16TH GFAR STEERING COMMITTEE
MARRAKECH, MOROCCO
DECEMBER 3, & 4 2005
MINUTES OF THE MEETING

OPEN SESSION

1. WELCOME ADDRESS

The chair, Mohammad Roozitalab welcomed all participants to the meeting and specifically recognized the following persons attending the meeting for the first time. The new chair of APAARI, Professor Gunasena, the new chair of CACAARI, Prof. A. Khanazarov, and Mr Ron Bennet sitting in for Jack Wilkinson, President of IFAP. He then quickly highlighted a number of activities recently carried out or in progress, including: GPP evaluation; preparation for a GFAR review and for GFAR 2006; interaction with the CGIAR; three Management Team meetings; and consultation for the nomination and selection of a new GFAR chair. He indicated that the Management Team had met three times since the previous Steering Committee held in Uganda in June 2005, closely interacting with the Secretariat, and expressed appreciation for the work the Secretariat is doing including the organization of the series of meetings in Marrakech.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 15TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING, AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Minutes were approved after the acceptance of an amendment proposed by Christian Hoste, representative of EFARD to indicate in the minutes that the revised GFAR Charter was approved by the Steering Committee during its June meeting held in Entebbe, Uganda.

ACTION ITEM:
The secretariat to insert approved amendment into the minutes of the 15th SC meeting held in Entebbe, Uganda
The agenda was then reviewed and adopted after a slight timing change to accommodate a short interaction session with the CGIAR chair and the CGIAR Systems Office Director.

3. **REPORT ON GFAR ACTIVITIES IN 2005**
Rupert Best, a Senior Programme Officer in the Secretariat presented a report on activities carried out during the year. Some of the outputs he highlighted under each of the pillars of the Business Plan are summarised below:

3.1. **Inclusiveness and inter-regional collaboration**
- Associate membership status for farmers’ organizations on the AARINENA Executive Committee.
- Full membership status for farmers organizations on the FORAGRO Executive Committee.
- FARA multi stakeholder consultation for a stronger more inclusive regional Forum agenda.
- Enhanced inter-regional exchange of information through stakeholder participation in EFARD, FORAGRO and FARA General Conferences.
- Research priorities updated in the South East Asia and Pacific Regions.

3.2. **Collaborative Research Partnerships**
- Support provided to ongoing GPPs (PROLINNOVA, Under Utilised Species, and Conservation Agriculture).
- Significant advances in the development of the pipelined GPPs (Global Post Harvest Initiative, and Information Communication Management for Agricultural Research for Development).
- Progress on the development of a new initiative monitored (Non Timber Forest Products).
- Twelve projects approved for funding under the DURAS Competitive Grants Scheme.
- Improved information sharing among GFAR facilitated initiatives through EGFAR.

3.3. **Advocacy, Public Awareness and Strategic Thinking**
- A global consultation on the Role of Biodiversity in Achieving the UN Millennium Development Goal of freedom from hunger and poverty was carried out by the Global Facilitating Unit in collaboration with IPGRI and the M.S. Swaminathan Foundation in Chennai, India. The outputs of the consultation which included a ten-point action plan were fed into the UN review of progress made towards achieving the MDGs in September 2005.
- Continued interaction with the Generation Challenge Programme through the Stakeholder Committee.
- Organization of a planning workshop in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Science Council on high value agricultural products, to provide inputs into the development and implementation of the new CGIAR priority research area on high value commodities.

3.4. **Management Information System (MIS)**
- Implementation of some components of the ICM4ARD initiative in RF.
- Improved outreach through:
- updated and improved EGFAR
- publication of EGFAR newsletters
- publication of a new look annual report with a theme essay on partnership
- development of a communication strategy.

**Discussion**

Efforts made so far in improving integration of CSO into, and their participation in RF activities were commended, although it was realized that more efforts need to be made both by the RF and the Secretariat for further improvement. It was also pointed out that some activities carried out by RF in collaboration with the Secretariat were not included in the report. Some of the examples cited were: training of ICT managers from APAARI affiliated countries and a high level dialogue on biotechnology that included a Ministerial consultation carried out by APAARI in collaboration with the Secretariat. Efforts will therefore be made to include such activities in future reports of the Secretariat.

