific questions and challenges raised by the GFAR Executive Secretary in his analysis of achievements, gaps and the way forward
- specific response to issues highlighted by FOs
- specific comparative advantage of the IARCs in collaboration with and contribution to GFAR, and vice versa
- comments on the conference in general, and suggestions for workshops or follow-up that are considered priorities over the next business plan
suggestions on how to improve the representation of IARCs at SRF, RF and GFAR levels, which surely must stem from stronger IARC involvement in NARS themselves, and how this may be best fostered

• any other issue of relevance to GFAR.

Naturally these are suggestions of issues that could be discussed, therefore please add any other issues you feel are of relevance to GFAR as you deliberate and consult amongst yourselves. Your conclusions and recommendations should be such that we can use them as components of a framework for the next GFAR business plan.

DONOR COMMUNITY

Donor representatives focused their discussion on three main issues. (1) SWOT analysis of the GFAR initiative; (2) key mechanisms for improving GFAR funding strategy; and (3) an expression of interest in the initiative.

With regards to the SWOT analysis, the lack of a long-term funding strategy and the unstable staffing situation at the GFAR Secretariat were highlighted as major concerns. They nevertheless renewed their commitment and interest in the principles that underpin GFAR, including its innovative collaborative programmes. The apparent instability in the Secretariat was viewed as a normal threat experienced by every new initiative. They identified a number real current and future opportunities offered by the evolving international agenda including the WSSD, NEPAD and the G8 summit in Evian, France and encouraged GFAR to seize such opportunities.

Some of the approaches and mechanisms proposed to improve the current funding situation were: (1) broaden and secure funding mechanism for both the Secretariat and the implementation of stakeholder-led initiatives; (2) improve transparency in the allocation of the financial resources across regions, stakeholder groups and thematic priorities; (3) encourage cost-sharing activities for the development of inter-stakeholder platforms; (4) improve coordination of funding
within the donor support group; (5) in-kind contributions from various donors; (6) the new Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between FAO and IFAD; and (7) innovative mechanisms to consolidate the Secretariat staffing through APOs, visiting experts and volunteers.

Consistent with the discussion, preliminary expressions of support were made by FAO, IFAD, European Commission, Canada (IDRC and CIDA), France, Italy and The Netherlands. Further commitments are expected from Germany, Switzerland and Great Britain.

**BOX 20. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: DONOR COMMUNITY**

This consultation is expected to serve as an opportunity for GFAR to involve a broader platform of donors potentially interested in supporting the activities led by GFAR. This particular consultation will allow a face-to-face dialogue involving multi- and bilateral donors to openly discuss various expectations from their points of view and concerns as well as their related commitments towards the GFAR business plan.

**POINTS FOR DISCUSSION**

GFAR invites the donor community involved in ARD to deliberate their future contribution to the GFAR initiative, and would like to solicit specific feedback on the following issues:

- discuss common perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of GFAR funding strategy since the launching of GFAR and discuss what could be a desirable budget for the basic functions of the GFAR Secretariat
- identify the key funding mechanisms and priorities, which would have to be integrated into a funding strategy for GFAR
- discuss potential roles of various donors and of GFAR in advancing its sustainable funding strategy.
Naturally these are suggestions of issues that could be discussed, therefore please add any other issues you feel are of relevance to GFAR as you deliberate and consult amongst yourselves. Your conclusions and recommendations should be such that we can use them as components of a framework for the next GFAR business plan.

PRIVATE SECTOR

Despite active participation of the private sector earlier in the sub-plenary on SMEs, nobody attended the private sector stakeholder meeting. There was, however, a well-attended full-day private sector seminar prior to the FARA meeting that made a series of recommendations from the African private sector perspective, which were presented and further discussed in FARA. The importance of better engaging the private sector at all levels from NARS through RF/SRF up to GFAR at the global level is critical, in view of the key role played by the private sector in development. Private sector representatives on GFAR will be contacted and a virtual debate initiated on how to increase the involvement of the private sector as a key stakeholder in GFAR.

The commercial private sector has a key interest in their customers or suppliers, particularly in relation to research support in this context for SMEs, as well as farm production enterprises themselves, and such research may be more socio-economic or policy-oriented than technical. It would thus seem appropriate to organize workshops at the sub-regional level to bring private sector agribusiness representatives together with FOs to review research needs in support of input supply, marketing and credit, and how they could play stronger roles in NARS, RF/SRF and GFAR. The concept of such workshops was endorsed by conference participants, and could be a key part of programs supported by GFAR over the next three years.

