A. CONTEXT & RATIONALE

1. The social and environmental impacts of the Green Revolution since the 1970s, the on-field testing of genetically-modified crops in the 1990s, the continued neglect of small farmers in national priorities, and persistent rural poverty and vulnerability of the rural poor – are among the critical issues that have led a growing number of civil society organizations (CSOs) in Asia to question the directions, priorities and strategies of agricultural research and extension in the region. While recognizing the potential impacts of scientific research on poverty and food security, CSOs have advocated the need for greater focus on farmer-led research and extension, sustainable farming systems, greater recognition of indigenous knowledge and gender equity, among others.

2. Performing more than their critical role as ‘public watchdogs’, however, CSOs in Asia have also become active field practitioners of the very changes and alternatives that they advocate. Sustainable and organic agriculture; farmer-based research and extension; the promotion of indigenous species, cultures and farming practices; agrarian and resource reforms; participatory approaches; appropriate technology – these are among the alternative practices promoted by NGOs, farmer organizations (FOs), sometimes in partnership with sectors in the academic and scientific community over the past two decades.

3. However, while a few civil-society initiatives have successfully coalesced into national and even global movements and campaigns, most CSOs and FOs today continue to operate as small and independent actions, albeit effectively, in their respective communities. There is a need and potential for sharing experiences, building information linkages and exchanges, expanding CSO and...
FO working alliances with the academic and scientific community, and creating common consensus and strategies among these various civil society actors concerned with agricultural research and extension. There is also a need for CSOs in Asia to more directly engage the formal public sector in dialogue, towards influencing national and regional agricultural research priorities.

4. Many Asian CSOs today advocate along the broader themes of “food security, poverty alleviation and natural resource management” – which are also the stated goals of most publicly-funded International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs), National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs), and Government Extension Systems (GESs) in the region. However, there is still need to build common platforms of understanding and practice among the various stakeholders that go beyond the development rhetoric.

5. In recent years, at the global level, the continued public debate on issues of agricultural research and extension has opened up space for CSOs to pursue some potential reforms and institutional changes especially among public-funded research institutes (NARIs and IARCs). Some of these opportunities are:

**GFAR.** At a 1999 CGIAR Conference in Dresden, Germany, the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) was created “to foster collaboration and partnerships among the (various) stakeholders of agricultural research and sustainable development.” Among its initial activities in 2000-2001, GFAR has begun a process of “regional priority setting” through a series of regional and sub-regional consultations, which it has helped organize. To date, these forums have primarily involved National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs), donors and policymakers, with only a few NGOs invited to such forums. However, GFAR has a stated committed to open up to greater CSO and FO participation in succeeding regional fora.

**NGO Committee of CGIAR.** Meanwhile, as part of its overall workplan, the NGO Committee of the CGIAR (NGOC) has

---

3 Some 16 major International Agricultural Research Centers belong to the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research), an informal association of almost 60 countries, international and regional organisations, and private foundations established in 1971 to support a system of agricultural research worldwide.

4 The Lucerne Declaration and Action Program adopted at the CGIAR Ministerial-Level Meeting held at Lucerne, Switzerland, in February 1995 encouraged the CGIAR to develop a more open and participatory system. An NGO Committee of the CGIAR, with 8 regional members from civil society, was established in order to strengthen civil society-CGIAR dialogue.
similarly embarked on a common effort to organize regional consultations among CSOs/FOs. A first such consultation was held among some 30 CSOs and FOs from Southern and East Africa that coincided with the recent CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting held at Durban, South Africa in May 2001.

**CGIAR.** Over the past year, the CGIAR itself has been undergoing some institutional and structural changes. CSOs continue to monitor and press for major reforms in the CGIAR system. At the recent Durban meeting and at the coming CGIAR International Centers Week (Washington DC, October 2001), NGOs are likely to pursue the CGIAR, particularly on its earlier commitment made in October 2000 to evolve the existing International Agricultural Research Centers towards becoming more of “eco-regional centers” that build upon and respond to national and regional priorities as defined by its various stakeholders, including CSOs and FOs.

6. There is thus an urgent need for Asian CSOs and FOs to build common understanding and consensus on the issues, priorities and strategies for agricultural research and extension – in order to influence the directions and content of ongoing changes in formal public institutions – particularly the CGIAR, IARC and NARI systems.

7. Some key questions for CSOs and farmer organizations might be: What should be the priorities for agriculture at country and regional levels, and how should scientific research be placed at the service of these? How can we build greater scientist-policymaker-farmer-CSO linkages in pursuing such national and regional agendas? How do we build greater participation and “ownership” of small farmers in such processes? How do we strengthen linkages between research and extension to benefit the rural poor? How do we build more accountable and aware public institutions?

**B. OVERVIEW OF THE CONSULTATION PROCESS & ACTIVITIES**

8. From June 2001 to August 2001, the NGO Committee, through its Asian member-representatives (LATIN-Indonesia and the Asian NGO Coalition/ANGOC), together with the Asian CSO representative to GFAR (Dr Angelina Briones, MODE/ UPLB), organized the following activities:

9. **Pre-Consultation Discussions:** E-mail discussions were conducted in June-July 2001 among the NGOC, ANGOC, LATIN, and MODE/ UPLB (Philippines) on the overall framework and implementation arrangements for the regional CSO/FO consultative process.
10. **E-Conferencing:** An e-mail conference was undertaken prior to the Bangkok Workshop with LATIN-Indonesia as lead agency. A list of over 100 NGOs & SFOs was drawn from across Asia and included in the E-Conference mailing. A Summary paper was then prepared by LATIN that constituted an input for the Bangkok Workshops which were organized by ANGOC, LATIN and MODE/UPLB on 28-29 August 2001.

11. **Bangkok Workshops:** In order to maximize the presence and participation of other CSO and SFOs, as well as the use of limited resources, consultations were conducted as thematic workshops within the “Asian Regional CSO Conference on the World Food Summit + 5” which was organized by the Asian NGO Coalition and the FAO Regional Office for Asia-Pacific (FAO-RAP) in Bangkok on 28-29 August 2001. During the main Bangkok Conference, two thematic workshops were organized on the themes of “Sustainable Paths to Food Security” (28 August 2001) and “Towards a New Agenda for Agricultural Research in Asia” (28 August 2001) – to discuss the issues, priorities and strategies for agricultural research and extension. (Refer to Figure 1 on the Asian Regional Consultation Framework) These two workshops were attended by 26, and 18 participants, respectively. Workshop outputs were then shared with the larger plenary, and these contributed to the overall Conference Statement entitled “End Hunger! Fight for the Right to Live!”