Some concern was raised by the Executive Secretary of APAARI, Raj Paroda that the DURAS project effectively cut off all but two countries from the APAARI region from actively participating in its competitive grant scheme and wondered why the funding agency should impose such a restriction, and if it would be possible to open it to full participation by other countries. Explanations were provided by both the DURAS project coordinator (Oliver Oliveros) and the EFARD representative (Christian Hoste) as to why participation in this component of the DURAS project was restricted to countries belonging to the Zone de Solidarité Prioritaire (ZSP). They noted however, that at all GFAR affiliated stakeholders participate in and benefit from other components of the project such as the development of ICM capacities through the ICM4ARD.

Another issue raised was on how weaker NARS are encouraged to participate in some of the on-going multi-stakeholder competitive research activities and whether the project monitoring and evaluation (PME) systems measure impact or outputs. The DURAS project was used to illustrate how weaker NARS are encouraged and helped to participate in multi-stakeholder activities through the provision of funding support to help in the development of full and competitive proposals, or through project related capacity building activities. With regards to whether the PME measure outputs or impact, it was suggested that this would depend on the individual projects and the duration of their implementation.

Finally a suggestion was made that given the important role the private sector could play, it should continue to be fully engaged in future activities related to the high value product initiative.

**4. Plan of Work for 2006**

In his introductory remarks for the presentation of the plan of work for 2006, the Executive Secretary (Ola Smith) indicated that the year 2006 will constitute an important landmark in the short history of GFAR. Firstly, because it will be the year of the tenth anniversary of the founding of GFAR, secondly because in 2006, GFAR will hold its third general conference when stakeholders get together to reflect on the past and plan for the future, and finally because it is the final year of the current triennial business plan cycle (2004-2006). It should therefore be a year when for reflecting on our past efforts and achievements, and sharing the outcome with others. Hence the idea of focusing on the theme of managing and sharing information, and devoting a substantial part of available resources and energies to the Management Information Systems (MIS) component of the business plan this year, without
neglecting on-going and promising activities. Salient points made with regards to planned activities under each of the business plan pillars were:

4.1. Support to Regional Forums to promote inclusiveness and foster inter-regional collaboration
- Continue through advocacy to improve stakeholder participation and representation in RF activities
- Update regional priorities in the CACAARI Region and foster the development of the regional forum

4.2. Collaborative research Partnerships
- GPP evaluation completed and guidelines for the development, implementation monitoring and evaluation of GPPs developed
- GPhI: Develop 1-2 inter-regional projects on this topic through an inter-regional planning workshop
- Support efforts of the GFU for UUS to find funding for new ideas
- PROLINNOVA: Support an international workshop to develop an operational plan for the period 2006-2007
- Conservation Agriculture: Support activities designed to establish a Global Facilitating Unit for Conservation Agriculture in collaboration with other partners
- Monitoring of the DURAS funded projects with the participation of the Scientific and Partnership Committee

4.3. Advocacy, public awareness and strategic thinking
- Stronger functional linkages with other institutions established. Focus will be on raising the profile of GFAR within FAO through the implementation of a GFAR day at FAO.
- Continued facilitation of the activities of the Stakeholder Committee of the Generation Challenge Programme.

4.4. Management Information System
- Enhanced access and expanded reach of GFAR through the development and use of a new communication strategy
- Maintenance and further development of a functional, user-friendlier and versatile EGFAR
- Implementation of several components of the ICM4ARD initiative

4.5. Management related activities
- Organization and servicing of GFAR statutory meetings
- GFAR Evaluation
- Resource mobilization

DISCUSSION
Some of the main issues raised and discussed after the presentation include the following:

A question was raised as to why GFAR is not involved in the ongoing International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology Development (IAASTD). The Executive Secretary indicated that GFAR is involved at several levels. Firstly the Secretariat participated
in the organization of the initial regional forum consultation that kicked off the assessment and helped to identify participants for those consultative meetings. Secondly regional forums are actively participating in the current regional consultations and workshops. Nevertheless, it was suggested that the Secretariat should endeavour to play a more active role and identify regional forum participants who can reflect GFAR perspectives in the exercise.

