



GCARD Regional consultation

Final synthesis for Europe October 2009

Dr John Irwyn RICHARDS – Agricultural Development Practice (UK)
Olivier CHARTIER – EUROQUALITY (FRANCE)

Content

- 1. INTRODUCTION..... 3**
- 2. THE GCARD CONSULTATION IN EUROPE 4**
 - 2.1 THE REVIEW 4
 - 2.2 THE E-CONSULTATION 4
 - 2.3 THE FACE-TO-FACE MEETING 4
- 3. WHAT PRIORITIES EMERGED FROM THE CONSULTATION?..... 5**
 - 3.1 WHICH RESEARCHABLE THEMES?..... 5
 - 3.2 WHICH PRIORITIES IN TERMS OF “PROCESS” OR “INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE”?..... 5
- 4. THE WAY FORWARD..... 7**
 - 4.1 WHAT CHANGES ARE REQUIRED? 7
 - 4.2 WHICH PARTNERSHIPS AND FRAMEWORKS? 8
 - 4.3 WHAT ARE THE EXPECTATIONS FROM GCARD?..... 8
- 5. CONCLUSION..... 9**
- ANNEXES 10

1. INTRODUCTION

The aims of the GCARD consultations were to solicit regional perspectives through publications and stakeholder views on ARD in preparation for the Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development 2010 (GCARD 2010) due to take place on 28-31 March 2010 in Montpellier (France)¹. Six consultations in six different regions² were implemented between July and November 2009. Each consultation was composed of three main activities: (i) a review of available literature, (ii) an e-consultation and (iii) a face-to-face workshop.

This document is the final synthesis for Europe. The challenges faced by the European reviewers were similar in many ways to those addressed by the other 5 regional review groups in so much as they were asked to identify ways to improve the contribution of agricultural research to poverty reduction within the region, and globally; however, the challenges faced by the European reviewers were also different in so much as they had to consider the fact that Europe provides the majority of donor funding for global-ARD through bilateral and multilateral channels. Thus in undertaking the synthesis, issues related to both the users/beneficiaries of ARD at the global and European levels and the suppliers of ARD funding had to be reviewed. This bottom-up/top-down challenge makes the European review findings unique particularly since the North American donor community has not partaken in the GCARD exercise

This synthesis attempts to interpret the evidence available and views expressed in the Europe Review document and from the findings of the e-consultation and the face-to-face workshop. No particular weighting is put on the information provided through these routes and we have tried to be fair and objective in synthesising the findings, discussions and outcomes of the exchanges. In so much as they may not reflect all the consolidated views expressed, we apologise for these inadvertent omissions.

In presenting the synthesis, we have taken the following approach: firstly, we define the process undertaken in reviewing the available documents and capturing the views of European stakeholders. The subsequent section identifies the priority drivers and research challenges which need to be addressed by ARD at the global level. We also identify those key research process issues which need urgent attention to significantly improve the efficiency by which ARD achieves pro-poor impact and value for money criteria. A section follows on potential ways forward for ARD – what changes need to be instituted globally and those which are needed to address the particular issues facing poor agriculturally dependent rural communities in Europe (and particularly in Eastern Europe). The section also deals with the new partnerships needed to effect change. Finally, with an input from EFARD, we propose some additional topics/actions for the draft agenda of the GCARD-2010. We also attach a comprehensive list of annexes which attempt to detail the major conclusions of the GCARD-Europe initiative.

¹ <http://www.egfar.org/egfar/website/gcard>

² (1) Asia Pacific, (2) Central Asia & the Caucasus, (3) Europe, (4) Latin America & the Caribbean, (5) Sub-Saharan Africa and (6) West Asia & North Africa.