12. Representatives of IRRI, APAARI and FAO-RAP attended, and participated in discussions at the NGOC-organized workshops. An opportunity was also provided for Dr. Patricio S. Faylon, APAARI representative, to address the main plenary during the closing session (see Annex D for his statement).

13. The objectives of these activities were:
   - to share information on activities in agricultural research and development;
   - to discuss key issues on agricultural research in Asia;
   - to identify mechanisms for better communication among stakeholders in agricultural research in the region;
   - To develop civil-society strategies for influencing agricultural research at country and regional levels.

**Fig 1. An Overview of the Consultation Process**

---

5 This larger Bangkok Conference was attended by more than 80 CSOs from 14 countries, who discussed on various aspects of the overall theme of “food security”. See Annex E for the main conference statement, entitled “End Hunger! Fight for the Right to Live!”
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C. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Note: This is a consolidated summary of views, as culled from the various activities – namely, the e-conference, presentations and discussions at the thematic workshops held in Bangkok on 28 & 29 August 2001, and written contributions returned through circulated questionnaires.

IN SEARCH OF SUSTAINABLE PATHS TO FOOD SECURITY

REVISITING THE QUESTIONS

14. Limited progress on poverty. The crucial promise made by governments and the international community in the 1996 World Food Summit to halve poverty and hunger by 2015 has now been deemed impossible by the same institutions that adopted it. According to FAO itself, only 8 million undernourished people were made healthier in the 1990s, far below the 20 million annual average necessary for the WFS targets to be achieved.

15. Asia’s rural poor. In Asia, the number of poor in the region may have declined by almost two-thirds, from 720 to 350 million, but this was mainly due to one country – China. Other countries have stagnated, or even worsened, in the fight against poverty. Until today, indigenous peoples, scheduled tribes, coastal fisherfolk, scheduled castes and rural women constitute the large majority of the absolute poor in Asia.

16. Productivity is not the main question. In terms of agricultural research, it seems that we are all asked to expect that a “Second Green Revolution” will deliver the goods, and help end world hunger, primarily through increased productivity. But it is all too easy to just gloss over the reality, that some countries with the largest number of malnourished people in the world have the largest stocks of grain in the South! A key example is India. Just recently, in an unprecedented decision made in August 2001, the Supreme Court of India ruled on the immorality of hoarding grain stocks in public warehouses after a bumper-crop harvest, while many citizens went hungry. The issue was not productivity, but distribution and access. Many viewed this decision as a legal recognition of the right to food as a fundamental right, and as a right to life itself.

17. The need to re-focus agendas. If global commitments are to be met, then the eradication of hunger and rural poverty, not just increased productivity and conventional crop research, should be the central focus of agriculture research and development. All too often, we tend to lose focus on the real purpose of our development efforts. Yet the often-claimed Second Green Revolution will deliver on the goods only if it focuses on marginal areas and the small farmer.
The centrality of this actor, the small farmer, living in remote, complex, diverse and often risk-prone environments must be understood and accepted. What are the barriers – social, political, cultural and economic – that prevent the poor from feeding themselves? For corollary to the right to food, is the right to feed oneself and one’s family.

18. **Continued neglect of the poor.** Yet crops grown by the poor (mostly in marginal areas) are rarely the focus of new or recent research work. If they do exist they give the impression of being token projects. What does it take to bring a change not only in mission statements but also in work being conducted in the labs and in farmers’ fields? Deliberate, pro-poor and resource management-oriented choices will have to be made.

19. We continue to search for new varieties of crops (with promises of bumper yields) when the maximization of yields by the majority of farmers from previous varieties have barely crossed 50% of what the best farmers have achieved with those varieties. Future impact on household food security in rural areas is going to come about primarily from bringing about small increases across larger number of farmers. No new biological technology breakthroughs can assure widespread impact unless, of course, it is in the marginal tracts where the first green revolution did not have an impact.

20. **Grim reminders from the Green Revolution.** At best, the Green Revolution of the 70s may have bought us some time in the race for meeting production demands of a growing global population. Yet, the costs have been equally high, i.e. – increasing rural indebtedness, chemical effects on soils, water and human health, the loss of biodiversity and indigenous farming systems, and the neglect of poor farmers and marginal lands in favor of better-off farmers in irrigated lands, among others.

21. **Questions about biotech.** While the potentials of biotech have been much-heralded, we know the reality is that most of the biotechnology (thus far) in use today focused on herbicide resistance and has not focused on the poor, nor is it of relevance to marginal areas. So why is it increasingly being proposed as the centerpiece of a strategy to resolve hunger and malnutrition? Has it anything to do with the new opportunity created by the free market allowing increased control of the agrochemical and seed industry more than at anytime in the history of agriculture? Has it something to do with being able to claim intellectual property rights over “inventions”? How can we make a totally radical shift (if possible, a reversal in favor of an agenda of the poor)?

**Rethinking Our Solutions**

22. **Re-thinking the role of research.** The challenge of alleviating poverty requires us to re-think the very role of research itself, for many of our part
conventional approaches will no longer hold. We cannot do more of the same under an attitude of business-as-usual.

23. **Farmer-led approach.** We need to review and rethink implementation strategies. Across the world civil society is moving away from technology-, technician- and center-based strategies towards farmer-led and people-centered approaches. New opportunities have become available in those countries where local governments have been empowered and where devolution has taken place. The space and potential for partnerships have expanded but such work isn’t necessarily the easier path, but probably the most cost-effective approach to achieve wide impact.

24. **Need for research partnerships.** A poverty orientation for agricultural research implies the need for focused targeting and multi-locational and decentralized work. The transaction costs are higher if research institutions decide to do this alone. However, if they partner with civil society (and a socially conscious private sector) such efforts will not only have a greater impact on poverty but will also be cost-effective. But sharing a common mission is not enough. A genuine appreciation of each other’s roles and their complementarity is essential.

25. **Focus on small farms.** The focus on small farms and small farmer households must remain at the core of our strategy. Our future impact on household food security in rural areas is going to come primarily by bringing about small increases across larger numbers of farmers. But these small increases are not the subject that makes headlines or would be considered publishable in a journal. The work ICAR and various Indian research institutions and universities with support of IRRI and IFAD, is a good example of what is possible. In Eastern India, the largest increase in recent years has taken place in rainfed rice. An average yield increase of about 0.38 tons per hectare in rainfed areas of about 21 million hectares of rice in Eastern India provided about 8 million metric tons of rice. Let us not forget that about 25% of global rice production is rainfed. Yet most increases have taken place in irrigated areas (where incidentally, declines are evident). One can have a sense of what a huge opportunity lies in these marginal, rainfed areas.