It was pointed out that although one of the priorities of GFAR is to strengthen regional forums, the budgetary allocation for the first pillar of supporting regional forums to foster inter-regional collaboration was reduced by about 50% compared to the previous year. The main reason for the reduction in the allocated budget to Pillar 1 was the rationale given for focusing on pillar 4 the MIS component this year. The funds allocated to RF for implementing the MIS component in 2005 was $100,000 compared to $360,000 this year. In addition, $100,000 was earmarked for inter-regional collaboration under the collaborative research partnership pillar. All of these activities contribute to strengthening RF which therefore still remains a priority.

While supporting the deserved emphasis on the ICM activities as well as the collaborative research partnerships components focussed on the global post harvest initiative, a number of members suggested that a third emerging priority which needs to be worked on was that of biotechnology. Apparently there are on-going activities on biotechnology in the different RF and the time might be ripe to initiate the development of a GPP or an inter-regional collaborative activity on biotechnology. It was suggested that the Programme Committee may want to examine how this idea could be implemented.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

i) The Secretariat should endeavour to play a more active role in the IAASTD initiative and identify GFAR representatives from regional forum participants who can reflect GFAR perspectives in the exercise.

ii) The Programme Committee and the Secretariat should examine how to go about developing a GPP on biotechnology

5. **INTERACTION WITH CGIAR CHAIR AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

The traditional interaction between the Steering Committee, the Chair of CGIAR and the Director of the CGIAR Systems Office took place during the Marrakech meeting. GFAR chair, Mohammad Roozitalab welcomed the two visitors, and rapidly highlighted a number of on-going GFAR activities some of which involve active participation of CG Centres such as a recent planning workshop on high value agricultural products jointly organized with the Science Council Secretariat. He also indicated that the SC will be selecting a new chair and vice-chair to replace the incumbents whose terms office will soon come an end. On the other hand, he mentioned some of the contributions GFAR is making to advance the work of the CGIAR. Pertinent examples were the participation of GFAR in the deliberations of the CGIAR Executive Council through his own contribution and that of a RF representative, as well as the effort recently made by GFAR to help identify a suitable candidate from Farmers’ Organizations to bring in CSO perspective to the deliberations of the CGIAR Executive Council. He concluded by expressing the hope that such fruitful collaboration will continue in the future.

Ian Johnson Chair of the CGIAR group expressed his happiness to continue this traditional informal exchange with the SC. He acknowledged the important contribution of GFAR to the
work of the CGIAR highlighting in particular the role the GFAR chair is playing within the CGIAR ExCo, and on which he has left his mark. He also acknowledged GFAR’s recent contribution to on-going efforts to reactivate CSO active participation within the CGIAR. He informed the SC that while AGM 2005 in Morocco will focus on the centrality of Science for the future of Agriculture, the theme in AGM 2006 will shift to civil society participation and involvement and that GFAR will be consulted and invited to play an active role in the implementation of the plan. He informed the SC that CGIAR funding is at a record high thanks to some initiatives taken to ensure that the CGIAR better serves both donors and recipients, and noted that the number of members from developing countries contributing to funding the system and serving as investors in research is on the increase, and concluded by thanking the SC for the opportunity for this interaction.

In his short intervention, Francisco Rafschneider Executive Director of the CGIAR Systems Office also acknowledged the contribution of GFAR representatives on the Executive Council, and congratulated GFAR for a visible and palpable growth both at its Secretariat and at the RF level. He acknowledged the contributions of the RF to the development of Medium Term Plans, and briefly enumerated a number of on-going joint activities with a particular mention of the development of a Youth Forum on Agricultural Research for Development, a Forum that will be holding its first meeting in Marrakech during AGM 2005. He concluded by indicating that the CG system is aware of the forthcoming GFAR 2006 Conference and plans to participate actively and provide some assistance for its organization, and that he looks forward to a continued good working relationship with GFAR.

**DISCUSSION**

In the short discussion that followed these presentations, committee members reiterated and reinforced the strong collaborative relationship between GFAR and the CGIAR with concrete examples of such relationship provided by the Executive Secretaries of APAARI (provision of support for RF secretariats of AARINENA and CACCARI by CG centres) and FARA (support for the development of the SSA CP, and national capacity development activities). Other issues raised before the visitors left were related to the importance of ensuring that in pursuing its agenda of excellence in Science, the system should ensure that Farmers’ organizations and NGOs are carried along, and that one prerequisite for this is to ensure that they are adequately capacitated so that they can contribute to the realization of the targeted goals.