2. THE GCARD CONSULTATION IN EUROPE

2.1 The review

[The review for Europe](#) was prepared in July 2009 by Wyn Richards and Olivier Chartier (Euroquality). It is based on an analysis of ca 60 peer-reviewed and other documents available at the time of its preparation. The report has 5 main chapters: chapter 1 identifies coherence and gaps in research priorities against development aspirations (in **what** areas do we need new knowledge?); chapter 2 looks at coherence and gaps in the implementation of ARD (**how** knowledge creation and utilisation can be better organised?); chapter 3 (and extended 21 page annex) looks at poverty issues in Europe and globally; chapter 4 identifies challenges (gaps between recommendations and implementation); and chapter 5 provides a framework for the e-consultation. The report covers the contribution of Europe to global ARD and in Europe itself (with emphasis on its contribution to poverty alleviation in South East Europe).

2.2 The e-consultation

[The e-consultation for Europe](#) started on the 2 September and ended on the 25 September 2009. More than 190 participants from 49 countries participated and around 115 messages were exchanged. In the first phase, participants were invited to introduce themselves and to share their experiences of past research with the view of identifying factors influencing successful research for development. Subsequently, participants were invited to answer five specific questions based on the findings of the Review for Europe document:

- Question 1: do you agree with the identified drivers of agricultural research?
- Question 2: does European ARD effectively support global poverty reduction?
- Question 3: does European research effectively support poverty reduction in Europe?
- Question 4: how can civil society participation be improved?
- Question 5: how can the use of research results be improved?

In the last phase of the consultation, participants were tasked with proposing one topic each to raise at the GCARD in Montpellier.

2.3 The face-to-face meeting

[The Face-to-Face GCARD-Europe workshop](#) was held in Brussels on the 29th September 2009. The workshop was attended by 55 stakeholders from Europe, one observer from AARINENA, one from FARA and one CGIAR representative. Four break-out group discussions were held on the following issues: (i) Global ARD priorities that are shared by European and developing countries; (ii) Agricultural research priorities for poverty reduction and development in Europe; (iii) How European support for ARD in developing countries can be made more effective and achieve greater impact; and (iv) Why are new or stronger partnerships necessary and how should they be structured?

Box 1: Recommendation for further consultation before the GCARD

The GCARD process in Europe was positively evaluated by participants (eg.70% positive reaction from the e-consultation³). Whereas several groups of stakeholders contributed to the meeting/e-consultation, two were not sufficiently represented: stakeholders from all sectors in East and South East Europe (particularly Russia); and representatives from the private sector. In preparation for the GCARD, we recommend that an additional workshop with stakeholders from Eastern Europe (including Russia) be organised in order to discuss the contribution of ARD on poverty issues in Europe in more detail.

³ According to the evaluation survey, 25% of the participants rated the e-consultation “excellent”, 45% “good” and 25% “average”.

3. WHAT PRIORITIES EMERGED FROM THE CONSULTATION?

3.1 Which researchable themes?

First and foremost, there was general agreement that **ARD needs to focus more on poverty reduction**. It was felt there is a need for greater clarity on the purpose of agricultural research for development; the needs of poor agriculture dependent communities (people) should be the target for ARD. With time, this investment will improve both the livelihoods of the poor and the national economy. Some suggested that ARD should be re-entitled Agricultural Research for pro-poor Development or Agricultural Research for Poverty Alleviation.

A table summarising the main drivers and challenges for ARD was prepared in the Europe Review document, commented on in the e-consultation and up-dated in the face-to-face meeting. The final table is given in the annex (Table1) followed by comments providing evidence on each issue. **Six main themes are identified** in the table. Other issues were also highlighted by stakeholders; these are summarised in Table 4 in the annex.