26. **Need for land reforms.** In the different Asian countries, between 13 to 71 percent of farmers are landless or near-landless, without security of tenure over their farms and homesteads. This lack of access to productive assets severely limits their choices and decisions about their lands, crops and livelihoods. Moreover, we see the rapid conversion of the most productive lands (prime alluvial plains & valleys) to other uses, while the poor are increasingly pushed and forced to eke out livelihoods from fragile ecosystems. And amidst the growing resource-conflicts, agricultural research must now confront and address serious policy questions related to resource reforms, tenurial security, and resource management which impact most on the lives of the poor.
Questions about markets. The success of many land distribution efforts are often limited by poor access to credit, poor quality of soils and a limited “market orientation” (not uncommon among new land holders). Today, this situation has gotten more complex with globalization and free trade, which have increased the level of risk and vulnerability of small growers. Global competition invariably works against the poor.

Coastal & forest producers. Coastal and forest food producers still continue to be marginalized and neglected. While the environmental value of their ecosystems are now better recognized (e.g. biodiversity value, contributions to climate), practical, on-the-ground efforts to augment and stabilize food production from these ecosystems are grossly limited. The bias for agriculture and farmers continues, neglecting the critical contributions made by the fishers, forest farmers continues and increasing numbers of urban food producers. More participatory technology work is needed with these groups, building upon the work of the conservationists who have made some significant inroads with these communities.

Participation vs control. Participation is now a much used (but often abused) word. However, participation is different from control. Increasingly we are aware that whoever controls the inputs and outputs of agricultural research tends to benefit the most. Where are we heading today? Can we honestly say that farmers are more in control? Or is it the huge corporations? And where do our research institutions stand on this matter? Where people’s choices are increasingly limited and control is increasingly rested in external commercial entities, the right of the farmer has been violated.

Continued neglect of extension systems. Many extension systems are either being privatized or are decaying from neglect and reduced public funding. Farmer-to-farmer approaches and appropriate social organizations such as farmer associations may offer better results. Knowing that conventional systems have failed to protect small farmers, their natural resource and the consumers as well, more interest is being generated into farmer to farmer systems, such as the IPM program. However, donors and their partners must make investments in these alternative system and capacity building. To strengthen farmers’ capacities to continue to innovate implies the need to constantly foster opportunities for learning and sharing new ideas, acquiring strategically important information and material inputs and providing marketing outlets.

A critical self-observation is that both IARCs and NGOs now need to go more to the field than before. Many of us started our development work as community organizers, animators and field extensionists. Yet today, we are not spending as much time on the field as before. We all need to strengthen our work on the frontlines.
32. **Biased credit systems.** The need to increase the financing of agriculture (in the light of the neglect of the last decade) is critical. The “cost” of credit is putting smallholders into the spiral of debt and growing landlessness. While many micro-finance programs have been instituted, we need to be reminded that most such micro-finance are not designed, and are in fact biased against agriculture. Meanwhile, formal credit remains generally inaccessible, while informal credit typically charge a high 20 percent interest a month. High interest rates itself works as a bias against agriculture.

33. **Challenges in scaling-up.** The emphasis on model farms that are set up for demonstration purposes (supposedly for educational purposes) have served the past needs of many of our institutions to prove what works and to prove what’s possible. However, today that is no longer the question we should be seeking to answer! There is no need for us to prove that crops can grow without chemicals (or with highly reduced levels). What we need is to demonstrate that our farmers value such findings. One primary indicator to indicate that farmers have bought on our approach is widespread adoption. If this is indeed our goal, a shift needs to be made in our strategies. Model farms give us a false illusion that alternatives are being adopted when in fact, it’s the attention and supervision and outside visitors that might be keeping these initiatives alive. The focus keeps ARCs and NGOs from working more widely in the community.

34. **Institutional change.** The basic challenge for agricultural research centers (ARCs) is institutional change. And given the reduced public spending on public agricultural research, ARCs are now forced to raise questions on their continuing relevance, approaches and impact. Scientists can no longer disclaim responsibility for how their research is utilized. Research cannot be divorced from development questions.

35. **Is there really a need for more research?** To be sure, there have been field innovations and successes, but what exactly are the barriers that constrain us from doing more? One striking observation worth noting in the discussions is that few NGOs have even mentioned the need for more research, apart from the cited need to focus more R&D on the poor and on marginalized areas. Among CSOs, there is a very strong sentiment on putting higher value on indigenous knowledge systems. Even as we recognize the need for scientific methods of research, we must not lose the values from how indigenous peoples take care of their natural ecology. Also, there should be greater emphasis on research utilization, on applying and making accessible existing research, and on promoting the sustainable use of local resources. We need a campaign to expand information, access and field choices.

**THE OTHER GLOBAL FACE OF AGRICULTURE**
36. While much of the discussion on agricultural research tends to center on the concerns of CSOs, FOs and public research institutions, we should not lose sight of the larger and perhaps more significant trends now threatening smallholder agriculture: the rise of the private sector in G-7 countries, supported by internationally-imposed agreements, which include:

- **The globalization of markets** under a WTO regime that has increased the monopoly by a few TNCs over seeds, technology and food trade, and has spurred the dumping of agricultural products into poor countries that unfairly compete with domestic producers. This continues to eroded domestic and local food sovereignty.

- **IPR.** The concomitant imposition of an intellectual property rights (IPR) regime that has led to the piracy of indigenous knowledge and the privatization of the benefits and profits derived from these knowledge and patents.

- **Market-led policies** that domestically, tend to increase the concentration of land ownership in a few hands and its corporatization, as well as the encroachment of agribusiness on smallholder farms. In most Asian countries, such liberalization has also spurred conversion of prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural purposes.