**6. REPORT ON PROGRAMME COMMITTEE MEETING**

Following the approval of the reviewed Charter which among other things provided for the transformation of the NARS-sub Committee to a Programme Committee (PC), the Committee met for the first time, and an effort was made to develop an agenda that reflects to a certain extent this new role. This involved a presentation by all Regional Forums and other stakeholder groups on achievements during the current year and plans for the coming year where appropriate. Reports were also presented by all on-going GPPs and new initiatives being developed. The Executive Secretary of FARA, Monty Jones was given the task of presenting a summary of the outcome of the meeting to the SC.

In his presentation, Monty Jones reported that all of the stakeholder groups (except FORAGRO, IARCs and the DSG) including the coordinators of on-going GPPs and the proponents of pipelined initiatives made formal presentations on their activities in 2005 and those planned for 2006. The full text of the report is available on EGFAR, and highlights of the various presentations have been summarized in the PC meeting minutes. It should
however, be noted that the report recognized the improvement and richness of GFAR meetings and the important steps taken so far towards greater inclusiveness of all ARD stakeholders from research institutions to civil society organizations. It also highlighted one recommendation made to the SC concerning the NTFP initiative currently being developed, as follows: “The PC commended the consultation process employed for the development of this initiative and recommended that the SC should formally approve it as a GPP based on its meeting the criteria established for the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of GPPs for which guidelines are currently being developed by a GPP evaluation team”

**DISCUSSION**

Comments and discussion revolved around the need to improve the contribution of the PC and how it functions so that it would have the desirable impact on GFAR programmes and activities. Some salient points made were:

- While it is important to share information, the PC should focus more on a discussion of more fundamental programme issues, and should take sufficient time to discuss the programme of work and budget of GFAR in order to make appropriate recommendations to the SC.
- Reports from stakeholder groups should continue to be presented to the PC and not revert back to the SC. In this regard, the PC meeting should be scheduled to last for 2 days.
- In the future, reports from stakeholder groups should be less process oriented and more focused on concrete achievements, outputs and future plans.
- The SC should take a decision and give clear guidance on whether the annual budget prepared by the Secretariat should be discussed by the PC and recommendations made to the SC, or that it should remain an item for discussion and decision only by the SC.

The issue of financial support from the GFAR Secretariat to RF (especially their Secretariat) and to facilitating units of GPPs stimulated a discussion on the flow of financial support within the GFAR group. The CIDA representative (Anne Germain) suggested that the flow should be two-way from the secretariat to stakeholders and vice versa, with a clear evidence of stakeholder buy-in and support for the activities of the Secretariat which receives core-funding from some donors. She suggested that in the near future efforts should be made to quantify and indicate contribution of say RF to the Secretariat in order to demonstrate this mutual support. The view of the APAARI Executive Secretary (Raj Paroda) was that while it is acknowledged that CIDA contributions to the Secretariat has to a large measure contributed to the observed increase in GFAR activities, and that without such a generous contribution, GFAR may not be as strong a it is today, it should also be recognized that RF also need to be funded and that without strong RF, GFAR itself would not be strong. In order words, some solution has to be found to the issue of adequate support from donors to RF.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

i) Stakeholder groups to ensure that future reports to the PC are less process oriented and more focused on concrete achievements, outputs and future plans.

ii) SC to decide whether the annual budget prepared by the Secretariat should be presented to and examined by the PC or continue to be presented only to the SC.

iii) The Secretariat should make an effort to reflect contributions from stakeholders other than donors to the Secretariat in future financial reports and budgets.
7. **GPP Evaluation**

Rupert Best gave an account on the status of the GPP evaluation process which was approved by the Steering Committee in June 2005. He indicated that a member of the review team (Julian Gonsalves) was programmed to present the update but was unable to obtain a visa to Morocco and hence was unable to attend the meeting. Salient points in the report he presented which did not include an update form the review team were:

7.1. **Desired outcomes of the evaluation process would be:**

- A more robust GPP identification, design and implementation process
- Documentation of the lessons learned from the GPP process to date
- Concrete recommendations that feed into the overall GFAR Evaluation in 2006

7.2. **Planning Meeting held on 12-14 September 2005, in Rome with the review team:**

- More understanding of the origins and evolution of the GPP concept
- Further review of the key questions and development of additional subsidiary questions
- Planned the information gathering phase and subsequent analysis and reporting

7.3. **Future steps: Information Gathering**

- Questionnaires to be developed and interviews of key informants scheduled
- Field visits to Uganda, Cambodia and Nepal
- Information gathering and experience sharing workshop (25-27 January 2006, Rome)
- Final report to be ready by 28 February 2006

The committee took note of the progress made and agreed on the deadline of 28 February for the submission of the final report, which will then be considered during the June 2006 meeting of the SC.