GFAR’S ASSETS OF POTENTIAL INTEREST TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

GFAR, primarily as a facilitator at the international level, has a number of assets that are of key interest to the private sector.
• As a global forum meeting place of NARS, and their SRF/RF, it has unrivalled access to all their research institutions, knowledge of their rural farming communities, and their countries.

• Through its fostering of Farmers’ Organizations and NGOs, it brings together the key clients of the commercial private sector, facilitating ease of dialogue between them.

• Through assisting the SRF and RF in priority-setting, it has brought to the forefront the most important research problems that need addressing. Alleviating such research bottlenecks through the subsequent activities of all its stakeholders (FOs, NGOs, IARCs, ARIs, donors, the private sector and the NARS themselves) will help strengthen economies and alleviate poverty, thereby opening new opportunities in a wider, hopefully more equitable, world market for all partners in this research and development endeavor. This should be of special interest to the private sector.

• Through EGFAR and the development of RAIS of each RF and SRF, it is helping in the access to knowledge and its transfer between NARS and regions, to support the new knowledge-based approach to development and harness the new advances in ICT (more assistance from private sector ICT companies would be welcome here, and should be to their advantage).

• In its honest broker and advocacy role, it can help with responsible stewardship of new technologies being introduced to LDCs, and provide a neutral forum for debate on contentious issues related to GMOs and IPRs.

• As a facilitator for the development and implementation of GPPs, GFAR not only brings researchers together in research programs, but also the partnerships carry through into implementing development. These GPPs could bring together in various combinations the private sector with all the other stakeholders in GFAR.
• GFAR has also focused attention at the request of NARS and several ARIs in the developed world on some of the commodities that lie outside the CGIAR mandate. These are mostly cash crops, again of particular interest to the private sector, which also increasingly is doing most of the research on them.

• Finally, through its RF/SRF, GFAR is well placed to assist in the transfer of innovative technologies, methodologies and approaches between regions as well as countries.

These are some of the strong reasons why the private sector should be interested in playing a stronger role in GFAR and its RF/SRF. Furthermore, as already stated, stronger RF/SRF and a stronger GFAR will only be possible with strengthening the basic institutional building blocks, the NARS. However, successful agricultural development in most countries has been spearheaded by the private sector, and a stronger indigenous private sector is vital to development, especially with the liberalizing of most developing countries’ economies, and increasing globalization. So the international private sector has much to offer in helping to strengthen the indigenous private sector both as partners in their NARS, and, more importantly, in the interests of more effective and quicker development.

The above rationale needs to be developed into a strong advocacy statement on why the private sector and GFAR will benefit from closer collaboration.

**BOX 21. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: PRIVATE SECTOR**

The largest economic sector in most developing countries is agriculture, and the developing countries that have prospered the most have mainly used agriculture, including agroprocessing and other agro-industries as the engine that drives its growth. The success has also been largely dependent on the private sector hence the need to foster public-private sector collaboration in ARD, and to ensure that national policy and regulatory frameworks are conducive to private sector development.
Furthermore, with the current market liberalization and decentralization, the advent of participatory, demand-led, knowledge-based research and extension systems replacing the old top-down technology generation and dissemination approach, and the recognition of the critical importance of marketing, processing and trade to the agricultural sector, the private sector has an even more important role to play. However, it has often proved difficult to harness the private sector, as it is composed of many thousands of small and large businesses. Moreover there is a whole range of private sector partners of key importance to farmers. On the supply side there are, for example, seed, fertilizer, pesticide, biologicals, transport, equipment and packaging suppliers, and on the demand side, agro-industries, processors, wholesalers, supermarkets and traders as buyers, and service suppliers from rural finance and banking institutions, NGOs, private advisory services and private research centres. Several excellent examples of good public-private sector research partnerships also exist, some facilitated by GFAR, but at Dakar we need to review how this can be better advanced over the next three years. We should also address why and how GFAR should attract stronger involvement from the private sector.

