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ANNEX 1

Terms of Reference for GFAR Review Panel

1. Background

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

2. Focus areas for the stripe review

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

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

2.1. GFAR Programme of Work

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

2.1.1. The Content

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

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

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

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

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

2.1.3. *The Effectiveness and added value*

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

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

2.2. *Representativeness, membership and governance*

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

2.2.1. *Membership*

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

2.2.2. *Representativeness*

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

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

2.2.3. Governance

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

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

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

2.3. GFAR organizational structure

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

Three issues have to be addressed by the review team.

2.3.1. The Secretariats

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

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

2.3.2. The Facilitating Agencies

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

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

3. Composition of the review panel

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

4. Review timetable

- First step: Preparatory Work

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

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

- Second step: The GFAR-2000 Meeting

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

- Third step: Preparation of the Report

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

THE GFAR CHART

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

1. BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

**Box 1: GFAR’s mission statement**
GFAR’s mission is to mobilize the stakeholders in agricultural research for development in their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources.

**Box 2: Guiding principles of GFAR’s mode of operation**
- **Subsidiarity**
  Programs and projects are planned and managed at the lowest level at which they can be effectively executed.
- **Complementarity**
  GFAR strives to develop a global agricultural research system by drawing on the complementary strengths of the stakeholders.
- **Additionality**
  GFAR supports programs and projects that aim specifically to add value to what each stakeholder can do on its own.
- **Involvement of all stakeholders**
  GFAR operates through its stakeholders and mobilizes all stakeholders in planning and executing its programs and activities.
- **Partnership**
  GFAR’s work program supports the evolution of the development-aid concept towards that of full partners with common interests collaborating for mutual benefits. The NARS of the developing countries along with their regional and sub-regional fora are the cornerstones of the global agricultural research system that GFAR aims to create.
2. THE GFAR STEERING COMMITTEE

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

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

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

The first GFAR plenary meeting has taken place in May 2000 and the GFAR-SC did not see the need of modifying the composition of the committee. As a consequence, the current composition will remain valid till 2003.²

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

Each constituency should establish a transparent nomination process.

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

In order to ensure some continuity in the representation and facilitate the GFAR decision process, each constituency should nominate its representative for a period of three years and also designate an alternate³. Ideally, the two nominations should not coincide in time.

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.3. Functions of the GFAR Steering Committee

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

a) Approve the general policy and strategy of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), making sure they are consistent with the mission of GFAR, with its objectives and with the recommendations of the Plenary Meeting of the GFAR, the latter playing the role of a General Assembly.

b) Approve the rules and regulations of GFAR.

c) Elect the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of GFAR from the members of the Steering Committee, as described in the previous section.

d) Appoint the GFAR Executive Secretary and make sure the GFAR Secretariat is staffed with highly competent persons that can contribute to the objectives of GFAR. This also includes approving the composition of the GFAR Secretariat, the persons that are posted to it and the Agreement with the Host Institution for the functioning of the secretariat.

e) Discuss and approve the GFAR Mid-Term Plan (Business Plan) and the Programme of Work of the GFAR Secretariat.

f) Approve the annual budget of GFAR as well as the three-year budget forecasts that are prepared by the GFAR Secretariat.

3 For the NARS representatives, the Chairperson of each Regional Forum becomes “de facto” the GFAR-SC member, unless otherwise specified by the Regional Forum. The alternate should be a recognized leader of agricultural research or rural development of the region.
g) Approve the annual Technical Reports and the annual Financial Reports presented by
the GFAR Secretariat, making sure that the funds provided by donors are being
judiciously utilized.
h) Facilitate the flow of information and the exchange of experiences among stakeholders
of agricultural research for development.
i) Discuss and endorse the various initiatives the stakeholders want to carry out in
strengthening their own constituencies or in carrying out joint activities among them.
j) Promote those activities or initiatives it considers appropriate for achieving the
objectives of GFAR and organize the GFAR Plenary Meeting every three years or
with the periodicity determined by the GFAR-SC.
k) Commission an external evaluation every five years to assess the progress being made
in the direction of the objectives and goals of GFAR.
l) Establish the sub-committees or working groups that may be deemed necessary to
accomplish its mandate in an efficient and effective manner.

3. THE GFAR COMMITTEES

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

3.1 The NARS Sub-Committee (NARS-SC)

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

The main purpose of the NARS Sub-Committee is to strengthen the participation of the
NARS and their Regional/Sub-regional Fora in the Global Forum, given the key role they
play in agricultural research for development. It should be pointed out that similar
mechanisms are being established to strengthen the participation of the other stakeholders as
well, which are analyzed in section 3.3. The NARS Sub-committee will have the following
functions:
To review all GFAR plans and activities specifically related to one of the four GFAR lines of
action, namely the “strengthening of the NARS and of their Regional and Sub-Regional Fora
(RF/SRF)”.
To discuss the overall agenda of GFAR from a NARS perspective in order to develop
common positions and ensure that the NARS priorities are fully taken into consideration.
To promote inter-regional cooperation and collaboration both South-South and South-North,
as well as the exchange of experiences in how to promote regional/sub-regional cooperation
in agricultural research.
To provide a forum where NARS can discuss topics of common interest at the global level,
such as develop common positions in CGIAR-related issues as well as in other fora related to
agricultural research for development.
The NARS sub-Committee elects a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson who report to the GFAR-SC on progress made by the NARS specifically regarding these different functions and convey to the GFAR-SC the specific requests and needs of the NARS.

### 3.2 The GFAR Management Team (GFAR-MT)

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

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

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

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

- Review the progress made by the GFAR Stakeholders and the GFAR Secretariat since the last GFAR Steering Committee meeting as well as the contacts that the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson have had over the period under review.
- Discuss and agree on the draft GFAR Secretariat Programme of Work before its submission to the GFAR Steering Committee.
- Review the financial situation and approve the necessary budgetary adjustments, if needed.
- Advise on the agenda of the next GFAR Steering Committee meeting.
- Approve financial supports provided by GFAR and expenditures of over US $10,000, within the annual budget approved by the GFAR Steering Committee.
- Organize a brainstorming session on one or two global strategic issues (a few experts and observers may be invited to participate).

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

### 3.3 Constituency Working Groups (optional)

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

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

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

c) The GFAR Private Sector Working Group was established, constituted by the two representatives of the private sector in the GFAR-SC (member and alternate), with the rotary participation of other persons from the private sector, seeking to develop an active interaction with different types of agroindustries in different regions. This group has a close interaction with the CGIAR Private Sector Committee. They are also exploring how to develop closer links with existing associations of agroindustries that could collaborate in facilitating the participation of the private sector. The GFAR Private Sector Working Group organized the special workshop that took place at GFAR-2000 on Public-Private Sector Cooperation in Research on Genomics in Dresden (May 22, 2000).