GFAR Evaluation. The Steering Committee decided to move this agenda item to the closed session.

8. **GFAR 2006**

Ajit Maru from the GFAR Secretariat presented an update on on-going preparations for the GFAR 2006 Conference. The update included a brief description of activities that fall into three phases: before, during and after the conference.

8.1. **Post conference events**

These include the preparation and publication of web based and printed versions of the proceedings, briefing papers, and the GFAR Business Plan for 2007-2009, since one of the outputs of the conference is the formulation of a frame work and guidelines for the content of the business plan

8.2. **Conference events**

He presented a draft conference programme, which comprised the following elements:

- Pre-conference consultations mainly of CSO
- Opening ceremony
- Plenary sessions to discuss the theme
- Working group/workshops to address different aspects of the theme and sub-themes
- Side events
- A competitive poster display session
- Closing ceremony

8.3. Pre-conference events
A special emphasis was put on the on-going preparatory activities currently being implemented
- Contact and consultation with the host Government, the Government of India, to secure its commitment, set dates (November 9th to 11th) just after the APAARI General Assembly 5th-7th November to maintain the tradition of collaboration with RF. He confirmed that the Government of India gave its commitment to host the event and participate in its organization, including the provision of a monetary contribution of $11,000
- Publication of the first announcement of GFAR 2006 on EGFAR
- The constitution of a Conference Working Group (CWG) made up of representatives of various GFAR stakeholders to work with the secretariat on the formulation of the conference theme and sub-themes, and the development of a conference programme.
- He shared with the SC, a number of ideas the CWG was examining as potential conference theme, which are all based on the linkage between agriculture and the Millennium Development Goals including:
  - Investing in agricultural research: towards a practical plan to contribute to the attainment of the MDGs
  - Reorienting agricultural research to meet the MDGs
  - Optimising the contributions of agriculture to the attainment of the MDGs: the role of agricultural research
- He also presented a number of sub themes under discussion by the CWG, including:
  - Eradicating hunger and extreme poverty: ensuring community food security and linking farmers to markets
  - Developing institutional partnerships for agricultural innovation

He concluded the presentation with a draft budget based on the participation of about 400 persons of whom only about 100 will be sponsored by GFAR, and which came to about $430,000.

DISCUSSION
A lively discussion followed this presentation during which the various themes and sub themes were discussed and others suggested. Finally the SC settled for the theme of: Re-orienting agricultural research to meet the Millennium development Goals. It mandated the CWG to conclude its deliberations and select appropriate sub-themes and draft a conference programme. It also requested the CWG to regularly update the SC on the outputs of its deliberations.

ACTION ITEM:
- CWG to conclude its deliberations and select appropriate sub-themes and draft a conference programme.
- CWG to regularly update the SC on the outputs of its deliberations
CLOSED SESSION

The closed session of the SC meeting started at 08h30 on the 4th of December as scheduled. The chair welcomed participant and requested members to adopt the agenda which was adopted after the addition of two new items The second external review of GFAR which was moved from the open session by the SC, and the role and functions of the Management Team proposed to be discussed under the agenda item of Charter review: proposed Management Team amendments.

9. GFAR Evaluation
Rupert Best from the Secretariat made a brief presentation on activities carried out to date in preparation for the implementation of the review. These activities were: identifying and contacting potential reviewers, drafting the review Terms of Reference (TORS) which included a background, areas of focus of the review, a time table and a budget.