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

GFAR invites the private sector involved in ARD to deliberate their future contribution to the GFAR initiative, and would like to solicit specific feedback on the following issues:

- emerging issues of relevance to ARD, which should be given priority in the GFAR business plan as outlined by the keynote speakers, and an indication of where the private sector can best contribute to the advancement of these issues

- specific questions and challenges raised by the GFAR Executive Secretary in his analysis of achievements, gaps and the way forward

- specific response to issues highlighted by FOs in relation to input supply, marketing, processing, trade and credit provision for which they are now almost wholly dependent on private sector suppliers, buyers or service providers. It seems clear that much more socio-economic research and policy analysis work is required in this context
• specific comparative advantage of the private sector in its collaboration with and contribution to GFAR
• comments on the conference in general, and suggestions for workshops or follow-up activities that are considered priorities over the next business plan
• suggestions on how to improve the representation of private sector at SRF, RF and GFAR levels, which surely must stem from stronger private sector involvement in NARS themselves, and how this may be best fostered
• any other issue of relevance to GFAR.

Naturally these are suggestions of issues that could be discussed, therefore please add any other issues you feel are of relevance to GFAR as you deliberate and consult amongst yourselves.

Your conclusions and recommendations should be such that we can use them as components of a framework for the next GFAR business plan.
GFAR 2003 CONFERENCE EVALUATION
RESULTS

At the end of the GFAR 2003 conference, participants were asked to complete a five-page questionnaire consisting of 33 multiple choice or short answer questions. The questionnaire was divided into four parts: (1) general questions on the participant; (2) organization; (3) technical content; and (4) overall appreciation of the conference. The results of the questionnaire will be used to improve future conferences. Unless otherwise specified, all data are derived from the responses of the questionnaire. The non-response outputs will be commented on only in those cases where the number is significant.

PART 1. PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION

The total of 386 participants from 75 counties came from all GFAR-recognized regions (Table 9). Participants from FARA made up 51% of the total number of participants, although it should be noted that nearly half of the participants from FARA were based in Senegal, which facilitated their participation. The second most represented fora was EFARD with 22%, and the remaining fora were represented at more or less the same level, varying between 4% and 7% (Figure 1).

The percentage of countries represented from APAARI was the lowest at 15%, followed by CEE-CAC and FORAGRO at roughly 30%. Approximately 50% of the countries in EFARD, FARA and AARINENA were represented. Since only two countries comprise NAFAR (Canada and the United States) this forum was fully represented.
Table 9. Regional representation (Data based on list of participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Fora</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
<th>Number of countries represented</th>
<th>Total number of countries in the region</th>
<th>Percent of countries represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APAARI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE-CAC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFARD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORAGRO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFAR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARA</td>
<td>195(^9)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AARINENA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Distribution of participants by region (Data based on list of participants)

\(^9\text{87 form Senegal}\)
STAKEHOLDER DISTRIBUTION

Participants from NARS made up the largest represented stakeholder group with 31% of the total (Figure 2). IARCs, donors and NGOs were the next best represented groups, followed by ARIs and FOs. The private sector was the least represented stakeholder group at 3% of the total.

Figure 2. Stakeholder distribution as a percentage of total participants (Data based on list of participants)

VOLUNTARY RETURN OF COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 94 questionnaires were returned, or 24% of the total attendance of the conference (Table 10). The majority (79%) of respondents were male and 17% female. Participants from NARS made up 32% of those who responded, and the remaining stakeholders responded in similar numbers ranging from 10% to 17% with the exception of private sector at 1%. The stakeholder distribution of returned questionnaires roughly mirrors the stakeholder distribution of participants at the conference.
Table 10. Stakeholder distribution of returned questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 2. ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

GENERAL ORGANIZATION

The majority (72%) of respondents thought that 2.5 days of conference was the right length, 21% thought that it was too short, and 4% thought it too long.

No clear consensus was reached on the question of balance between plenary and working group sessions. Approximately half (47%) felt that the balance was right, 23% said not enough time in the plenary and 26% said not enough time in the working group sessions. From some comments, it became apparent that this question was not asked in a way that was clear to all participants. Ambiguity of the results of this question could have been avoided if another question was asked: whether or not there was sufficient time in plenary and sufficient time in working groups.

A small majority (57%) of the respondents felt that there was enough time between sessions to facilitate informal discussions with fellow participants on matters of mutual interest.
POSTER SESSION

The overall opinion on the poster session was favorable, with 7% of respondents rating them very good, 54% good, 28% average, and only 4% poor. This can be considered as a strong endorsement of the quality of the posters and the concept of having them. However, since a third of all respondents thought them only average or poor, there seems to be considerable room for improvement which is further reflected in the additional comments. Forty respondents chose to comment on issues ranging from ability to participate, presentation and location, presence of authors/designers, timing and language.