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

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

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

### 4. GFAR MEETINGS

#### 4.1 Global Forum Plenary Meetings

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

4.2 Meetings of the GFAR Steering Committee (GFAR-SC)

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

The agenda of the meetings is prepared by the GFAR Secretariat in consultation with the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson. The draft agendas and important documents to be tabled are circulated at least three weeks in advance to allow the GFAR-SC members and their alternates to consult their constituencies.

The Chairperson may decide to divide the meetings in two sessions: (i) an open session to give to all GFAR members and supporters to exchange views and share experiences; and (ii) a close session for GFAR-SC members to discuss GFAR business matters and take decisions.

4.3 Permanent electronic interaction among GFAR members

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

5. THE GFAR SECRETARIAT

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

5.1. Specific Goals

The goals of the GFAR Secretariat are the following:
**Communication.** To develop a far-reaching, multi-channel system for the exchange of information among all GFAR constituents.

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

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

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

5.2. **Functions:**

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

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

b) Assist the various stakeholders in the implementation of the activities that are included in the Programme of Work.

c) Organize the GFAR Steering Committee meetings and the triennial Global Forum plenary meeting, and help the various constituencies to prepare their contributions to these meetings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. **THE GFAR FACILITATING AGENCIES**

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

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

Over time the role of these facilitating agencies has evolved but the GFAR-SC recognizes their initial critical role and believes that they should continue to play the following three functions:
Facilitate the link between GFAR activities and development programs, given the importance of this link for achieving their common mission of poverty alleviation, food security and environmental sustainability.

- Sensitize and mobilize all GFAR stakeholders towards achieving its goals and objectives.
- Support, directly or indirectly, the GFAR stakeholders and the GFAR Secretariat in implementing the agreed GFAR strategic agenda.

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

Mandate and Responsibilities of the GFAR-SC Members

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

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

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

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

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

At the Cairo meeting in May 1997, each constituency was given a 3-year period to organize its process to legitimate its representation to GFAR. At that time, as some constituencies were not yet fully organized, some representatives have been chosen on their own capacity on a consensual basis, often from the CGIAR Committees related to their constituency. It is expected that these “ad interim” representatives will rapidly organize their constituency and put in place a more formal nomination process, following the principles and guidelines mentioned in section 2.3.
Annex 2
Terms of Reference
for the GFAR-SC Chair and Vice-Chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Vice-Chairperson has the following functions:

a) Assist the Chairperson in his/her tasks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The tasks to perform are as follows:

- a) Management and supervision of the GFAR Secretariat and of the staff that is posted to it, in order to assure that it effectively carries out the functions described in section 5 of this Chart;
- b) Preparation and monitoring of a 3-year rolling workplan and corresponding budget and its coordination with the FAO MTP, in particular the workplan of the Service of Research and Technology Development and its regional and sub-regional activities;
- c) Implementation of the annual Programme of Work as approved by the GFAR Steering Committee and financed by the GFAR Support Group. When implementing it, a special attention will be given to the joint activities developed with FAO in support of the regional and sub-regional fora;
- d) Assist in the development of mechanisms for systematic and improved interaction between the GFAR stakeholders, in particular between and within the regional and sub-regional fora;
- e) Assist the Regional/Sub-regional Fora in developing programmes aimed at strengthening NARS and regional/sub-regional cooperation in agricultural research;
- f) Organization and support of all GFAR Steering Committee meetings;
- g) Organization of the Plenary Meetings of the GFAR every 3 years;
- h) Maintain close interaction with all the institutions that GFAR has to relate to, in carrying out its mandate;
- i) Supervision of all GFAR publications: annual reports, working papers, brochures, studies and workshop proceedings, etc;
j) Participation in meetings of the various constituencies (NARS, ARIs, CGIAR, Private Sector, NGOs, Farmers’ Organisations) that are of importance for the overall coordination of GFAR activities,
k) Advice to the Chairperson, as need arises, on the formation of ad hoc technical committees and Working Groups;
l) Dissemination of all GFAR Steering Committee decisions to all partners; and
m) Any other task assigned by the GFAR Steering Committee.

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

The Seven Stakeholders of GFAR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 The NGOs and farmer organizations tabled a joint Declaration at the GFAR 2000, Dresden Conference, calling for widening the scope of the Forum to encompass more than just agricultural research. While issues concerning agrarian reform, organization of markets and consumer rights will have to be raised in other fora, the Panel agrees on the importance of interpreting the research agenda in its broadest sense and of the importance of focus on policy issues. It also endorses the decision that for the next three years no change should be introduced in the composition of the stakeholders. It is also of the view that the GFAR Secretariat should remain neutral and the debate on differences among stakeholders should remain a key focus of GFAR. It is encouraging that both farmer organizations and NGOs welcome GFAR as an opportunity for debate and exchange of ideas, and that they are willing to collaborate on the basis of their own Declarations made in Dresden. To encourage their further enthusiastic participation in GFAR, the Panel recommends that the GFAR Steering Committee further review and debate the points raised in the NGO and farmer organizations’ Declarations.
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Form for GFAR Panel Review Questionnaire
Request for input into the review of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR)

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Who are you?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The detail of responses is shown in the attached tables.

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Responses to specific questions:

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

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

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

2. Promotion of Research Partnerships on:

2.1 Genetic Resources Management and Biotechnology

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

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

2.2 Natural Resource Management and Agroecology

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

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

2.3 Commodity chains

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

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

2.4 Policy Management and Institutional Development

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

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

2.5 Information and Knowledge Management

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

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

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

(B) Usefulness. 23 (29%) of respondents gave no opinion as to the usefulness of the process launched by GFAR in this area. Of those giving an opinion, 68% thought the process launched by GFAR in this area was “very useful”, 23% “useful” and 8% “not useful”. Respondents from ARIs, donors, and NARS had more than 50% saying “very useful”. Of the seven IARC respondents giving an opinion, only one rated the process launched as “very useful”, 4 “useful”, and 2 “not useful”.
(Table 1)

Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire sent by External Review Team

01 – Global/Regional Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 14 6 1</td>
<td>0 67 29 5</td>
<td>11 10 52 48</td>
<td>5 6 10 0</td>
<td>24 29 48 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 4 4 1</td>
<td>0 44 44 11</td>
<td>3 6 33 67</td>
<td>1 4 4 0</td>
<td>11 44 44 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>50 50 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 50 50</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 11 2 2</td>
<td>0 73 13 13</td>
<td>6 9 40 60</td>
<td>5 5 4 1</td>
<td>33 33 27 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 17 0 0</td>
<td>6 94 0 0</td>
<td>4 14 22 78</td>
<td>2 13 3 0</td>
<td>11 72 17 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 2 6 1</td>
<td>0 22 67 11</td>
<td>1 8 11 89</td>
<td>0 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 22 33 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 3 3 0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0</td>
<td>3 3 50 50</td>
<td>1 3 3 0</td>
<td>17 50 50 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2 52 21 5</td>
<td>3 65 26 6</td>
<td>29 51 36 64</td>
<td>14 35 27 5</td>
<td>18 44 34 6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND:
For Participation
0= Did NOT participate
1= Did participate