Box 2: Researchable themes (see Table 1 in annex for details)

In addition to the overarching need to focus research on poverty reduction, the following six issues were identified as priorities:

- Climate change – forecasting, alleviating, coping, mitigating
- Growing pressure on environment and natural resources due to growing population
- Energy security – food or energy dilemma
- Increasing demand for food and change in consumption and dietary patterns
- Plant & animal diseases; forecasting and coping with pandemics
- Globalisation – ensuring the poor are not disadvantaged

3.2 Which priorities in terms of “process” or “institutional change”?

Arguably, the most important outcome of the European consultations was agreement on **the need to radically strengthen the processes which influence the way research is conducted** – the so-called ‘how’ issues. These range from the need for far greater donor collaboration to the need to introduce new incentives to encourage researchers to generate products that are more readily accessible to users. These process issues are presented in detail in Table 2 (see annex). Consistent key priorities emerging from the Europe Review, the e-consultation and the face-to-face meeting can be captured in six “keywords”:

Prioritisation: there is need for more effort to address pro-poor agricultural research. This can be done by **prioritising poverty** issues in the research agendas.

Coordination: particularly between all donors involved in international ARD. There is a need to compose a simple global map to indicate the roles, responsibilities and particular expertise of the ARIs, IARCs, the NARS/NARES, the regional/national agricultural fora/associations and hubs, the donor groups (multilateral, bilateral, private sector and

Foundations), the NGOs and the commercial sector etc. Greater awareness of ‘who does what best’, and the (potential) linkages between them, would help promote coordination, reduce duplication and improve the effectiveness of agricultural research for pro-poor development.

Continuity: in order to contribute effectively to the sustainability of efforts aimed at poverty alleviation, there is need for greater continuity of research. The length of research programmes/projects should vary much more according to the challenge posed (whether the research is basic, adaptive or applied and on the perceived output and outcome) than according to the availability of funding and the 3 year mentality.

Partnerships, there is need for greater and more diverse cross-sector partnerships, eg. between agriculture and human health, education, infrastructure, business; more Public Private Partnerships; between Researchers and Users; more North-South and South-South; between value chain institutions and researchers; stronger partnerships with the media etc.

Incentives: there is a need for new incentives for researchers and their partners to ‘translate’ and ‘deliver’ research products to users; (this will also need additional training as researchers and their colleagues seldom have the required skills for this). We also need incentives to transform ‘old’ research findings and complementary information (eg. small farm business management) into use and to facilitate greater and more diverse partnerships.

Communication: more focus on knowledge management and in communicating research finding in the appropriate manner to discreet audiences - value chain members, the media, policy makers etc. Also need far bigger budgets to professionalise communications - to facilitate market research up-front and product marketing at end. The private sector spend at least one-third of its research budget on communications and market research – why not public research?

Box 3: Top 6 priorities in terms of process & institutional changes (see Table 2 in annex for details)

• Pro-poor agricultural research not sufficiently prioritised	=> Prioritisation
• Poor coordination of donors and scientific communities	=> Coordination
• Irrelevance of short term research to poverty alleviation	=> Continuity (of action)
• Insufficient global and national partnerships	=> Partnerships
• No incentives for change	=> Incentives (for researchers)
• Poor communication	=> Communication

A number of other “process issues” were raised in the consultation. We give them less importance as they were not consistently raised in the three stages of the consultation. They include for example:

Monitoring and Evaluation (M+E) is a key research tool to enable management to learn what works in research processes and change things when required. There is need for researchers to embrace the monitoring of their activities as a welcome management aid tool. Again, a greater proportion of research budget should be spent on M+E than is currently the case – and more critical decisions made (such as early closure of projects in some cases or provision of supplementary project funding in others) based on evidence such as achievement of target indicators.

Data collection: there is need for more reliable historical and contemporary data and greater statistical rigour– only by collecting current information and contrasting it with reliable historical data can ARD be an evidence-based activity.

Innovation: this might include dealing with value chains, not only farmers; ensuring research is people-centred, not commodity-centred; using ICT and other ‘smart’ communication tools; working with new partners particularly cross-sector and public-private.

Other institutional and process issues were raised by several stakeholders and we have tried to capture these in Table 4.