Some respondents were not aware of the opportunity for submitting a poster and would have liked to participate. It was suggested that more farmers should have been included, and one asked why they had been denied the ability to participate. Another expressed the opinion that the submissions were too dominated by IARCs. It should be noted that the poster session was advertised to all potential participants and/or their organizations well in advance in solicitation of participation, and all stakeholders, especially farmers' organizations and NGOs, were encouraged to participate.

Several respondents thought the posters could have been more centrally located, preferably by the coffee break area. Some complained that the room was too small, and displays too crowded, which might have been accommodated by making posters smaller as one suggested. Two judges recommended that all posters be portrait orientation rather than landscape in future, which would make it easier to present and compare them, especially when using easels. One respondent commented that better support panels/easels were needed.

Six respondents thought that the posters should have been manned by authors more often in order for them to better explain their posters, and one even suggested that they should be there at all breakout sessions. One suggested that 08:00-09:00 was not an ideal time, and requested an evening time.
One commentator wanted more time to discuss them in plenary, one asked for more posters in Spanish, and another suggested having all of them in three languages: French, English and Spanish, even though it may deter some entrants.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER EVENTS
Nearly 74% of respondents provided comments on the linking of the GFAR 2003 conference with other events. Approximately two-thirds thought that having the GFAR and FARA meetings together was a good idea and attended both of them, and some commented that they would not otherwise have attended both. It was suggested to hold the next triennial meeting in conjunction with another regional conference from a different continent. A third of the respondents said that they were not able to attend both, though some would have liked to. On the negative side, some felt that the events together were too long, that it was difficult to maintain enthusiasm towards the end of the conference, or that it detracts from the focus of each event. Two participants commented that, while they liked the idea, the schedule was too tight. Some participants of the CSO Workshop regretted the overlap of the workshop with the FARA plenary and the Senegalese Day.

DOCUMENTATION
The respondents were evenly split on the question of whether or not there was sufficient document distribution/availability prior to the conference; however, nearly two-thirds felt that the provision and standard of the documentation at the conference itself was good or very good. Approximately 65% of the respondents chose to comment on the documentation. The majority of the comments related to wanting more information in advance and more sent electronically. Another concern was the need for more translation of documents because they were almost solely in English. A few thought documentation was insufficient, others that documents should be more clearly identified on the cover sheet to avoid confusion, and others said that documents should have been released in a more timely fashion.
SUMMARY

The overall organization of the conference was rated very good by 28% of respondents, good by 38% and adequate by 24%. A few respondents thought that the organization was poor and one thought that it was very poor. The distribution of ratings and the comments suggest that there is considerable room for improvement in terms of logistical organization. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents made specific complaints or comments. Four issues dominated the responses on the negative side: (1) poor chairmanship; (2) insufficient translation; (3) hotel bookings and accommodation; and (4) changes in timetable. On the positive side, congratulations were given to the organizers.

Ten respondents criticized the chairs, stating that they did not keep to the scheduled time and often left too much time for discussion in plenary. However, some also mentioned that they felt the working group and sub-plenary sessions could have been better organized. Six respondents specifically stated that changes in timetable should not be allowed at such a tightly scheduled conference, particularly when key stakeholder meetings were put off until 1830 hours. Eight respondents said there should have been more translation of documents into French and Spanish, as well as the need for more translators in the sub-plenary sessions. Another eight were upset at hotel arrangements, half of them because of the loss of reservations at the Meridien, the other half because of the very poor standard and comparatively high cost of the Ngor-Diaruma hotel.

Some individual complaints included: (1) too few participants from certain groups (farmers, private sector, Lusophone countries); (2) few tourism events; (3) poor general logistical management; (4) lack of a list of participants; (5) no transportation back to the airport; (6) no side events at lunch; (7) no internet availability; (8) ineffective coffee breaks; (9) too ambitious and should have limited the themes; and (10) three years being too long of a gap between GFAR conferences.
PART 3. TECHNICAL SUBSTANCE

KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

The majority of respondents rated the keynote addresses favorably in terms of how well they covered critical ARD issues pertinent to GFAR, i.e. 15% rated the speeches as very well and 55% as well. Only six respondents rated the speeches as poor or very poor.