For Importance and Usefulness
0= Don't Know
1= Very important/Useful
2= Important/Useful
3= Less Important/Useful
(Table 2)

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

**02 - GRM and Biotechnology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Participated in it?</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>In Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 12 5 2</td>
<td>10 57 24 10</td>
<td>12 9 57 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 4 4 1</td>
<td>0 44 44 11</td>
<td>5 4 56 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 100 0 0</td>
<td>0 2 0 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 4 6 5</td>
<td>0 27 40 33</td>
<td>11 4 73 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 12 4 1</td>
<td>6 67 22 6</td>
<td>12 6 67 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 1 3 5</td>
<td>0 11 33 56</td>
<td>6 3 67 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 3 1 1</td>
<td>17 50 17 17</td>
<td>1 5 17 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4 38 23 15</td>
<td>5 48 29 19</td>
<td>47 33 59 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**

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

**03 - NRM and Agroecology**

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

**LEGEND:**
For Participation or Importance and Usefulness
0= Did NOT participate 0=Don't Know
1= Did participate 1=Very important/Useful
2= Important/Useful
3= Less Important/Useful
### 04 - Commodity Chains

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

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

### 05 - Policy Management and Institutional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Importance Frequency</th>
<th>Importance In Percent</th>
<th>Participated in it? Frequency</th>
<th>Participated in it? In Percent</th>
<th>Usefulness Frequency</th>
<th>Usefulness In Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>2 7 9 3</td>
<td>10 33 43 14</td>
<td>18 3</td>
<td>86 14</td>
<td>9 2 8 2</td>
<td>43 10 38 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>0 1 5 3</td>
<td>0 11 36 33</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td>89 11</td>
<td>3 0 5 1</td>
<td>33 0 56 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>0 50 50 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>50 50 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARCS/CG</td>
<td>5 3 6 1</td>
<td>33 20 40 7</td>
<td>9 6</td>
<td>60 40</td>
<td>7 1 5 2</td>
<td>47 7 33 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>1 1 5 1</td>
<td>6 61 28 6</td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>44 56</td>
<td>4 9 4 1</td>
<td>22 50 22 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>0 6 2 1</td>
<td>0 67 22 11</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>78 22</td>
<td>3 2 3 1</td>
<td>33 22 33 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>1 2 3 0</td>
<td>17 33 50 0</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>4 1 0 1</td>
<td>67 17 0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9 31 31 9</td>
<td>11 39</td>
<td>39 11</td>
<td>54 26 68 33</td>
<td>31 16 25 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**

- For Participation
  - 0 = Did NOT participate
  - 1 = Did participate
- For Importance and Usefulness
  - 0 = Don't Know
  - 1 = Very important/Useful
  - 2 = Important/Useful
  - 3 = Less Important/Useful
(Table 6)

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

**06 - Information and Knowledge Management**

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

**LEGEND:**

For Participation  
0= Did NOT participate  
0= Don't Know  
1= Did participate  
2= Important/Useful  
3= Less Important/Useful  

or Importance and Usefulness  
0= Don't Know  
1= Very important/Useful  
2= Important/Useful  
3= Less Important/Useful
(Table 7)

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

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

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

**LEGEND:**

For Participation or Importance and Usefulness

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

GFAR Global Vision Statement

The Dresden Declaration

The Global Vision for Agricultural Research for Development

PREAMBLE

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

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

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

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

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

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

We, the GFAR stakeholders, believe that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. The formulation of a global strategic research agenda, which capitalizes on the comparative advantages and the strengths of the different GFAR stakeholders;

2. The promotion of innovative, participatory, cost-effective and sustainable research partnerships and strategic alliances;

3. The ICT networking among stakeholders and the establishment of specialized agricultural knowledge and information systems.