4. THE WAY FORWARD

4.1 What changes are required?

In terms of research “topics” (what do we need new knowledge in?), the consultation indicated that the most important change needed is to set poverty reduction as the overarching objective for agricultural research. This means, for instance, that the needs of poor people should be taken more into account in research programming and the current focus on commodities more considered. Under this “umbrella objective”, six main issues were identified by the consultation process– see Box 2 and Tables 1 and 4

In terms of “process” (how do we create and use knowledge more effectively?), the consultation revealed that changes are needed at all levels of the agricultural research system (research programming, research implementation, innovation etc.). A number of ideas, summarised in “six keywords” (prioritisation, coordination, continuity, partnership, incentives and communication) were proposed – see Box3 and Tables 2 and 4

A key challenge remains in the few months preceding the GCARD on how to integrate the findings from the regional GCARD documents with those from the on-going CGIAR reform process - the “[CGIAR Strategy and Mega Programs](#)”. However we would suggest that the findings of the GCARD provides the framework for the particular contribution of the reformed CGIAR as it does for all the other public and private sector institutions involved in ARD.

Perhaps the most important message from the consultation in Europe is the urgent need to start initiatives on improving agricultural research for poverty reduction in eastern Europe. It appears that the incidence and prevalence of relative and absolute poverty in Europe are on the increase – particularly in rural locations and city slums. The consultation revealed that the concerns of poor farming communities in Europe have been relatively neglected by the European ARD community, including by EFARD itself. However, partly as a consequence of the GCARD Europe initiative, EFARD has already proposed to include agriculture in Eastern Europe in its future agenda, in addition to addressing poverty in ‘the south’. The consultation helped to raise a number of specific concerns (see Box 4 and Table 3 in annex) but more work is required to identify more detailed research challenges; this could be done, for example, by

convening a session at the GCARD on poverty issues in Europe and the possible contribution of agricultural research to their resolution. Other “topics” and “processes” identified by the European stakeholders but not highlighted as priorities in this synthesis (see Table 4) may resonate more with those from other regions.

Box 4: Poverty issues in Europe (see Table 3 in annex for details)

The consultation demonstrated the relative disinterest of the ARD community on poverty issues in Europe. A number of issues of particular concern to poor smallholder farmers in Eastern Europe were identified (e.g. smallholder productivity, isolation of researchers, rural unemployment, social exclusion etc.). It is proposed that a session be dedicated to poverty issues in Europe at the GCARD.

4.2 Which partnerships and frameworks?

The issue of partnerships was enthusiastically debated at the face-to-face workshop. It was recommended that new partnerships be developed between Europe and developing countries - beyond the researcher community. An example of an efficient EU/Africa strategic alliance is the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD) and there are lessons to be learnt from this. EFARD, with the support of EIARD, is encouraged to develop strategic alliances with the different regional ARD fora, as was done with FARA for PAEPARD. It was also proposed that effort be expended in reinforcing the existing partnerships which work but could do better if given more resources and encouragement by donors. There is need for better alignment of partnerships at different levels (e.g. linking the international system to local-level research) and for new approaches to partnerships with the private sector and partnerships between relevant disciplines -agriculture, health, environment, social reforms, infrastructure etc. Stronger linkages between ICT and agriculture are also recommended; such an approach has already been successful in the health sector. Another need is to transform the lessons learned into a toolkit for generating more successful ARD partnerships.

4.3 What are the expectations from GCARD?

The results of the consultations in the six regions should help the organisers of the GCARD define the agenda in order to ensure appropriate actions come out of Montpellier. It is important that the agenda builds on the “the prioritised research needs and process issues” coming out of the consultations and focuses its attention on “how to implement changes in ARD”. GCARD Montpellier provides an unique opportunity to advance the contribution of agricultural research to poverty alleviation – so needs to transform rhetoric into action.