37. It is noted that currently, over 90 percent of agricultural research is privately controlled by transnationals, and that the operating budget of one company alone, i.e., Monsanto, is larger than that of the CGIAR system. Seen from this larger context, CSOs note the need to support public agricultural research, even as we continue to advocate for changes and reforms in both the CGIAR/NARIS systems, as well in the broader arena of global public policy. (Refer to NGOs/CSOs Statement in the Asian Regional Consultation, Annex E)

**Towards an Agriculture Research Agenda for Asia**

**Framework for a Farmer-led Research**

38. There was an overall consensus that the following criteria as adopted from the CSO Declaration to Durban (May 2001) should serve as the overall framework for defining and implementing a research agenda relevant to the urgent problems facing agriculture in Asia today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research should be:</th>
<th>... and not:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer-driven</td>
<td>Mainly scientist-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed at the needs of the poor/vulnerable</td>
<td>Mainly commodity-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimately linked to farmer-to-farmer learning</td>
<td>Top-down extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on agroecology as a scientific basis, and</td>
<td>Reductionist approaches and large-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional knowledge as a starting point</td>
<td>high-external-input monoculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully inclusive of smallholders and the landless</td>
<td>Focused on better-off farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully inclusive of women, indigenous peoples and other under-represented groups</td>
<td>Focused on male farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing outputs that cannot be privatized and that remain in the public domain</td>
<td>Accepting patent/IPR regimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on participatory breeding methods</td>
<td>Using transgenics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in a larger context of policy development that emphasizes poverty alleviation, especially in rural areas</td>
<td>Following a commodity approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed at food security, especially in marginal/vulnerable environments where the poor live, and guided by concerns of national food sovereignty, right to food and equity</td>
<td>Directed at crop productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on full and real participation of SFOs and other CSOs in priority-setting, agenda formulation, research collaboration, governance and decision-making</td>
<td>Token, symbolic consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded in an open and transparent manner with funds accessible to non-CGIAR actors via competitive mechanisms</td>
<td>Guaranteed to the CGIAR centers only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address issues of resource access for poor people, e.g. land, water, genetic resources</td>
<td>Accepting current resource access and distribution as given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on priority setting that starts at the local level and is integrated upwards through partnerships in which SFOs and community-based organizations are key actors</td>
<td>Based on priority setting globally or in Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use germplasm that remains held in trust for humankind and not subjected to IPR</td>
<td>Privatized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. However, there is still a need to put flesh into these motherhood phrases. Given the current international trends towards regionalization of agricultural research projects and agendas, civil society seeks to be counted in this re-orientation by drawing concrete actions for the new framework.

40. The donor community itself has identified some general development thrusts – i.e., poverty alleviation, natural resources management, etc. Yet, we ask:
   - What implications does this research orientation have on agriculture research & development?
   - What are the special research needs, to support small farmers?
   - What are the possible areas for research partnerships?

41. Research partnerships actually involve three sectors – research institutions, NGOs and small farmers, yet small farmers are often forgotten in this equation. This brings to the fore some important research perspectives – i.e., farmers’ rights; indigenous knowledge systems; and farmers’ role as the main sources of agricultural innovation, as caretakers of biodiversity, and as should-be actors rather than mere subjects of research.
42. In the Asian context, the potentials for building ARC-CSO partnerships in agricultural development research is increasingly recognized, highlighted by:

An emerging regional research agenda, which emphasizes:
- a stronger focus on poverty reduction and household food security
- biodiversity, ecological protection and conservation, NRM and management of the “commons”, and the need to address the growing resource conflicts especially in a region with the world’s highest population density
- participation, social and gender equity and empowerment.

Shifting paradigms, especially in the field of social research:
- participatory research; action research; involved vs. detached science; applied problem-solving orientations; constructive vs. extractive research
- the need to subsume scientific rigor (scientists) under field relevance (farmers)
- integration of social with technical science
- blending of holistic with technical perspectives
- integrated systems views vs. specialist views
- interest in social processes
- a growing recognition of research as a medium for empowerment and mediation.

Emerging social realities, including:
- increasing visibility and recognition of CSOs and farmers, and their development alternatives
- increasing realization and frustration that past approaches have not worked.

43. Critical collaboration stance. Nevertheless, fundamental differences between research institutions and NGOs/CSOs still remain in terms of perspectives, institutional mandates and research paradigms. Scientists tend to look inwards, towards their own research institutions, not towards the farmers. There is a propensity & drive to publish and to be published in scientific journals. Enough of this has been done.

44. Taking on a stance of critical collaboration, NGOs/CSOs emphasize (and thus question) the empowering effects of research on local communities, e.g.:

- Questions about research relevance and participation: Whose agenda and questions? For whose benefit? Under what partnership arrangements?
- Inherent risks in field experimentation: who ultimately pays for the consequences?
- Fear about bringing indigenous knowledge into global knowledge: questions about the privatization of intellectual property, and about private vs. public domain research/access.
• Increasing demands made on local communities: as mere objects of studies, study visits, showcases and demo sites.
• Questions about continuity in the post-research period: Most research efforts do not provide for local institution-building.

**FOCUS OF A REGIONAL RESEARCH AGENDA**

45. Drawing from the earlier discussions, the following general proposals/topics were raised for formulating a regional research agenda:

46. **Research on NRM.** Given the Asian situation, NRM should be a priority research area. Physically, there are no more new land frontiers to speak of for large-scale agricultural expansion. NRM research must follow an integrated approach. Agro-ecology + traditional knowledge must serve as our starting point. NRM research also means focusing not only on the biophysical, but also on integrating the social and political aspects. The strength of the NARIS might perhaps be on the biophysical, while CSOs tend to be focused more on the socio-political. Is this one potential area for complementarity?

47. **Statistical methods.** There is need to research on statistical methods itself, moving from the “old” and static (which focus only on a few, limited variables), towards simulation research. The scientific basis for the NGO approach itself poses a challenge for the science community.

48. **Research on research approaches.** There is a need to review the current research methods themselves. The poverty situation has grown so much more complex, and we must find new ways by which to proceed. As fields of specialization become narrower, we seem to have lost our links with the *farming systems research* tradition. We also need to critically review conventional crop-based research, as is currently being done.

49. **Research on research institutions.** Sample topics could cover the impact of research institutions on the socio-economic lives of our people with the knowledge that from the very start, these international research institutions were set-up for the economic benefit of the rural poor. Included in this assessment should be the practical utilization of research, including extension systems, access, and existing barriers that constrain poor people from benefiting from R&D efforts. We would also like to advocate strengthening policy research both in government and non-government organizations.