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

Set of Summary Tables showing activities in GFAR Action Plan by stakeholders

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Lead Stakeholder:</th>
<th>2. Core Stakeholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) No general lead-stakeholder.</td>
<td>a) All stakeholders are involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Each stakeholder has developed its own Shared Vision and has participated in the development of the Global Vision (GV).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Most stakeholders have engaged in visioning exercises. The need for a “visioning” exercise has been a general feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The need &amp; scope for a GV was collectively discussed and adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A global consultation through 3 meetings (Beijing, Wash. &amp; Dresden) and e-mail interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Consultants prepared draft of an “Issues Paper”, that was then discussed in two meetings (Washington &amp; Dresden), and through intensive e-mail interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Final GFAR-2000 discussion of GV through inter-stakeholder roundtables aimed at facilitating participation and dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Mutual inputs from one stakeholder to another. Main case is input into CGIAR-GV (still in process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Dissemination of GFAR-GV and on-going dialogue with stakeholders around differences of opinion. Important forum function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Get people to think on desirable future: Process as important as GV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Develop sense of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Develop sense of urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Develop Framework for Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) An emerging five-point Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – IPRs in ARD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Access to genetic resources and benefit sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Biosafety regulations and decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Sustainable funding strategies for ARD cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Creating a favorable environment through agricultural development policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Regional activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Completion of the formulation of the regional visions and strategic agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Participation to the formulation of the global ARD strategic agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### THEME/TOpIC No. 2-A: Genetic Resources Management (GRM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Lead Stakeholder:                             | a) During the first year the GFAR Secretariat was contacted by several stakeholders and encouraged to get into this topic, but for a full year it only followed the process taking place in the inter-governmental commission.  
b) Discussion within GFAR Steering Committee and interaction with CGIAR and FAO to explore what GFAR could contribute to a complex ongoing negotiation process.  
c) Breakthrough comes in ICW-99, when several key NARS agree to support a role for GFAR to play in this process. A one-page statement is carefully written with the strong participation of those NARS and other stakeholders.  
d) An Advisory Working Group established in January/February of 2000, with strong stakeholder involvement.  
e) Close interaction with the CGIAR-GRPC to coordinate initiative.  
f) A group of consultants involving stakeholders plays an important role.  
g) Strong e-mail interaction.  
h) At the same time RF/SRF addressed these issues in their annual meetings given the priority they attach to them (i.e. ASARECA, FORAGRO, AARINENA, and others). | 1. Objectives:  
a) Create awareness on main GRM policy issues.  
b) Facilitate initiatives for identification of policy options and for policy management capacity building.  
c) Facilitate dissemination of “best practice” & approaches in IPR management.  
d) Promote global & regional partnerships related to Leipzig GPA.  
2. Niches identified: Different Types of GRM activities  
a) Provide a forum for debate on strategic issues on GRM.  
b) Identification & dissemination of “best practice” and of policy options.  
c) Interaction between the inter-govt. Commission and the GFAR stakeholders.  
3. Tools or mechanisms:  
a) Policy papers prepared to facilitate debate on strategic issues.  
b) Dresden Declaration on GRAFT.  
c) Regional awareness workshops (i.e. CORRA/IRRI workshop & others).  
d) EGFAR used as a platform for communication and for dialogue.  
4. Concrete partnerships:  
a) GFAR Initiative in GRFA covering the type of activities mentioned in previous column.  
b) Groundwork laid for the partnerships mentioned in last column. | 1. Global activities:  
a) A proposal for strengthening research (analysis) and policy-making capacity on GRM, to be pursued with relevant stakeholders and in close collaboration with responsible agencies (FAO and IPGRI) (related to Crucible initiative).  
b) Facilitation of the implementation of the Leipzig GPA  
2. Regional activities:  
a) Regional awareness workshops involving not only policy-makers but also legislators are being proposed by several stakeholders.  
b) Some RF/SRF have expressed interest in IPR workshops and access to information on policy options and “best practice” |
**THEME/TOPIC No. 2-B: Biotechnology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td>a) Several Regional/Sub-regional Fora have expressed interest, or are developing, regional workshops and networks on biotechnology policy. b) The NARS/GFAR Secretariat has developed a close collaboration with FAO in seeking to assure stakeholder involvement in the e-conference this organization is carrying out on the role of biotechnology for food and agriculture. c) Most Regional/Sub-regional Fora have engaged in the organization of biosafety workshops, or are disseminating information on “best practice” in this field. d) An increasingly active interaction among stakeholders is taking place in exploring new forms of research cooperation in various areas of biotechnology. (see column on emerging proposals)</td>
<td>1. <strong>Objectives:</strong> a) Create public awareness on biotechnology policy issues. b) Develop a shared vision of the role of biotechnology in developing countries. c) Disseminate “best practice” &amp; approaches in biosafety. d) Facilitate global &amp; regional partnerships in biotechnology seeking to assure participation of NARS in them. 2. <strong>Niches identified:</strong> a) Provide a forum for debate and dialogue on strategic issues on biotechnology. b) Facilitate regional/global research partnerships in biotechnology. 3. <strong>Tools or mechanisms:</strong> a) Some RF/SRF have prepared policy papers to facilitate debate on strategic issues. b) Use of internet and e-conferences for global or regional electronic fora on this topic (FAO e-conference). c) EGFAR is used as a platform for communication and for dialogue. d) “Global R&amp;D Framework Programmes” in key research areas. 4. <strong>Concrete partnerships:</strong> a) Coop. with FAO in regional dimension of e-conference on biotechnology. b) Groundwork laid for partnerships in last column.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Global activities:</strong> a) Collaboration with FAO in e-conference on biotechnology for food &amp; agriculture, seeking to strengthen regional dimension. b) Facilitate new modalities of cooperation between public and private sector in the context of “Global R&amp;D Framework Programmes”, with the interested stakeholders. Three cases emerging: b-1 – Global Initiative for the Application of Biotechnology to the Improvement of Livestock Productivity through the Control of Trypanosomosis. b-2 – A public-private common approach for trait discovery in rice. b-3 – A similar approach is starting to take shape in the cotton genome sequencing. c) Establishment of a Consortium for assessing the potential benefits and risks of GM crops. 2. <strong>Regional activities:</strong> a) Some RF/SRF are interested in promoting regional workshops on biotechnology policy issues, or on specific applications of biotechnology (i.e. AARINENA Workshop in Kuwait).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most active stakeholders have been:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) ARIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) IARCs (CGIAR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Facilitating agencies: FAO and World Bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THEME/TOPIC No. 3: Natural Resources Management and Agroecology (NRM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Lead Stakeholder:**                          | a) Intensive discussions and programming effort in the CGIAR NGO Committee.  
   b) Gradual emergence of a broader "NGO constituency" in GFAR.  
   c) Consultation Meetings and Workshops:  
       1 - October 1999 – Washington DC, USA  
       2 - December 1999 - Rambouillet, France  
       3 - January 2000 - Paris, France  
       4 - April 2000 – Manila, The Philippines  
   d) Intensive e-mail exchanges for follow-up discussion  
   e) Interaction with other stakeholders: IARCs, NARS, ARIs, and Farmers.  
   f) This is an area in which both the CGIAR and NARS are very active. These activities have laid the basis for the two strategic global programmes on roots and tubers and on SLM mentioned in last column. | 1. Objectives:  
   a) To strengthen research designed to promote local innovation in Agroecology/NRM through partnerships between farmers, NGOs, NARS and IARCs.  
   b) To provide a system of information specially designed to upscale, classify and manage information on experiences in NRM and agricultural development.  
   **2. Niches identified:**  
   a) Management of local innovations/knowledge management and participatory R&D.  
   b) Scaling up of local innovations.  
   c) ICT application in NRM and Agroecology.  
   **3. Tools or mechanisms:**  
   b) Three methodological mechanisms:  
       b-1) Promoting Local Innovations (PROLINNOVA).  
       b-2) Interdev.  
       b-3) PolicyNet.  
   **4. Concrete partnerships:**  
   a) A combination of NGOs, IARCs and NARS is developing the proposals for the partnerships that appear in the last column. | 1. Global activities:  
   a) A global programme for Promoting Local Innovations (PROLINNOVA) with an information system (InterDev) and a policy dimension (PolicyNet).  
   b) A global programme on Direct Sowing and Conservation Tillage (DMC).  
   c) A global programme for Roots and Tuber Research (led by CIP).  
   d) A global programme of Research on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) (led by CIAT and IBSRAM).  
   e) Global programmes on Water resources and management, desertification and IPM (under discussion).  
   **2. Regional activities – Proposals for Scaling-up:**  
   a) Promoting Innovative Partnerships for the Scaling-Up of Successful NGO-led Agro-ecological Initiatives in Latin America.  
   b) Strengthening Ecological Agriculture for Students and Teachers in Asia.  
   c) Linking Farmer Movements for Sustainable Agriculture.  
   d) Scaling-Up and Scaling Further Up: ASPTA Family-Farmer Agroecology Program in Central-Southern Paraná, Brazil.  
   **3. Other emerging proposals:**  
   a) A series of other partnership proposals are emerging as single projects & particular regions (i.e. Eritrea, the Andean countries, Mashreq region, Philippines, CAC region, etc.). |
| **2. Core Stakeholders:**                          | a) NGOs (ASPTA-Brazil, ILEA/ETC, GRET, IIRR, PELUM-Zimbabwe, CEDAC-Cambodia, CIED-Peru)  
   b) IARCs (CIMMYT, CIAT, CIP)  
   c) NARS (Brazil, Mexico, Philippines)  
   d) ARIs (CIRAD) |  |  |
### Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholders:</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) IARCs and ARIs: IPGRI (through INIBAP) and CIRAD, with the support of GFAR have constituted a coordination unit to identify/promote initiatives.</td>
<td>a) A conceptual paper prepared by IPGRI, discussed and endorsed by the GFAR Steering Committee. b) Participation of members of the coordination unit to meetings of some commodity boards/scientific conferences developing close interaction with private sector. c) Request to RF/SRF on their priorities, and on how to integrate NARS into this process. d) Contact made with the CFC.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Objectives:</strong> a) Promote CC (“filière”) approach to facilitate agroindustrial development pattern with strong rural participation b) Facilitate links between ARD and agro-industrial production and markets, through integration of post-harvest &amp; marketing. c) Facilitate development that generates income &amp; employment for rural poor. d) Promote public/private partnerships.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Global activities:</strong> a) PROCOCOs: A global research programme for coconuts with a CC approach. b) A Sugar Cane global research programme. c) The Cassava Global Strategy. d) Other proposals are being discussed among partners but no clear proposals yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Niches identified:</strong> a) Non-CGIAR mandated crops. b) Develop links between ARD and commodity groups and associations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other ARIs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Tools or mechanisms:</strong> a) IPGRI/CIRAD Coordination Unit. b) Concept of “Global Programmes”. c) Exploring new sources of funding and public/private joint ventures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Concrete partnerships:</strong> a) Groundwork has been laid for emerging partnerships that appear in last column. b) At global level, most interesting step has been signature of agreement between IPGRI/COGENT and BUROTROP for PROCOCOs CC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) FAO and IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Different actors in commodity chains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders

1. **Lead Stakeholders:**
   - a) Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS) since this is an area of high priority to them.
   - b) ICUC – International Centre for Underutilized Crops.
   - c) IARCs and ARIs: IPGRI/CIRAD Coordination Unit.

2. **Core Stakeholders:**
   - a) NARS
   - b) Other ARIs
   - c) Other IARCs
   - d) Private sector
   - e) FAO and IFAD
   - f) Global scientific networks such as BAMNET

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) A conceptual paper prepared by IPGRI, discussed and endorsed by the GFAR Steering Committee. | 1. **Objectives:**

- a) Increase the sustainable utilization of the genetic resources of developing countries.
- b) Promote CC (“filière”) approach to facilitate value-added and agro-industrial development of local underutilized crops with market potential.
- c) Facilitate development of rural SMEs that can generate income and employment for rural poor.
- d) Integrate peasant economies into the national and international markets.

| b) Request to RF/SRF on their priorities and ongoing regional programs. |
| c) Several Regional/Sub-regional Fora are developing regional programs or networks on underutilized crops with a CC approach. |
| d) Several workshops have taken place on this topic. |
| e) Three types of studies/approaches have looked at this field: |

1. Analysis of utilization of genetic resources. IPGRI has led this approach.
2. Programs aimed at development of rural small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), and development of entrepreneurial capacities in rural sector.
3. National programs of R&D on a given crop or commodity that feel the need to develop post-harvest & market projection.
| f) Interaction with fisheries and forestry is also opening new possibilities. |
| g) The Rural Development Programmes in many NARS are increasingly interested in these opportunities as ways of generating value-added and employment in the rural sector in developing countries. |
| 1. Global activities:

- a) A Global Plan of Action will be prepared by the Task Force previously mentioned, aiming at increasing the utilization of these crops/commodities through regional and sub-regional networks.
- b) The Network of Agro-industrial Development of Peasant Economies (RESECA) is emerging from interaction between NARS from LAC region and European ARIs.
- c) A regional network on Fruit Production, Post-harvest and Marketing System in the Caribbean Islands is being established.
- d) Improving food security and safety through value-added indigenous food processing in Africa.
- e) Development of an agro-ecological research network for organic vegetable production and marketing in the LAC region. N.B.: Most of these initiatives are either regional or sub-regional. They could interact with similar initiatives in other regions to form a “loose global network”, such as may be the case of tropical fruits, which is of interest to various regions. |

### Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date

1. **Niches identified:**

- a) Non-CGIAR mandated crops.
- b) Develop links between ARD and rural development programmes based on development of rural SMEs.

2. **Tools or mechanisms:**

- b) Concept of “Global and Regional Programmes on CC-UC”.
- c) Exploring new sources of funding and public/private joint ventures.

3. **Concrete partnerships:**

- a) Groundwork has been laid for emerging partnerships that appear in last column.
- b) At global level, the most interesting step has been the establishment of the Task Force mentioned above and the announcement of support for the Groundnut Network.

### Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003

1. Global activities:

- a) A Global Plan of Action will be prepared by the Task Force previously mentioned, aiming at increasing the utilization of these crops/commodities through regional and sub-regional networks.

### Global activities:

- a) A Global Plan of Action will be prepared by the Task Force previously mentioned, aiming at increasing the utilization of these crops/commodities through regional and sub-regional networks.

### Regional activities:

- a) BAMNET, the International Bambara Groundnut Network, will be strengthened, linking it to research programmes in SSA in order to increase stakeholders’ involvement.

### Regional activities:

- a) BAMNET, the International Bambara Groundnut Network, will be strengthened, linking it to research programmes in SSA in order to increase stakeholders’ involvement.