Three of those who commented felt insufficient attention had been given to marketing and trade issues, and a fourth cited not enough on globalization and its effect on the south. Two more felt inadequate attention had been given to the role of GFAR in supporting farmers' organizations, another that there was not enough on the role of GFAR in capacity-building, while the last specific comment asked for more comparative analysis on the role of GFAR in advocacy. Some additional criticisms were that the speeches lacked real analysis, there was insufficient relationship to GFAR itself, a lack of attention to defining priorities for GFAR, and they were not challenging enough. Two commentators stated that they felt the address on NEPAD was too diffuse and mostly consisted of general knowledge. So while most respondents were happy with both papers, it is clear that issues and priorities for GFAR could have been more clearly defined in the two addresses.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS ON KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

The roundtable discussions were rated less favorably than the speeches; only 7% rated them as very good and 40% as good, which suggests room for improvement. Two-thirds of respondents provided comments on what they considered the most important issues for GFAR, as raised during the discussions and speeches. Three issues dominated the responses: (1) the role of GFAR (mentioned by 23% of respondents); (2) partnerships (18%); and (3) better ICT and knowledge-sharing (16%). Another five issues ranked highly: forward thinking on strategy and new research paradigm (13%); the advocacy role of GFAR (11%); stakeholder
coordination (11%); capacity-building and strengthening of CSOs (10%), with special attention to farmers (10%).

**Role of GFAR**

Almost a quarter of all respondents called for a greater clarification and definition of the role of GFAR, especially with respect to RF/SRF, and generally supporting advocacy and facilitation functions related to new research partnerships, capacity-building and information-sharing. Three commentators cautioned on getting involved in operational tasks, or implementing GPPs or other research projects. One respondent called for a clearer distinction to be drawn between the roles of GFAR and of its Secretariat.

**Partnerships**

18% of respondents simply mentioned partnerships and partnership mechanisms. Some called for a clearer definition of what a partnership involves, and others said partnerships should be more business-like.

**ICT and knowledge-sharing**

Respondents called for a greater use of ICT coupled with capacity-building of its use; some simply stated the importance of better information and knowledge-sharing.

**Other comments**

Sustainable funding was identified as a major concern, and it was suggested that efforts be made to secure funding from the World Bank and national governments. Approximately 11% of respondents specifically mentioned the advocacy role, and another 11% suggested stakeholder coordination, with others stressing the need for more legitimate representation. About 10% thought special attention should be given to strengthening CSOs and/or the weaker NARS, and another 10% specified farmers and their organizations. Other issues suggested include: (1) biotechnology and genetic resources; (2) environment; (3) poverty; (4) the private sector; (5) linking
more strongly to extension, dissemination and development; and (6) more use of participatory approaches in research.

**GFAR BUSINESS PLAN 2004–2006**

The presentation on the past achievements, gaps and the way forward was well received with 56% rating it as good or very good. The discussion, however, was not rated quite as high, 46% giving it a score of good or very good. And the average rating of the roundtable discussions by stakeholder group was even lower, with 34% of the respondents regarding the discussions as good, 28% as adequate, and 10% as poor. It should be noted that 20% did not respond, presumably because they did not attend the discussions. Nearly half of the respondents stated that they were able to contribute to the discussions, only 10% said that they were not able to, likely because of language barriers, 13% responded that the question was not applicable meaning that they did not feel the need to intervene, and 29% did not answer the question.

The most common priority areas for the next three years as identified by respondents are: (1) partnerships at national, regional and international levels; (2) more involvement of CSOs (FOs, NGOs and private sector) and their consequent capacity-building; (3) information exchange and communication among stakeholders; (4) sustainable funding strategies; (5) genetic resources and natural resource management; and (6) small and medium-sized rural enterprises and markets.

**CASE STUDIES ON SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS**

The two case studies, *Milk/Meat Preservation Technologies* and the *China/Canada Dryland Farming Project*, and the following panel discussion were generally graded well. The China/Canada case was ranked slightly higher, with 58% saying that it was good or very good, whereas 51% said the milk/meat case was good or very good. The panel discussion was not rated quite as favorably. The majority (57%) of respondents thought that the discussion was good or adequate and 11%
thought that it was poor. Approximately 20% of respondents did not answer the three questions on the case studies.