50. **Policy research.** For many years, agriculture itself and the livelihoods of small farmers have been grossly neglected, even overturned, by public policy. The increasing focus today on market-led development strategies, combined with the continuing bias for urban consumerism, threatens to worsen the plight of the rural poor. Public policy, including the need for redistributitional reforms and for re-defining the priorities of public spending, needs to be addressed. Donors will need to be educated. IARCs and NARIS will not be able to address these without support of the public will, through CSOs and FOs.
51. **Poverty reduction studies & strategies.** How do we reduce risk and vulnerability, from the perspective of the rural poor? Even from conventional crop-focused, research (including variety-testing), we have learned that when given a choice, the main concern of the poor will not be the maximization of yields and profit, but the stability of their livelihoods and the reduction of risks. We have limited awareness and knowledge of the concerns of the poor, and thus a participatory, shared-learning approach is necessary.

52. **Cross-cutting concerns.** In the pursuit of these topics, several cross-cutting concerns were likewise raised. Among these:

- **Sustaining livelihoods of the rural poor.** It is easier to reproduce poverty, and much more difficult to eradicate it. It is easier to create livelihoods, but much more difficult to sustain it. What are required, to make a small farmer economically viable? NARIS should address such and similar problem topics.

- **Investments.** Utilizing the results of research often requires investments. This includes, for instance, research on the poorest areas, such as semi-arid and dryland areas.

- **Rural women.** How do we minimize the drudgery of rural women’s workloads? What technological or policy interventions would empower rural women?

- **Social dimensions of technology.** Conventional agricultural research has focused almost exclusively on technology, which tend to neglect and even impose upon, indigenous knowledge. There is need to consider the social dimensions of technology, and the social impacts that innovations bring.

- **Voices of the poor.** In our agendas, methodologies and research utilization, how do we bring the voices of the rural poor to be heard? How can research itself be used for and by the poor, for their own empowerment?

- **Development of local people’s institutions.** Research is also the case of the development of local institutions to support technological innovation. Research that targets poverty and NRM tends to be more site-specific, and participatory approaches are crucial for success. More importantly, researchers must have a post-intervention strategy to ensure continuity and sustainability of the intervention. Local people’s institutions, including strengthened local governments, are key to achieving this.

**FOLLOW-UP**
53. We recognize that there will now be stronger pressures on IARCS and NARIS to be more development oriented, given the growing complexity of rural poverty, and the measures, including research and public policy interventions, that need to address it. CSOs/FOs will continue advocacy for continued policy and institutional reforms in such institutions.

54. There is a call for more suggestions from the participants on the possible research agenda for the region. There is need for more consultations with FOs and CSOs, especially at the national and sub-national levels. Establishing a regional agenda will require a bottom-up approach, with greater involvement of NARIS and CSOs/FOs. Initially, a regional consultative set-up with the use of e-conferencing, would allow continued networking at minimal expense.
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(Thematic Workshop Sessions organized at the “Asian Regional CSO Conference on the World Food Summit + 5”, held on 28-29 August 2001, at Bangkok, Thailand)

WORKSHOP: SUSTAINABLE PATHS TO FOOD SECURITY
28 August 2001

1. G.N. Reddi, SARRA-India
2. Sil Vineth, CNAC & SEDOC - Cambodia
3. Rainier Almazan, PAKISAMA – Philippines
4. Saman Amarasinghe – NNGOC, Sri Lanka
5. Sakiul Millat Morshed – SHISUK
7. Dennis Uba, APHD - Thailand
8. S.P. Yadav, CWDS – Nepal
9. P. Chaturvedi, IAAS – India
10. Angelina Briones, MODE & UPLB – Philippines
11. Tony Quizon, CARRD & ANGOC - Philippines
12. Riza Tjahadi, PAN-Indonesia
13. Alice de Cruz, CI-ROAP – Malaysia
14. Julian Gonsalves – India
15. Grace Santos, ANGOC - Philippines
16. Andrea Ferrante - AVCS/ Italian NGO Host Committee for the WFS+5
17. Dave Ingles, IRRI
18. Mahesh Unuyal, FAO-RAP
19. P.S. Faylon, APAARI-PCARRD/ DOST - Philippines

CAUCUS: TOWARDS A NEW AGENDA FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN ASIA
29 August 2001

1. Rainier Almazan, PAKISAMA-Philippines
2. Alice de Cruz, CI-ROAP – Malaysia
3. Corazon de Jesus, SEARICE – Philippines
5. Julian Gonsalves – India
6. Jyant Kumar, Church’s Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA) - India
7. Dang Ngoc Quang, Rural Development Services Center (RDSC) - Vietnam
8. P.S. Faylon, APAARI/PCARRD – Philippines
9. Phulrenu Guha, Forum of Voluntary Organization, West Bengal (FVOWEB) - India
10. Tony Quizon, CARRD & ANGOC - Philippines
11. Dwi Muhtaman, LATIN – Indonesia
12. Angelina Briones, UPLB - Philippines
13. Grace Santos, ANGOC
14. Pham Van Ngoc, ActionAid - Vietnam
15. Isagani Serrano, PRRM – Philippines
16. David Ingles, IRRI – Philippines
ANNEX B
DOCUMENTS CIRCULATED FOR THE THEMATIC WORKSHOPS

*The Bangkok Declaration.* Statement of 120 representatives of NGOs and people’s organizations (POs) from 19 Asia-Pacific countries at the first Asian Regional CSO Conference on the World Food Summit, held in Bangkok in April 1996.


*Invitation to the Thematic Regional Caucus on Towards a New Agenda for Agriculture Research in Asia.* Invitation & questionnaire circulated to participants at the Bangkok Conference.


Reddi, G.N. *Sustainable Paths to Food Security.*

ANNEX C

TOWARDS A NEW AGENDA FOR AGRICULTURE RESEARCH

Workshop Report to the Overall Plenary
by Dr. Angelina Briones, U.P. Los Baños

1. The main discussion on agriculture research was on how it helps in poverty reduction, food security and natural resources management. Civil society wants to take advantage of this period when an international committee (i.e., Change Design and Management Team) was created to look at how international public research (i.e., CGIAR) can respond to these issues.

2. On the part of CSOs, the framework adopted for the agricultural research is found in page 2 of the Durban Declaration. But there is still a need to put flesh into these motherhood phrases. There is also a trend with the international response to agricultural research is going towards regionalization of research projects and proposals. The International Agricultural Research centers claim they have this mandate for the last 40 years. There is a clamor now for change, hence the consultation processes on the framework for these agricultural research institutions.

3. This is an opportunity for civil society to be counted in this re-orientation by drawing concrete actions for the new framework. There was a very strong sentiment on putting higher value to indigenous knowledge systems. Even if we say that we want scientific methods of research we want to do this without losing the values from how indigenous peoples took care of the natural ecology.