### Concrete partnerships:

- a) Groundwork has been laid for emerging partnerships that appear in last column.
- b) At global level, the most interesting step has been the establishment of the Task Force mentioned above and the announcement of support for the Groundnut Network.
### THEME/TOPIC No. 5: Policy Management and Institutional Development (PMID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. POLICY MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS) since this is an area of high priority to them.</td>
<td>a) All Regional/Sub-regional Fora have identified the importance of the policy dimension in terms of effective development impact of ARD. This has been reflected by the establishment of regional networks in ASARECA, WECARD/CORAF and FORAGRO, where this has been identified of very high priority.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>1. <strong>Global activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Two IARCs: IFPRI and ISNAR.</td>
<td>b) Several studies and workshops have shown the importance of policy issues for addressing the issue of rural poverty and sustainable development (i.e. CIAT Poverty Workshop in September 1999).</td>
<td>a) Strengthening NARS Capacity in policy analysis and development.</td>
<td>a) Agricultural policies, rural poverty and competitiveness: Re-thinking agricultural policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) A conceptual paper prepared for GFAR-2000 identifying issues and opportunities.</td>
<td>b) Facilitate participation of stakeholders in policy debates in their countries positioning ARD in it.</td>
<td>b) Creation of a research partnership between FOs like the European Farmers Coordination, Via Campesina and researchers in agricultural economy and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Niches identified:</strong></td>
<td>2. <strong>Regional activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Reposition debate on agricultural policies in developing countries.</td>
<td>a) Improved participation of Farmers’ Organizations in the development policy dialogue in West Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Farmers’ Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Capacity-building on policy management in priority areas (i.e. GRFA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Regional/Sub-regional Fora (NARS) since this has to do with modernization of NARS.</td>
<td>a) NARS are confronting a challenge in terms of reforms to modernize them and make them more effective.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>1. <strong>Global activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Two IARCs: IFPRI and ISNAR.</td>
<td>b) Need to integrate new actors of ARD in an institutional diversified env.</td>
<td>a) Facilitate exchange of experiences on NARS integration &amp; reform.</td>
<td>a) Development of closer links between research and extension services in NARS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) New challenges confront research management and organization.</td>
<td>b) Contribute to development of new forms of ARD cooperation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Core Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Niches identified:</strong></td>
<td>2. <strong>Regional activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NARS</td>
<td>d) Discussion with NARS leaders to establish the NARS Forum in EGFAR in order to exchange experiences and “best practice” information.</td>
<td>a) Exchange of experiences among NARS on strategic issues for NARS.</td>
<td>a) Organization and management of technological integration in agriculture and agro-industry in the Southern Cone (PROCISUR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) IARCs</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Options for ARD cooperation.</td>
<td>b) Building capacities for the strategic management of institutional change in agricultural science and technology organizations in Latin America (modernization of NARIs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Farmers’ Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Mexico Produce Foundations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**THEME/TOPIC No. 6: Improving Information and Knowledge Flows among Stakeholders (ICT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Lead Stakeholders:**  
There is a different lead-Stakeholder for each of the four levels that were identified in Rome Consult Meeting:  
1 – Local Level (Knowledge Management for Local Innovations): NGOs.  
2 – National Level (articulation of NAIS): NARS  
3 – Regional Level (establishment of RAIS): RF/SRF  
4 – Global Level (establishment and management of Global Databases): CGIAR, FAO, ARIs (global networks). | a) GFAR Steering Committee convened the Rome Consultation Meeting on how to enhance global cooperation in ARD information (co-sponsored by FAO & World Bank).  
b) Consultants have been used to work with stakeholders to:  
1 – Develop a Conceptual Framework for the RAIS  
2 – Formulate first draft of Regional Information Strategies (WECARD/CORAF, FORAGRO-INFOTEC, AARINENA).  
c) Regional Workshops to identify information needs and to validate Regional Information Strategy  
d) Electronic fora to discuss information needs among end-users (FORAGRO and APAARI).  
e) In GFAR-2000 interaction among the RAIS was initiated.  
f) Use of Internet to establish EGFAR as a decentralized system of stakeholder-led websites for:  
1 - Communication among Stkhs.  
2 - Gateway function.  
3 - Knowledge marketplace and specialized fora (i.e. NARS Forum). | 1. **Objectives:**  
a) Facilitate info & knowledge flows among Stakeholders  
b) Strengthen capacity of NARS & of RF/SRF to use ICT (avoid tech. gap)  
c) Address the issue of information glut through Gateway function of EGFAR  
d) Move from model of large global centralized DB to decentralized DBs.  
e) Increase use of Internet as a tool for dialogue and for development of learning processes among stakeholders through EGFAR.  
2. **Niches identified:** Different Types of Information Management Activities at:  
a) Local Level  
b) National Level  
c) Regional Level  
d) Global Level  
3. **Tools or mechanisms:**  
a) Information Strategies  
b) DB development and Information Systems linking them.  
c) EGFAR: The basis have been laid for  
1 – Communications Platform  
2 – Gateway Function  
3 – NARS Forum  
4. **Concrete partnerships / mechanisms:**  
a) Partnership among NARS to establish the RAIS.  
b) Information Partnership among the RAIS. | 1. **Global activities:**  
a) Fully develop EGFAR (see its three components).  
b) Strengthen the ownership of EGFAR by stakeholders.  
c) Strengthen interaction with other global actors (i.e. FAO/ WAICENT, CGIAR, etc.).  
2. **Regional activities:**  
Advance process of establishment/strengthening of RAIS:  
a) FARA-RAIS  
b) AARINENA-RAIS  
c) FORAGRO-INFOTEC  
d) APAARI-RAIS  
e) Strengthen RAIS in the North to facilitate access to info resources there (EIARD/InfoSys)  
3. **National activities:**  
Identification of “Best Practice” and of successful cases of NAIS in order to disseminate these experiences.  
4. **Local activities:**  
Development of an approach to Knowledge Management of local innovations in NRM: the InterDev Project. |
**THEME/TOPIC No. 7: Strengthening NARS and Regional/Sub-regional Fora (RF/SRF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Stakeholder(s) and Core Group of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Types of Interaction and Activities that have taken place</th>
<th>Objectives and Main Steps/Products to date</th>
<th>Emerging Proposals for MTP 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Lead Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) The four Regional Fora, and their respective Sub-regional Fora, are the key actors in this process (AARINENA, APAARI, FARAF & FORAGRO), and more recently CAC Regional Forum. | a) Although historical evolution varies, some of the RF/SRF have been under development for the last ten years. Two models predominate: 1 – Strong SRF and a RF that provides a framework for action at regional level. 2 – Strong RF with little development of the SRF. | 1. **Objectives:**  
  a) Strengthen RF/SRF in their capacity to perform the various functions assigned to them.  
  b) Facilitate inter-regional exchange of information & collaboration among RF/SRF.  
  c) Facilitate exchange of experiences in NARS integration and in NARS reform to increase their effectiveness.  
  d) Support the participation of NARS and of RF/SRF in setting the global research agenda.  
  | 1. **Global activities:**  
  a) Facilitate participation in further developing the emerging *Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues* (linking the national-regional-global)  
  b) Facilitate activities aimed at assuring sustainability of RF/SRF. Action with donors and with regional development banks.  
  c) Facilitate exchange of experiences on how to implement Regional Strategies.  
  d) Facilitate exchange of experiences on how to evolve towards “regional integration” in agricultural research (ARD) which is more than “regional networks”. Experiences such as those underway in PROCISUR and PROCIANDINO in LAC should be carefully followed and assessed for lessons to learn.  
  | b) Through the RF/SRF, specific NARS play a key role in this process. | b) The *NARS-SC* has been established in 1996 as part of GFAR process.  
  c) A diagnosis has been made of strengths and weaknesses that led to a proposal for the strengthening of RF/SRF on the basis of this report.  
  d) RF/SRF have developed *Regional Strategies* for strengthening of ARD and hold periodic meetings. NARS/GFAR Secretariat participates.  
  e) To initiate inter-regional exchange & coop., cross-participation in the RF/SRF meetings is starting.  
  f) Launching of the *NARS Forum in EGAFAR* to facilitate exchange of experiences among NARS.  
  g) Given importance of access to information, establishments of RAIS becomes an important RF/SRF activity.  
  h) Increasing contribution to the formulation of *A Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues* (see Table 1). | 2. **Niches identified:**  
  a) Interaction between the national, the regional and the global levels in discussing the *Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues* (see Table 1).  
  GFAR Secretariat has an important role in linking these three levels.  
  b) Information & Communication.  
  c) GRM policy.  
  | 3. **Tools or mechanisms:**  
  a) EGFAR and RAIS.  
  b) Discussion fora and reports.  
  4. **Concrete partnerships:**  
  a) SSA/SRF for FARAF Info. Strategy.  
  b) Two inter-regional partnerships:  
  1 – EFARD / AARINENA  
  2 – EFARD / FARAF |  |  |
| **2. Core Stakeholders:**                        |                                                       |                                          |                                      |
| a) In this case there is no difference between lead and core stakeholders. They are all direct actors. | a) Although historical evolution varies, some of the RF/SRF have been under development for the last ten years. Two models predominate: 1 – Strong SRF and a RF that provides a framework for action at regional level. 2 – Strong RF with little development of the SRF. |  |  
| b) The Regional Forum concept has been adopted by the European ARD community (EFARD/EIARD/EC). | b) The *NARS-SC* has been established in 1996 as part of GFAR process.  
  c) A diagnosis has been made of strengths and weaknesses that led to a proposal for the strengthening of RF/SRF on the basis of this report.  
  d) RF/SRF have developed *Regional Strategies* for strengthening of ARD and hold periodic meetings. NARS/GFAR Secretariat participates.  
  e) To initiate inter-regional exchange & coop., cross-participation in the RF/SRF meetings is starting.  
  f) Launching of the *NARS Forum in EGAFAR* to facilitate exchange of experiences among NARS.  
  g) Given importance of access to information, establishments of RAIS becomes an important RF/SRF activity.  
  h) Increasing contribution to the formulation of *A Global Agenda on Strategic ARD Issues* (see Table 1). | | |
| c) All other stakeholders in the global system have a stake of having strong NARS and RF/SRF and can thus collaborate in this process (IARCs, ARIs). | c) All other stakeholders in the global system have a stake of having strong NARS and RF/SRF and can thus collaborate in this process (IARCs, ARIs).  
  d) Two organizations have a special role in supporting this process: ISNAR and FAO/SDR. | |  |
| d) Two organizations have a special role in supporting this process: ISNAR and FAO/SDR. | d) Two organizations have a special role in supporting this process: ISNAR and FAO/SDR. | | |
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ANNEX 8
Case Study of AARINENA Regional Forum
The Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa (AARINENA)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---
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traveled to Beirut to meet AARINENA’s newly elected Chairman and its Executive Secretary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