EFARD would like GCARD to consider how ARD can be directed to address the needs of the poor, taking account of the livelihood needs of smallholder farmers, food security of both consumers and producers and sustainable management of natural resources. EFARD recognises the roles, responsibilities and unique skills of the different bodies involved in agricultural research – donors, ARIs, IARCs, NARS, Universities, CSOs, farmers' organisations and private sector, and the need for innovative partnerships to face growing challenges. A key question is how we can create incentives for research directed to the poorest and for the cross-sectoral partnerships required to get research into use? Finally, we urge GCARD to recognise that although poverty is much more prevalent in developing countries it is also a growing problem in Europe. Adding a development dimension to agricultural research in Europe is a new challenge requiring innovative approaches.

5. CONCLUSION

The consultation in Europe on global ARD identified six main drivers and associated researchable issues and six main priorities in terms of process & institutional change. As the principal global donor to ARD, the lack of coordination between the various European public and private institutions involved was a dominant theme in the publications reviewed and at stakeholder interactions.

In Europe itself, the review revealed a diversity of development and agricultural issues facing rural farmers. Whereas levels of absolute poverty are low, relative poverty levels are high and increasing. A major recommendation of the consultation is the need to embark on an ARD initiative for the Eastern European region where absolute poverty is more significant, particularly in the rural areas. We propose that a session on how to tackle this new challenge be convened at GCARD.

The forthcoming synthesis of the regional consultations by the global consultants, together with the analysis of the CGIAR “Strategy and Mega Programs” will help to identify entry points for discussions at the GCARD. Whereas much effort has already been put into preparing the conference agenda, we feel it important that the GCARD should not repeat discussion on the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ issues already prioritised – but focus more on an action plan for the future.

The feedback from the participants who contributed to the GCARD consultations in Europe was very positive overall despite the limited time that was available for its preparation and its unfortunate coincidence with the summer holiday period in Europe. A clear weakness was the minimal reference to issues of relevance to poor farmers from Belarus, Russia and Ukraine in the review and the poor participation of stakeholders from East and South East Europe in both the e-consultation and the face-to-face workshop. Therefore, we propose that an additional meeting of representatives from these countries be organised before the 2010-GCARD. Another weakness was the poor involvement of representatives from the private sector in the process. Once the synthesis of all six regional consultations is completed and available, it might be useful to organise an e-consultation with the private sector on ARD issues to encourage their greater involvement.

ANNEXES

Table 1. Common drivers & research challenges for ARD at global and European levels (not in priority order)

Problem	Research issue?	Shared interest Europe & DECs	Actually covered by ARD?	How to improve?	Can results be easily put into use
CLIMATE CHANGE	Yes Complex and controversial issues	Yes Viewpoints and interests might differ	Yes Beginning	Connect climate scientists with ARD scientists for better coherence .Connect agriculture and forestry	To be filled through consultation. Adaptation guidance easier to adopt than mitigation in the South
GROWING PRESSURE ON ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES DUE TO GROWING POPULATION	Yes Being addressed through many disciplines	Pressure on environment in Europe due to variety of other reasons	Yes	More on management of NR Link social and political sciences (trans-boundary water, irrigation management...) Land grabbing	Research to produce evidence for policy Social engineering unlikely to work in democratic countries To be filled through consultation
ENERGY SECURITY	Yes Biofuels, energy efficiency, alternative sources, etc. Low input systems More energy efficient agricultural systems Relevance to the poor	Yes But different viewpoints (fuel vs. food)	To a low extent (biofuels...)	Through Policy Development .Research should generate evidence to resolve controversy on the consequences of fuel vs. food and on the relevance to the food security of the poor	Evidence to guide policy PPP opportunities
INCREASING DEMAND FOR FOOD AND CHANGE IN CONSUMPTION AND DIETARY PATTERNS	Yes Link ARD with nutrition	Yes Food security Nutrition and Food safety	Yes for food security Newer for food safety and nutrition	Link ARD with health research Link with research in education, awareness raising Value chain and private activities	To be filled through consultation
PLANT & ANIMAL DISEASES, PANDEMICS	Yes Diagnostic tools Pest /disease preparedness risk framework	Yes Global problem	Yes Beginning at large global scale	Information sharing, communication, coordination	Develop public goods Public – private collaboration (large pharmaceutical firms) To be filled through consultation
GLOBALISATION	Yes. Huge political debate rooted in strong vested interests. Need to illustrate 'benefits' to the poor – eg on food and commodity prices	Yes	Yes partially Insufficient		Advising for policies with very strong potential impact