**SUB-PLENARY SESSIONS ON GPPS**

The sub-plenary session on ARD partnerships was attended by 29 of the respondents, which made it the best attended session. Sessions on small and medium-sized enterprises, innovative policy directions and approaches, and rural knowledge systems were attended by approximately the same number of respondents, whereas the session on agriculture-livestock integration was attended by 6 of the respondents (Table 11 and Figures 3 to 7).

Table 11. Distribution of respondents at sub-plenary sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Rural Knowledge Systems</th>
<th>Small &amp; Medium-sized Enterprises</th>
<th>Agriculture–Livestock Integration</th>
<th>ARD Partnerships</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly 47% of the respondents rated the sub-plenary on rural knowledge systems as good and 29% as very good. Thirty-five percent rated the presentation the next day as good and 29% as very good. However, the difference in rating may be due to the 12% non-response to the second question on the presentation.

**Figure 3. Stakeholder participation in rural knowledge systems**

Thirty-nine percent rated the session on small and medium-sized enterprises as good and 22% as very good. Thirty-nine percent rated the presentation as good and 17% as very good.

**Figure 4. Stakeholder participation in small and medium-sized enterprises and markets**
Thirty-three percent rated the session on agriculture-livestock integration as good, another 33% as adequate, and 17% as poor. Thirty-three percent rated the presentation as very good and 33% also rated it as adequate. One respondent thought it was done very poorly. Given the very small sample (six respondents) the statistical analysis of this sub-plenary session is not necessarily a true reflection of the quality of the session and presentation.

Figure 5. Stakeholder participation in agriculture-livestock integration

Fifty-nine percent of respondents rated the session on ARD partnerships as good and 21% as very good. The presentation the next day was rated slightly lower with only 48% rating it as good, 21% as adequate and 17% as very good. There was a 10% increase in non-response to the question on the presentation compared with the question on the sub-plenary.

Figure 6. Stakeholder participation in ARD partnerships
Forty-four percent rated the session on innovative policy directives and approaches as good, 44% as adequate, and only 6% as very good. Thirty-three percent rated the presentation as good, 28% as adequate and 17% as very good. Again, there was an increase of 11% in non-response to the second question compared with the first.

**Figure 7. Stakeholder participation in innovative policy directives and approaches**
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**SUMMARY**

Overall, participants felt that the objectives of the conference were achieved. Twenty-eight percent felt that they were achieved very well, 38% well and 24% adequately, which indicates there is margin for improvement. Seven of the respondents felt that the conference did not meet its objectives.

Nearly half of the respondents commented on major shortcomings raised during the conference, indicating that these be considered in the new GFAR business plan, while another half stated that they saw no gaps. Other comments were related to the preparation of the business plan, suggesting that it needs to be much more detailed and not based on general principles, and that the long-term direction was too vague. A few respondents commented that they felt the business plan to be overambitious.

Comments on the role of GFAR were related to a better definition of its role, that of the Secretariat and the RF/SRF.
Some recommended maintaining the facilitation function of the GFAR Secretariat which should not be involved with project implementation. Two respondents felt that more emphasis should be placed on wide dissemination of information using such tools as EGFAR and GLOBAL.RAIS. Three comments were received on the need to secure more funds, including developing a fund-raising strategy. Two wished to emphasize the importance of the advocacy role of GFAR, and two raised the issue of more translations in order to be more inclusive.

Points raised by only one respondent were to put more emphasis on: (1) energy; (2) economics of agriculture; (3) capacity-building at RF/SRF and NARS level; (4) strengthening links between GFAR and education; (5) strengthening links between international and sub-regional organizations; (6) subsidies and food aid; (7) appropriate ARD technology; (8) information systems especially EGFAR and RAIS; and finally (9) strengthening private sector involvement as stakeholders.

The majority of the responses to the final question on how they, as individual or as organization, plan to contribute to furthering the goals of GFAR over the next three years fell into four main themes. The most common theme was that of sharing information. Many respondents said that they plan to circulate information on GFAR and the outcomes of the conference to their constituency. Some took it a step further to offer to play the role of regional platform for information exchange and communication improvement.