Discussion
Some of the issues raised during a discussion on the presentation were:

- The number of reviewers required. The TORS suggested 3 but the option of only 2 reviewers was put on the table and briefly discussed. Based on previous experience of members of the Steering Committee it was decided that the review team should consist of 3 persons to ensure adequate expertise to cover required areas of interest.
- The current TORS should be considered as a draft that could be refined even during the process of review.
- A question was raised with regards to the budget and how the final figures were arrived at. It was indicated that a detailed table was prepared showing a proposed fee of $450/day to be paid for actual working days, travel costs for the three reviewers to visit the Secretariat, all regional forums and other selected stakeholders.
- The SC wanted to know which of the potential reviewers had indicated availability and interest and if their CVs were available. Potential reviewers who had indicated interest were identified, but it was indicated that not all of the CVs had been received, so it was not appropriate to share only those received with the SC.
- With regards to the selection of the review team it was suggested that efforts should be made to ensure a broad range of complementary expertise, ensuring that expertise in delivery and extension systems was represented on the team. It was also suggested that the team should reflect a regional balance and representation, but it was clear that in a team of three, it would be difficult to ensure a regional balance. Nevertheless there should be expertise on the team with regards to knowledge of and familiarity with the mandate and role of GFAR, and the National Agricultural Research Systems.
- Final comments were on the focus of the review exercise. Some suggestions were made that governance issues should receive less emphasis; but that relationship with hosts agencies, the sustainability of current funding mechanisms, and future programmes and directions for GFAR should receive a high priority.

Finally it was suggested that the Steering Committee should not micromanage the activity but should mandate the Management Team to finalize the Terms of Reference and the selection of the review team. This suggestion was accepted by the SC which endorsed the TORS subject to minor modifications suggested and others that may be made by the Management Team,
which should communicate the final outcome to the SC for acceptance on a no objection basis.

**ACTION ITEM:**
Management Team to finalize the Terms of Reference for the GFAR review team select the review team, and report the outcome to SC for acceptance on a no objection basis

**10. FINANCIAL REPORT AND BUDGET FOR 2006**
The Executive Secretary presented the 2005 financial report followed by the 2006 budget. For the 2005 financial report he indicated that received and expected monetary contributions for the year came to just over two million dollars ($2,076,820) and that a total of $212,274 was carried over from 2004. He also highlighted in-kind contributions from CIRAD, CIAT and Canada. Total expenditure he reported for the year was $1,565,519, leaving a balance of $723,575 to be carried forward to 2006. The report also showed a strategic balance of $900,000.

With regards to the 2006 budget, he indicated that expected monetary contributions came to $1,425,000 about 40% of which ($830,000) is core fund, and which when added to the balance carried over from 2005, gave a total expected income of 2,148,575. In-kind contributions in the form of seconded personnel from CIAT and Canada would continue for most part of 2006. Projected expenditure he reported for 2006 came to $2,132,500, leaving a balance of 16,075 as operating expenses to be carried forward to 2007. In addition, the presentation showed a prospective project restricted funding of $1,000,000 which was nevertheless separated from operating resources, and which when received could allow the implementation of other activities not currently budgeted for.

There was little discussion on the financial report for 2005, apart from a comment made by the representative from EFARD, Christian Hoste, for the need to check the amount carried over from 2004 ($212,274), as the components ($149,324 and 12,950) did not add up to the total shown. Subsequent checking of the 2004 financial report and the interim 2005 report showed that the total carried forward was correct but identified a typographical error in one of the components ($149,324) which should read ($199,324). It was also suggested that received and expected contributions from Donors should in future be clearly indicated.

**DISCUSSION**
Discussion centred mainly on the budget for 2006. The DSG representatives from CIDA (Jimmy Smith and Anne Germain) reiterated continuing support to GFAR core fund, but indicated that a confirmation of the expected 2006 contribution from CIDA could not be made at this time, until after the forthcoming general elections in Canada. The issue of core funding as opposed to project restricted funding for the Secretariat was also brought up. Some concern was raised with regards to the limited number of donors who provided core funding to the Secretariat, and that if the situation was not rectified the Secretariat would soon be unable to follow up on the projects targeted by restricted funding. It was suggested that the DSG should discuss this issue and come up with some appropriate solution. It was also suggested that perhaps the time was ripe for support to the Secretariat to come not only from the DSG but also from other stakeholders of GFAR to ensure a vibrant Secretariat.