Comments on the table

Climate Change

- **Africa:** Agricultural production, including access to food, in many African countries and regions is projected to be severely compromised by climate variability and change. The area suitable for agriculture, the length of growing seasons and yield potential, particularly along the margins of semi-arid and arid areas, are expected to decrease. This would further adversely affect food security and exacerbate malnutrition in the continent. In some countries, yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50% by 2020.

- **Asia:** Glacier melt in the Himalayas is projected to increase flooding, and rock avalanches from destabilised slopes, and to affect water resources within the next two to three decades. This will be followed by decreased river flows as the glaciers recede. Freshwater availability in Central, South, East and Southeast Asia is projected to decrease due to climate change which could adversely affect more than a billion people by the 2050s. It is projected that crop yields could increase up to 20% in East and Southeast Asia while they could decrease up to 30% in Central and South Asia by the mid-21st century. *IPCC 2007*

- **Emissions from Agriculture.** Need to put our house (agriculture) in order. Agriculture's average contribution to global emissions of CO₂, N₂O, CH₄ etc are substantial (in excess of 10 billion tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per year) or ca 17% of all greenhouse gasses emitted (*Cool Farming 2009*). Other estimates reveal a contribution of one-third from global agriculture.

Population control and:

- **Food insecurity issues;** there are several causes for the current concerns about food insecurity, but it is primarily due to unprecedented population growth. According to the US Census Bureau, the global population in 2000 had already reached 6bn, having grown by 138% in the previous 50 years. It expects global population to expand by another 50%, or approximately 3bn people, in the next 30 years. In 2050, Africa and Asia are estimated to comprise 20% and 60% of the global population respectively while developed nations will have twice as many elderly people as young.

-**Improved water resource management** By 2020, between 75 and 250 million people are projected to be exposed to an increase in water stress due to climate change. So as the world's population grows and incomes rise, farmers will, if they use today's methods, need a great deal more water: perhaps more than 2,000 cubic kilometres a year by 2030, according to the International Water Management Institute. Yet in many farming regions, water tables are falling with increased demand and water is likely to get scarcer as global warming worsens.

-**Protecting/conserving the environment.** The challenge faced by all governments, companies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) is how to stimulate economic growth and profitability as well as promoting environmental sustainability. Sustainable consumption and production has to be the way forward.

-**Degradation/Land sustainability issues** -Neither the land available for cultivation nor agricultural productivity has increased sufficiently to meet demand. Globally, an estimated 12.3 million to 19.7 million acres of farmland, out of a global total of 3.7 billion acres (ca 5%), is believed to fall fallow every year because of deteriorating quality. At the same time erosion, salinisation and desertification are all further reducing the amount of cultivable land. Recent studies predict that developing countries could lose 135 million hectares of arable land over the next half century due to erosion, declining water tables and encroaching number of settlements. **It is estimated that one hectare of productive land is lost every 7.67 seconds, which currently stands at 8.6bn ha globally.** Climate change, desertification, natural disasters and human activity such as deforestation have all contributed to the loss of productive land whether arable, pasture or forest. Arable land covers 3% of the world's surface. Despite the fact that this land is continually being lost to urbanisation, the total area under cultivation is rising because of deforestation which is an unsustainable practice.