Pledges associated with increased partnership and networking were also very common. Partnerships with farmers, universities, NARS, scientists and researchers, and partnerships within specific regions were all identified specifically. Increased inter- and intra-stakeholder group networking was also mentioned by a number of respondents. Some even identified specific partners with whom they would like to link, such as other participants interested in rural
knowledge systems, agrifood businesses, and EARD-Infosys+ and ZADI.

Increased participation was another aspect which respondents promised to improve upon in the future. They stated their intentions to become more involved in NARS, RF/SRF and GFAR activities, as well actively mobilizing colleagues and partners. One pledged to lead/facilitate the engagement of the North American Forum in GFAR and another offered to play a similar role in EFARD. More concretely, there were promises to become more involved in the development of GPPs, in capacity-building, and in farmer and NGO constituency-building.

Many pledged to support and promote the goals of GFAR by internalizing and integrating the recommendations, strategies and programs of GFAR into the work of their organization. Some suggested that they would try to adjust their strategic research plan to focus on GFAR priorities, and many offered to participate in the implementation of the business plan in whatever capacity available to them.

Some other themes that were mentioned by more than one respondent included the promise to become more actively involved in lobbying and advocacy, capacity-building, organizing workshops and training exercises, and to follow up on the key steps as identified by their stakeholder group.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

One notable feature of the meeting was the opportunity given to all participants to evaluate and rate GFAR 2003 in terms of the overall organization, the content, appropriateness and value of the sessions, the timing and time utilization including length of the meeting and time split between presentations and discussion. In addition, participants had another opportunity, through this tool, to comment again on main gaps and new priorities that GFAR should address. In general, participants’ responses were positive and favorable, with the majority of respondents rating performance for many of the items in the good to very good range. Other scores hovered around the satisfactory mark, while a few others returned a verdict of poor. While the technical substance of the conference was rated high, what irked participants most were: a lack of crucial documents in such other languages as French and Spanish, session time changes during the meeting, inadequate translating facilities during sub-plenary sessions, and poor chairing of some sessions. Gaps and new priorities were, as expected, similar to those identified by stakeholder and roundtable groups.

The GFAR 2003 organizing group formulated four expected outputs during the planning stages of the meeting: (1) identification of potential global partnership programs or inter-regional activities; (2) consolidation and strengthening of partnerships and alliances amongst GFAR stakeholders; (3) development of strategies for improving information exchange and knowledge-sharing amongst GFAR stakeholders; and (4) definition of a framework (identification of essential elements) for the GFAR business plan for the triennium 2004-2006. A careful analysis of the meeting events as they unfolded indicated that these outputs were realized. In the first instance, all of the potential partnership programs discussed during the five sub-plenary sessions moved closer to development and implementation, and these sessions, as did other discussion
platforms, provided a singular opportunity for consolidating old alliances but with opportunities for new institutions and individuals to become active partners. It was also very clear that during the special side event *Towards a Global Agenda for Information Communication Management*, some new innovative approaches were presented which need to be captured for future use. Finally the ideas put forward by speakers and chairs of plenary sessions, the comments, recommendations and conclusions of individuals through the evaluation mechanism, of the heterogeneous roundtable groups or the homogenous common-interest stakeholders groups not only constituted essential elements of the next business plan, but in some instances touched on programmatic contents. Our analysis suggests therefore that the expected outputs of GFAR 2003 were realized, as was confirmed by the meeting participants who, when asked how well the meeting objectives were met, responded as follows: 10% very well, 52% well, 28% satisfactorily and 10% did not respond.

GFAR 2003 was concluded during a closing ceremony presided over by the Senegalese Minister of Agriculture, Habib Sy. The first of the four speakers during this ceremony was the GFAR chair Mohammad Roozitalab who expressed his gratitude to all those who in one way or another contributed to the planning and implementation of the meeting. Representatives of GFAR facilitating agencies, Rodney Cooke from IFAD and Isabelle Alvarez from FAO, in their closing remarks highlighted the historical ties between GFAR and the two agencies, the current and future support to GFAR and its constituent regional and sub-regional organizations. Habib Sy, in declaring the meeting closed, reiterated the important contribution of agriculture to sustainable development, describing it as the real engine of development that not only contributes significantly to food security, but also provides reliable income through exports. However, he pointed out that a key condition for development to occur is for science and technology to be fully harnessed and rationally utilized for the benefit of communities, especially in developing countries.
Hence the real value of the GFAR meeting is that it has brought scientists and their development partners together to identify needs and use appropriate science and technology innovations to find solutions.