4. The group also tackled doing research on research methods. Traditional scientific methods, especially in using statistics, which have limited variables, cannot address new research requirement today. There is a need now for integrated research not only in the natural sciences or bio-physical factors but also together with socio-economic and policy research. This is a challenge to our scientists to come up with better parameters to measure what we want from these integrated variables.

5. In addition, there was also a felt need for research on research institutions. Sample topics could cover their impact on the socio-economic lives of our people with the knowledge that from the very start these international research institutions were set-up for the economic benefit of the rural poor. Actually this is already part of their mandate. We also would like to advocate strengthening policy research both in government and non-government organizations.

6. There is a call for more suggestions from the participants on the possible research agenda for the region. The committee would like to come up with three proposals for Southeast, East and South Asia. They will be incorporating these comments.
Everyone was encouraged to fill-up and submit the form distributed to the participants to register these suggestions and perhaps join in the electronic consultation being done on the matter.

ANNEX D

STATEMENT OF APAARI REPRESENTATIVE

By Patricio S. Faylon, APAARI Representative
Closing Statement at the Main Plenary

1. I wish to thank the organizers for giving the Asia-Pacific Association of Agriculture Research Institute (APAARI) and the Philippine National Agricultural Research System or NARS the opportunity to participate in this consultation meeting.

2. As you may be aware, the APAARI is in the process of formulating and packaging the sub-regional priority for agricultural research and development (ARD). We have undertaken the East and Southeast Asian Priority Setting exercises last June 2001 at Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines.

3. In the said consultation, we have invited representatives from various stakeholders. The NGO was represented by ANGOC.

4. Foremost among the objectives of the consultation was the development of arrangements or processes to institutionalize the participation of NGO, particularly in the setting of priorities for ARD with the Program/Activity/Projects (P/A/Ps) for implementation by the NARS and CGIAR Centres located in the Region.

5. The output of the exercise in Los Baños, along with the highlights of my participation to this consultation meeting, shall be the subject of the report I will present during the Annual APAARI Executive Committee Meeting to be held in Pakistan in November 2001. All the member-organizations of APAARI composed of the NARS from Asia-Pacific, the CGIAR Centres, and the Asia-Pacific Regional Centers shall be in attendance.

6. I hope the body recognizes my difficulty to react on a document, which has been subjected to critical scrutiny by the participants. It is difficult for me to justify further comments or suggestions on a document I feel very heavy on ADVOCACY.

7. In view of this, what I wish to do is to focus on ARD issues, which are outputs or have been touched, in one way or the other, in the workshop or in the Consultation Statement. I hope that by doing this, the concerns of NGOs/CSOs on the formulation of appropriate R&D agenda could be enhanced. These areas are embodied in the draft priorities of the NARS and IARCS. Therefore, I hope we will start working together on the following common areas of concern.
Development and adoption of CODE OF CONDUCT for organizations to observe and to uphold in the implementation of programs/projects on Food Security (FS); the accountability of organizations, to include R&D organizations, should be considered.

Formulation and implementation of P/A/P and policies to enhance decentralization of process on matters associated to food security.

Design adequate strategies to address the threats on food security and endeavor to give control of production to producers, particular to limited-resource farmers in the Asian Region.

I noted the recommendations to prioritize P/A/P to enhance access to technology by smallholder farmers in support of food sufficiency program. In like matter, the management of water resource in food production should be given attention and support.

The focus of R&D efforts in agriculture should be the food insecure sector of the population. Ecology and sustainable agriculture should be priority areas among research organizations in the Region. Furthermore, indigenous knowledge should be mixed or incorporated in the packages of technology for promotion to farmers. The NARS recognizes the need to empower the farming communities. At the moment, there are efforts to develop knowledge systems appropriate to the resources of smallhold farmers. Considering your recommendation, we will enhance the Management of Information and Knowledge Systems (MIKS) project in APAARI.

IPR is an issue that should be debated by the national research organizations and NGOs to arrive at policies appropriate for individual countries and to temper the law as understood by industrialized countries.

Assessments, formulation and/or advocacy of policies supportive to farmers and environment should form part of the mandates of ARD agencies.

Impact assessments of international trade agreements to be conducted by representatives of stakeholders should be a priority ARD areas. In like manner, the impact of debt servicing among farmers should be studied and safety net programs should be formulated for consideration by the government to at least minimize the impact of the problem among the poor.

At this point, I wish to inform everyone that the ARD systems fully support the NGO/CSO policy advocacy centered on the well-being of our farmers. Similarly, the national R&D system recognizes FS as a major development goal in the national R&D programs, in particular, and the national development program as a whole.

I also wish to inform you that our public R&D managers and scientists have clear understanding and positions about basic issues on agrarian reform, globalization of trade, and the important role of the NGOs/CSOs, particularly in enhancing the awareness of the populace on national issues important to all, such as GMO and
the effects of WTO in agriculture (vis-à-vis the visible flooding of our markets with imported goods and the parallel bankruptcy of our agricultural enterprises).

10. Lastly, I hope that the consultation that we have started during this year and the collaboration in packaging and implementation of proposed priority projects with the active participation of our farmers would happen soon, and implemented in our farming communities.
CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

1. Some 80 NGOs/CSOs from 14 countries in Asia gathered in Bangkok, Thailand on August 28-29, 2001 to assess and consolidate their position on the alarming state of food insecurity especially in Asia-Pacific, in preparation for the coming “World Food Summit + 5” Conference. The consultation was co-organized by the Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC), Pesticide Action Network (PAN-AP), the Institute for Motivating Self-Employment (IMSE) and the Food and Agriculture Organization – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO-RAP).

2. The consultation allowed NGOs/CSOs in Asia to examine food security from four aspects, namely, Right to Food, Empowerment through Access to Resources, Sustainable Paths to Food Security, and Food Security and International Trade. Workshops were held on the four topics during the first day and the results were presented and refined the following day. A drafting committee was selected from the participants to draw the general and specific recommendations of Asian NGOs/CSOs to the WFS + 5.

3. After five years, the same world governments and intergovernmental agencies that pledged to halve the world’s hungry by the year 2015 have deemed it an impossible task. Food as a basic human entitlement has not been translated into the government’s action plans. Grassroots communities of peasants, indigenous peoples and women, have continually been denied access to productive resources for food production. Distribution systems are not effective enough to reach the poorest communities desperate for food. Ironically, it is small farmer families who suffer the most.