List of persons met:

Dr. Ibrahim Hamdan          Senior Officer, Regional Office for the Near East, Cairo
Dr. Ahmed Rafea             Computer Science Department, AUC, Cairo
Dr. Cristo Hilan            Director, IRA/FNAR Laboratory, MOA, Beirut
Dr. Mahmoud Solh             Deputy Director-General, ICARDA, Aleppo
Dr. Miltiades Hadjipanayiotou Former Executive Secretary, AARINENA, Nicosia
Dr. Ismael Muharam          Deputy Director General, AREA, Cairo
Dr. Mustafa Yaghi            President du Conseil LARI and Chairman, AARINENA, Beirut
ANNEX 9

Case Study of WECARD/CORAF

Background

1. In the course of the Panel Review of GFAR, one of the team visited Dakar from 16-19 July 2000 to attend the WECARD (West and Central Africa Research for Development Forum)/CORAF - hereinafter just referred to as WECARD - annual plenary meeting. The purpose was to obtain views on GFAR from participants who had/had not been to the first plenary meeting of GFAR (the Global Forum on Agricultural Research) held in Dresden in May 2000, and also to see how the GFAR process was developing and what support it was receiving and/or anticipated from the GFAR Secretariat. The team member concerned had worked extensively in West Africa between 1980 and 2000: as a World Bank staff member in the 8Os, and as an IFAD Caisse Centrale or PTF Nigeria consultant in the 90s, (including attendance at a CORAF - when still just a francophone institution-annual meeting in Burkina Faso in 1993). He had also been involved in strengthening the NARS fora and helping to set up both FARA and GFAR itself, during the period 1994-6, again on behalf of IFAD.

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

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

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

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

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

The Work Programme of WECARD

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

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

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

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

The Sub-regional Research Fund

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

Assistance from the GFAR Secretariat

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

Conclusions

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ASIA - PACIFIC</th>
<th>CENTRAL ASIA &amp; CAUCASUS</th>
<th>LATIN AMERICA &amp; CARRIBEAN</th>
<th>SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA</th>
<th>WEST ASIA &amp; NORTH AFRICA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Vision &amp; Strategic Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strengthening RF/SRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Exchange among RF/SRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Strengthening constituencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promoting Research Partnerships:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 GRM and Biotechnology</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 NRM &amp; Agroecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Commodity Chains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Policy Management &amp; Inst. Development</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information &amp; Knowledge Exchange</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GFAR-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                         | **56,000**      | **17,700**               | **68,000**              | **94,100**          | **43,000**                  | **278,800** |
## Table 1 - Contributions Received from Donors by GFAR 1998-2000

(as of September 30, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy/IFAD</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-CTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR*</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIAR/CTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. N-KIND CONTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIDA + IDRC**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO ***</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD **</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands **</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank ***</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany - GFAR2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other GFAR-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Contributions made up to July 31, 2000

* Contributions and pledges received after August 1, 2000

** Contributions to the First GFAR External Review (IFAD, IDRC and CIDA).

*** Estimates covering mainly office space, equipment and communication. To be confirmed with each organization.

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

- National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) and their Fora
  Rogers Jones, NARCC, Sierra Leone – WECARD/CORAF
  Adama Traore, Chair, WECARD/CORAF, Mali
  Ndiaga Mbaye, WECARD/CORAF, Senegal
  Marcel Nwalozie, WECARD/CORAF
  Dady Demby, WECARD/CORAF
  Moise Houssou, WECARD/CORAF
  Ahmadou Ndiaye, WECARD/CORAF
  J. Detongnon, INRAB, Benin
  Paco Sereme, INERA, Burkina Faso
  Koffi Sie, CHRA, Ivory Coast
  E. Owusu-Benoah, CSIR, Ghana
  Olatunde Oloko, Min. of Ag. Sciences, Nigeria
  Umaru Alkaleiri, Min.of Ag., Nigeria
  Raj Paroda, ICAR, India, and Chair, GFAR
  Ali Mehdi, DCCP, AARINENA
  Miltiades Hadjipanayiotou, Former Exec. Sec., AARINENA, Cyprus
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ANNEX 14
LIST OF CASES OF SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS AND PROPOSALS FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS PRESENTED AT GFAR-2000