Another DSG representative from the European Commission (Robert Carreau) confirmed support to the Secretariat in 2006, but only to the tune of €60,000 instead of the €120,000
indicated by the Executive Secretary during his presentation, although he also confirmed that the outstanding €60,000 contribution for 2005 will be sent in 2006.

While acknowledging that the Secretariat had suggested that focus for 2006 should be on ICM related activities with less emphasis on activities that fell under the other pillars of the business plan, the APAARI and AARINENA Executive Secretaries pointed out that some of the activities for which they requested funding support from the Secretariat were not included in the budget. Commenting on the same issue, the Executive Secretary of FARA requested that it be put on record that the FARA complied with the suggestion from the Secretariat to focus on ICM related activities and had no problems with the budget as presented. Both APARI and AARINENA representatives, however, insisted they would want to see their other requests accommodated.

The representative from IARCS (Emil Frison) asked whether there was sufficient confidence that the Secretariat will receive the expected funds promised by the donors, and the Executive Secretary responded that on the basis of on-going discussion he was confident the promised funds would be provided.

A question was asked as to why IFAD, one of the facilitating and founding agencies of GFAR and a major supporter of GFAR in previous years was not listed as one of the donors with a pledged support to GFAR. Shantanu Mathur indicated that IFAD would be providing a multi-year project based support to the Secretariat, and is expecting a concept note to this effect from the Secretariat. This explains he pointed out, why the IFAD contribution was indicated under the prospective contributors list. He concluded that IFAD will continue to support GFAR which is involved in ARD described is a “sunrise industry” with increasing commitment for support.

In order to avoid an unnecessarily prolonged discussion on budgetary allocations to activities to be implemented by stakeholders in the future, the SC decided to set up a finance committee that will in future collaborate with the Secretariat to work on budget issues long before the SC needs to approve and take decisions on the budget. An Ad-Hoc committee of four persons was appointed and given the mandate to develop a framework and Terms of Reference for a Finance Committee. The Ad Hoc committee members are: Shantanu Mathur (Convener), Bryan Harvey, Emil Frison and Christian Hoste. It was decided that their report should be presented to the SC meeting of June 2006.

The 2005 financial report and the 2006 budget were then approved by the SC, with the suggestion that the Secretariat should examine the possibility of accommodating additional requests from RF should additional funds come in.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

i) DSG to discuss the issue of balancing core and restricted funding to the Secretariat and come up with a solution to an imminent funding problem

ii) The Ad-Hoc committee of (Shantanu Mathur (Convener), Bryan Harvey, Emil Frison and Christian Hoste) to develop a framework and Terms of Reference for a Finance Committee and submit a draft to the SC for approval by June 2006.

**11. SELECTION OF NEW CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

The chair briefly described the process that was put in place for the selection of a new Chair to replace him since he will complete his term of office by the end of 2005. He reminded SC
members that as per its decision during the Entebbe meeting in June 2005, a message accompanied by the terms of reference and responsibility of the chair was sent in July 2005 to all RF requesting for nominations for the position. A reminder was sent in October 2005 following which nominations were received from FARA, AARIENA and FORAGRO. All the chairs and executive secretaries of the RF met in Marrakech to examine and deliberate on the nominations received. During this screening process, FARA withdrew its nominations to ensure a smooth process and a unanimous decision. The outcome was the selection of Adel El-Beltagy as the next chair of GFAR. While accepting the outcome of the deliberation, and confirming his willingness to serve as the GFAR for the next three years, Adel El-Beltagy indicated that he will only be available to take up the position after May 2006 when he would have completed his term as the Director General of ICARDA. The SC therefore asked Mohammad Roozitalab to continue as chair until Adel El-Beltagy is available to take over as chair.

12. SELECTION OF VICE CHAIR
The chair reminded members of the SC that according to the GFAR Charter, the Vice-Chair position should be occupied by a representative of a stakeholder group other than the NARS and their RF. He then indicated that since the establishment of the position it had been occupied first by a representative of the ARIs and then of the NGO group. On the basis of this the Management Team thought that the Farmers Group should be requested to hold some consultation and identify a candidate to serve as the Vice-Chair. The Farmers group nominated Jack Wilkinson the President of the IFAP and a current member of the SC for the position.