4. The NGOs/CSOs stressed that institutions have approached these grave problems wrongly by enhancing trade conditions with the emergence of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and international agreements and national policies related to it. Including agriculture in the WTO will deprive the world’s poor and hungry not only to adequate supply but their capacity to determine what they want to produce.

5. The NGOs/CSOs thus urged governments, FAO and intergovernmental agencies to end world hunger by taking the Agreement on Agriculture out of

---

6 Electronic mail copies of the full Conference Report available upon request from ANGOC (Quezon City, Philippines) and FAO-RAP (Bangkok, Thailand).
the WTO and fortify national policies that would empower the small food producers at enhancing their production through sustainable means and with control and access to their resources.

**End Hunger!**
**Fight for the Right to Live!**

We, the representatives of more than 80 NGOs/Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) from 14 Asian countries are outraged that despite the abundance of food to feed the world, more than 800 million, with two-thirds found in Asia, still go hungry everyday.

The programs and practices aimed at reducing hunger and malnutrition by the Bretton Woods Institutions, international financial groups and inter-governmental agencies have failed miserably and instead aggravated food insecurity.

The crucial promise of the 1996 World Food Summit to halve poverty and hunger by the year 2015 has been declared impossible to achieve by the same institutions that adopted it. Albeit an important one, this “crucial” promise is still insufficient and unacceptable to the ‘other half’ i.e., the rest of the millions who go hungry everyday. According to FAO, only 8 million undernourished people were made healthier in the 1990s — far below the 20 million annual average necessary to meet the target of the 1996 World Food Summit.

Food has been declared a basic human right by many international agreements such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Preamble of the FAO Constitution, the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, among others. Yet, the right to food is continually denied. Worse, it is now considered more as an item for trade than for sustenance.

After five years, we demand that national governments and international institutions accept the responsibilities and consequences of their failed “experiments” and make this acceptance known to the poor.

Grassroots communities, including peasant farmers, landless agricultural laborers, small fisherfolk, rural women, indigenous peoples and forest dwellers have right of access to productive resources, such as land, water, forests, seeds, genetic resources and indigenous knowledge. They should be given the freedom to determine their

---

The term “Peasants” henceforth refers to peasant farmers, fisherfolk, landless agricultural laborers, rural women, indigenous peoples, forest dwellers and subsistence farmers.
own means to meet their food needs. Moreover, they have the primary right to benefit foremost from the transformation of their resources done with their prior and informed consent.

It is a paradox that peasants who produce food to feed the world are the ones suffering most from hunger and malnutrition. Subsistence and sustainable agricultural systems, which for centuries have been the basis of their livelihood, are being obliterated by the concentration of land ownership in a few hands and its corporatization, as well as the encroachment of agribusiness on smallholder farms. These activities dilute the culture and way of life of peasants with the ultimate aim of profit for the few.

The globalization process, perpetuated by the G8 countries and institutionalized by the World Trade Organization (WTO), international financial institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and multilateral development banks, particularly the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, has primarily benefited a few transnational corporations (TNCs). These TNCs have gained a monopoly of our food, genetic resources and agriculture and imposed the dumping of subsidized, unhealthy food and agricultural products and inputs, including chemical pesticides and fertilizers into our countries. This has created massive indebtedness, increased landlessness and displacement leading to rural out-migration, eroded our food sovereignty, worsened land and environmental degradation including the destruction of biodiversity, the biopiracy of indigenous knowledge, pesticide poisonings and unabated land conversions for non-agricultural purposes, mega-dams, mega-projects and maldevelopment. It has further marginalized peasants particularly women and children.

The WB/IMF model of market-oriented land reform subverts national governments to implement genuine agrarian reform by imposing debt bondage. It does not aim to distribute land to the landless but rather increases the concentration of land with the landed elite. The Asian Development Bank, through its privatization program, is even attempting to transfer peasants’ rights and access to water as a public resource to private corporations and large-scale producers.

The rights of indigenous peoples are likewise on the verge of extinction with the uncertain recognition of their contributions to food security. There is a critical need to distinguish the contribution of indigenous peoples, local communities and farmers’ rights especially on their own seeds under the forthcoming International Undertaking of Plant Genetic Resources.

Peasants must be empowered to ensure the achievement of our goal of food for all. Food security can only be achieved if the world’s cultivating peasants themselves own the agricultural lands and have access to resources required for healthy and safe food production and sustainable livelihood with gender equity.
In response to the Summit commitments, peasant movements and their partner NGOs/CSOs have also been working on their own initiatives towards ensuring food security. These include:

- Policy advocacy and lobbying to sensitize and strengthen peasant movements, although there is still a need to strengthen these initiatives further.
- Sustainable development programs to raise levels of self-sufficiency and self-reliance through increasing domestic production by establishing local-level seed and grain banks, conservation of biodiversity, formulation of village plans by the villagers, land, water and forest management, low-external input, sustainable agriculture, and utilization of local resources and local and indigenous knowledge systems.
- Forging the political will to uphold the Right to Food through people’s participation, supporting efforts towards democratization, gender equity and improving agricultural services, especially in the provision of support services and proper developmental management of food and emergency aid.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that our governments:

- Adopt an international code of conduct on the human right to adequate food to govern the activities of different actors including state parties and international institutions to end malnutrition and hunger.
- Food aid should not be used as a political weapon. Governments should be accountable to guarantee the right to food of vulnerable populations including displaced persons, victims of disasters and internal conflicts, as well as refugees.
- Review the implementation of land reform programs including violations thereof and formulate and implement genuine agrarian reform founded on progressive land legislation, which ensures equitable access to resources, sustainable agriculture and gender equity.
- Ensure policies and programs that enable communities to own and manage productive resources and disallow mega development projects, which displace populations and peoples, destroy the environment, livelihoods, and indigenous cultures.
- Formulate effective strategies to combat the threats to food security and prevent the shift of the control of agriculture from producers to market forces.
- Reject the policies and practices of Bretton Woods Institutions, especially the conditionalities attached to debt relief, credits and other financial assistance.
- Rescind the WTO Agreement on Agriculture, Trade Related Agreements on Intellectual Properties (TRIPS), Sanitary Phyto-sanitary Measures (SPS).
• Oppose the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and the revived Multilateral Framework of Investments in the WTO.

• “Deglobalize” and focus on strengthening domestic economy and optimal use of local resources for local communities.

• Remove the burden of usurious debt affecting peasants particularly loans linked to the promotion of chemical-based agriculture.