THEME 1: GRM and Biotechnology
1. Development and Use of Hybrid Rice technology in India
2. PRECODEPA: Avances, Logros Y Perspectivas del Programa Regional Cooperativo de Papa (Potato Regional Program)
3. CERAAS: The Regional Centre for the Improvement of Plant Adaptation to Drought
4. Development of Wheat Cultivars for Durable Resistance to Leaf and Stem Rusts in the Nile Valley and Red Sea Region

THEME 2: NRM and Agro-ecology
5. The Rice-Wheat Consortium in the Indo-Gangetic Plains: An Ecoregional Partnership in South Asia
6. The Latin American Consortium on Agro-ecology and Development (CLADES): A Successful NGO-led Partnership to promote Agro-ecological Research, Training and Information Exchange in Latin America
7. The Consortium for a Sustainable Use of Inland Valley Agro-Ecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa
8. Development of Integrated Crop/Livestock Production Systems in the Low Rainfall Areas of the Mashreq/Maghreb Region
9. European Tropical Forest Research Network

THEME 3: International cooperation on commodity chains
10. ICLARM & ACIAR: IARC-Donor Partners for Progress in Aquaculture in the Pacific Islands
11. Innovative Research Partnerships in the development of Hot Pepper Marketing in the Caribbean
12. BUROTROP: A Global Network for the Development of Research on Tropical Perennial Oil Crops
13. PROMUSA: A Global Program for Musa Improvement

THEME 4: Policy Management & Institutions Development
15. Regional Fund for Agricultural Technology (FONTAGRO) in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)
16. The 2020 Vision Networks for East Africa and West Africa
17. European Research Cooperation for Development: The INCO-DEV Programme
**Proposals for Innovative Research Partnerships Presented in GFAR-2000**

**THEME 1: GRM and Biotechnology**

1. Development of a GRM research and policy management capacity in developing countries
2. Public awareness building regional workshops
3. Techniques and Approaches for Conservation and Utilisation of Taro Genetic Resources in the Pacific
4. PROTA: Synthesis and wide distribution of information on the estimated 7,000 useful plants of Tropical Africa
5. Microbial Biodiversity as a Resource in Developing Countries
6. Establishment and Operation of a Multi-Site International Coconut Genebank (ICG) to Accelerate Genetic Diversity Conservation, Evaluation, Safe Exchange and Development of Improved Coconut Varieties
7. Establishment and Operation of a Multi-site Global Mushroom Germplasm Bank for Collection, Characterisation, Conservation and Utilisation of Biodiversity
8. Insect Resistant Maize for Africa (IRMA) Project
9. Trait Discovery in Rice: A Role for the Public Sector:
10. A Global Initiative to Exploit Biotechnology and Animal Genetic Resources for the Improvement of Livestock Productivity through Control of Trypanosomiasis
11. Developing a Common Vision for the Role of Biotechnology in Food and Agriculture
12. Creation of a Biocollecting Society

**THEME 2: NRM and Agro-ecology**

1. Proposal for an Accelerated Global Programme of Research on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the CGIAR
2. Presenting an Innovative Overall Concept: SLM – Sustainable Land Management Project, Eritrea
3. Global Programme for Roots and Tubers Research
4. BIODESA – Biodiversity and Agro-Industrial development in Latin America.
5. Valorisation of the Biodiversity resources in tropical Chaparé and Andean Cordillera, Cochabamba, Bolivia
6. Launching of a Global Initiative on NRM Focussed on No-Tillage, Direct Sowing and Mulch-Based Agriculture Innovative Technologies
7. Global Programme on Knowledge Management in Agroecology (InterDev)
8. Promoting Innovative Partnerships for the Scaling-Up of Successful NGO-led Agro-ecological Initiatives in Latin America
9. Strengthening Ecological Agriculture for Students and Teachers in Asia
10. Linking Farmer Movements for Sustainable Agriculture
11. Scaling-Up, And Scaling Further Up: An Evaluation And Proposals for a 10-Fold Expansion of ASPTA's Family-Farmer Agroecology Program in Central-Southern Paraná, Brazil
13. Inter-Cropping of Cereals and Shrub Legumes on African Smallholder Farms to enhance Productivity, Animal Nutrition and Soil Fertility under Semi-arid Conditions
14. ERICA – Eco Regional Initiative For A Change In Agriculture: Researchers and Farmers for a Sustainable Improvement of Production Systems in Benin and Neighbouring Countries
15. Philippines-Netherlands Biodiversity Research Programme For Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mount Malindang
16. CAC smallholder livestock production
17. Integrated Feed/Livestock Production Systems Using Non-Conventional Feed Resources in the Al-Mashreq Region
18. Health in Ecological Agriculture Learning
THEME 3: International cooperation on commodity chains

2. Development of an Agro-ecological Research Network for Organic Vegetable Production and Marketing
3. Development and Application of Appropriate Fruit Production, Post-harvest and Marketing System for Low Resource Farmers in the Islands of Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines
4. CORNET – Coffee Research Network in Eastern Africa (ASARECA)
5. Improvement of Food Security and Safety through value-added Indigenous Food Processing in Africa
6. Regional Network on Research and Technology Development of Date Palm in AARINENA Region
7. PROCOCOs – Creation of a Global Research Programme for Coconut
8. Identification and Commercialisation of Under-Utilised Plant Species of National, Regional and International Importance Within An International Network on Under-utilised Crops
9. Global Cassava Strategy

THEME 4: Policy Management & Institutions Development

2. Transfer of Knowledge and Experience about Scaling Up of People-managed Micro-credit: An Action Research
3. Organisation and Management of Technological Integration in Agriculture and Agro-Industry in the Southern Cone
4. Building Capacities for the Strategic Management of Institutional Change in Agricultural Science and Technology Organisations in Latin America
5. Mexico Case Produce Foundations
6. Improved Participation of Farmers Organisations in the Development Policy Dialogue in West Africa
7. NATURA Phd Programme
8. Linking-Up Farmers’ Organisations to Agricultural Research
9. Creation of a Research Partnership between Farmers Organisations like the European Farmers Coordination, Via Campesina and Researchers in Agricultural Economy and Policies