SC members wondered if Jack Wilkinson would have the time to take on this additional responsibility, given that he has not been regularly attending SC meetings. Farmers’ representative attending the SC meeting (Ron Bonnet) informed the SC that he had been asked to confirm Jack Wilkinson’s availability, willingness and readiness to take up the challenge. The SC took note of the message, and approved the selection of Jack Wilkinson as the next GFAR Vice-chair, noting however, that he will assume that position at the end of the year (2006) when the term of the current incumbent ends.

13. CHARTER REVIEW: PROPOSED MANAGEMENT TEAM (MT) AMENDMENTS
The SC discussed the amendments suggested by the MT, concerning various aspects of the appointment and evaluation of the Executive Secretary and the role of the SC, the MT and the DG of the host Institution, FAO.

SC members agreed to separate the process of appointment which relates to the role of DG of FAO, from the administrative process relating to the roles of the SC and MT

A. With regards to the process of appointment the SC agreed to:
   i) Change the current text in section 2.1.4 and use a formulation similar to the one used by the CGIAR for the appointment of the Executive Director of the Science Council who is in a similar position to the Executive Secretary. The text which will now constitute section 2.1.4 of the GFAR Charter reads as follows:

   “Select and propose a ranked shortlist of up to three candidates for the post of Executive Secretary of GFAR to FAO’s Director General for appointment. The appointment will
be made from this shortlist, unless a legal impediment intervenes, or the proposed
appointment is not consistent with the provisions of FAO’s Administrative manual.”

ii) In section 5.3 Duties and responsibilities of the Executive Secretary. The suggested MT
amendment was: “The GFAR Secretariat will be headed by the Executive Secretary, to be
appointed by the Director General of FAO the host institution on the recommendation of the
GFAR-SC for an initial period of three years, renewable in line with FAO rules and regulations,
and based on an assessment and decision of the GFAR MT. The Terms of Reference of the
Executive Secretary are provided in Annexure 3”.

The SC directed to remove all references to appointment in this section which should then
read as follows: “The GFAR Secretariat will be headed by an Executive Secretary whose
Terms of Reference are provided in Annexure 3”.

B. With regards to administrative processes, the SC determined that:

i) Under section 2.1.4 which describes the functions of the SC, and with regards to the last
bullet in this section, on the assessment of the Executive Secretary, the SC agreed that this
function has to remain as a function of the SC and not that of the MT as suggested by the MT.
It however accepted that the MT should play a role in the process. It therefore reformulated
the text in this section which will remain a function of the SC as follows: “Assess at least
once every 2 years, the performance of the Executive Secretary and can delegate as
appropriate. The assessment will be done with inputs from the MT.”

C) Some other minor amendments indicated below were approved by the SC:
Section 2.2.2 page 7 (concerning the composition of the MT)

Section 2.2.3 page 7 (the 6th bullet concerning an additional function for the MT i.e.) Serve
as an advisory body to the Secretariat as to how best to orient its efforts.

Section 3.1.1 page 8 (Concerning the composition of the PC)

Finally the SC concluded that the process used to assess the Executive Secretary during its
last meeting in Entebbe was inappropriate and felt the need to set up a process with due
diligence. It therefore constituted an Ad Hoc Committee to develop such a process for the
approval of the SC. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee are: Bryan Harvey (Convener),
Ibrahim Hamdan and Monty Jones. Deadline for concluding the write up to be sent to the SC
for approval was set at mid-February 2006.

The SC concluded deliberations on this item by formally endorsing the proposal of the MT
that the contract of the Executive Secretary be extended to June 2006, while indicating that in
the interest of maintaining a cohesive SC, it should be consulted on contract extensions of the
Executive Secretary in the future.

ACTION ITEMS:

i) The Secretariat should finalize the amended and approved Charter and disseminate
   as appropriate

ii) The Ad Hoc Committee of (Bryan Harvey (Convener), Ibrahim Hamdan and
    Monty Jones) to develop a process for the evaluation of the Executive Secretary
    and submit the draft to the SC for approval by mid-February
14. **CLOSING REMARKS**
In his closing remarks, the chair thanked members of the SC for their active participation in the deliberations. Since this was going to be the last time he would chair the SC the committee expressed its appreciation to Mohammad Roozitalab for the services he rendered to GFAR as chair over the last three years. The meeting was adjourned at 12h30.
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