• Create a public body or forum to review government expenditures and restructuring in favor of peasants and rural economies.

**We recommend that the FAO and intergovernmental organizations:**

• Adopt a World Convention on Food Sovereignty and Trade whose principles include the right of peasants and people to ensure their food and agricultural policies, food self sufficiency, control and access to land and resources, gender equity, fair prices and fair trade as well as sustainable agriculture.

• Support measures that restore food sovereignty to peasants where the people themselves can have control over the productive resources and make decisions on matters regarding their food security and discourage the establishment of corporate farms and big commercial fishing corporations.

• Recognize and operationalize farmers’ rights in the International Undertaking of Plant Genetic Resources and install mechanisms to ensure that farmers primarily benefit from their traditional knowledge and contributions and resources.

• Assess the environmental, social and economic impacts of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) on Food Security with the full and informed participation of NGOs/CSOs and prior and democratic consent of people in Southern countries and meanwhile call for a moratorium on all field-testing, commercialization and trade of GMOs in food and agriculture.

**As NGOs and CSOs, we commit to:**

• Make the right to food and food security as central to national and regional agenda without forgetting that this is a principal issue of peasants.

• Forge stronger alliance against anti-poor/peasant policies and put pressure against these entities including Transnational Corporations, World Bank, IMF, ADB and the WTO.

• Accelerate the process and implementation of genuine agrarian reform and other forms of resource rights entitlements for peasants to have control over
their way of life and for nations to strengthen its sovereign capacity to produce its own food

- Adopt a rights-based instead of the welfare approach to development work where entitlements for peasants are demanded on the basis of their rights and accountability of governments and other institutions are required because it is their duty to protect and uphold the rights of peasants.

- Continue the work of empowerment of the grassroots by raising their consciousness of their ability to secure food for themselves and their community and to preserve the community-based alternative livelihood systems that save them during times of emergencies. In addition, create awareness and understanding on the impacts of the globalization processes.

- Identify, document and publicize self-reliant, self-sufficient, sustainable production and consumption practices, programs and initiatives.

- Work towards ensuring food security and promote partnerships and linkages between urban and rural poor.

- Conscientize the general public about everyone’s role in perpetuating an unjust and unequal social economic system through our consumption practices.

**Our Calls today are:**

- Assert that all people have the right to safe and healthy food.

- Implement Land to the Tillers.8

- Adopt and celebrate a World Peasants’ Day.

- Oppose biopatenting and biopiracy.

- Demand End World Hunger. Take WTO out of Agriculture!

**NGOs/CSOs Represented in the Consultation**

**REGIONAL FOCAL POINTS** Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC), Institute for Motivating Self-Employment (IMSE), Pesticide Action Network-Asia-Pacific (PAN-AP) **BANGLADESH** Shiksha Shastha Unnayan Karzakram (SHISUK), Policy Research for Development Alternative

---

8 Land to the Tillers also include the right of peasant women to own land.
This statement from the Asian Regional Consultation of NGOs/CSOs on the World Food Summit-Five Years Later is the collective call of more than 80 NGOs from 14 countries namely, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam. The consultation was organized by the Asian NGO Coalition for Rural Development (UBINIG), Unity for Programmed Action in Coastal Lands (UPACOL), CAMBODIA Cambodian NGO Alliance for Cooperation (CNAC), HEKS Cambodia, CHINA China Association for NGO Cooperation (CANGO), INDIA Asian Institute for Rural Development (AIRD), Association of Voluntary Agencies in Rural Development (AVARD), Centre for Agrarian Research and Education (CARTE), Church’s Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA), Forum of Voluntary Organizations West Bengal, Gandhi Peace Foundation (GPF), Indian Association for the Advancement of Science (IAAS), National Alliance of People’s Movement (NAPM), South Asia Rural Reconstruction Association (SARRA), Vikas Adhyat Kendra (VAK), Voluntary Action Network India (VANI), INDONESIA Lembaga Alam Tropika Indonesia (LATIN), Kongres Wanita Indonesia (KOWANI), PAN-Indonesia, Sekretariat Petani Sumatera Utara (SPSU), Serikat Petani Jawa Tengah (SPJT), Yayasan Bina Swadaya, JAPAN Ja-Zenchu, SOUTH KOREA National Agricultural Cooperative Federation, MALAYSIA Consumers International Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (CIROAP), South East Asian Council for Food Security and Fair Trade (SEACON), Education and Research Association for Consumers (ERA Consumer), NEPAL Action Aid Nepal, All Nepal Peasants’ Association (ANPA), Community Welfare and Development Society (CWDS), National Cooperative Federation of Nepal (NCFN), NGO Federation of Nepal (NFN), Rural Reconstruction Network (RRN), PAKISTAN Peasant Development Programme, Rural Development Foundation of Pakistan (RDF), South Asia Partnership Pakistan (SAP-PK), PHILIPPINES Alternate Forum for Research in Mindanao (AFRIM), Asian Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (AsiaDHRRA), Center for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (CARRD), Pambansang Kilusang ng mga Samahang Magsasaka (PAKISAMA), Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID), Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas, Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM), Project Development Institute (PDI), Southeast Asia Regional Institute for Community Education (SEARICE), Farmer –Scientist Partnership for Development, Inc. (MASIPAG), Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas (KMP), South East Asia Rural Social Leadership Institute (SEARSOLIN), Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization- Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEAMEO-SEARCA), University of the Philippines- Department of Soil Science, SRI LANKA All Lanka Peasants Front (ALPF), Lanka Jathika Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (SARVODAYA), Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reform (MONLAR), National NGO Council of Sri Lanka (NNGOC), THAILAND Action Aid Asia, Alternative Agriculture Network, Asian Resource Foundation, Assembly of the Poor, CARE Regional Management Office- Asia, Asia Partnership for Human Development (APHD), Focus on the Global South (FOCUS), Institute for a Sustainable Agriculture Community, Northeast Alternative Network, Southern Alternative Agriculture Network, Sustainable Agriculture Foundation, Rural Reconstruction Alumni and Friends Association (RRAFA), VIETNAM Action Aid Vietnam, Rural Development Services Center (RDSC)
Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC), a regional NGO network, Pesticide Action Network in Asia-Pacific (PAN-AP) of Malaysia and the Institute for Motivating Self-Employment (IMSE) of India with the Food and Agriculture Organization Regional Office for Asia-Pacific (FAO-RAP) last 28-29 August 2001 in Bangkok, Thailand.