- **Decreasing land available for farming** -Despite the demand, per capita land availability for food production is expected to decrease significantly in coming years (by approximately 33% by 2050), according to the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations Statistical database (FAOSTAT). Indeed in the past 50 years, the total area of worldwide arable land has expanded by only 9% to 1,380m hectares. Forecasts for the next 50 years suggest that only the same rate of growth in farmed acreage is likely. In other words, **most of the worldwide accessible, available land that is suitable for agricultural purposes has already been exploited.** In the 1980s, the amount of land under cultivation began to fall for the first time since human beings began to farm around the Tigris and Euphrates. It continues to fall today, losing topsoil to development, erosion, and desertification. Hence, good quality farm land is in short supply. Not only is land suitable for farming decreasing, so are the number of middle sized farms - but the number of small and large farms is increasing.

Energy security

-The utilisation of land to grow crops for energy supply as opposed to food generally at variance with needs of the poor. Governments need to be convinced that provision of food in developing countries should not be compromised by generation of crops for fuel. Research needs to identify the pros and cons of energy crops on the fate of the poor.

Food security

-**Demand patterns** - Overall global food demand is increasing as the global population rises, with standards of living also on the rise (particularly in BRIC countries) which in turn increases the demand for high protein and high quality food (crop and animal products) eg the Chinese economy is forecast to grow by circa 8.5% over the next year.

-**Food consumption, production and fertilizer use patterns** - . Global grain **consumption** has risen by 8% or about 160 million tonnes over the past six years, while grain **production** has only risen by about 6% or about 110 million tonnes. Indeed global food consumption has exceeded production for 8 of the last 9 crop seasons (source: World Agricultural Summit 2009).However, demand for grain has to be met from a land base that has little room from which to grow. This is one reason why fertiliser demand over the same period increased by over 10% or by almost 15 million nutrient tonnes.

-**Food security – the World is running out of food and water! More food to meet demand is expected to be grown on less land and with less water.** Due to the effects of climate change, international energy concerns, geopolitical tensions causing the potential for disruption to domestic food supplies, the issue of **food security** will remain a prevailing theme.

Pandemics – prediction and response

-The recent emergence of global pandemics – mostly zoonoses- is a worrying trend particularly in that they arrive unexpectedly. Need for veterinary and medical research to collaborate to focus on mechanisms to identify early warning signs, to predict spread and reduce impact of such diseases – as they particularly impact on poor mal-nourished communities.

Globalisation and its effect on food and input prices and food reserves

- Key macro drivers which affect agricultural price volatility are population growth, changes in supply and demand, exchange rates, the oil price, financial markets and speculative fund positions and government trade policy (for example, the ‘decoupling’ reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy). Reserve grain stocks have declined to their lowest level since 1948 against a backdrop of protectionism in the form of tariffs and subsidies and rising input prices such as fertilisers and seeds.

Table2. Priority institutional changes needed to improve the contribution of agricultural research for pro-poor development in Europe and in developing countries

PROBLEM /TITLE	DESCRIPTION	WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE?	HOW CAN CHANGE BE EFFECTED?	WHAT WILL BE THE SHORT- AND LONG-TERM BENEFITS?
1. PRO-POOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH NOT SUFFICIENTLY PRIORITISED	Irrelevance of much agricultural research to needs of the rural poor	More effort to address pro-poor demand-led research	Eg. Need to empower the poor to articulate their needs; need donors and research administrators to be more explicit.	S - More resources address needs of the poor. L- Productivity and livelihoods of rural poor increase.
2. POOR COORDINATION OF DONOR AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITIES	Most bilateral donors work independently. Most scientific institutions work independently	Benefits of closer collaboration need to be illustrated to donor and scientific communities	Eg. By lobbying donor groups to work more closely on common pro-poor research issues. Produce global map of who does what?	S- More funding directed at key issues affecting the poor. L- Better value for money
3. IRRELEVANCE OF SHORT-TERM RESEARCH PROGRAMMING TO PRO-POOR RESEARCH	The 3year research project mentality which dominates research not appropriate for pro-poor development	Need greater mix of project durations to address specific development challenges – from 3 months to 10 years.	Programming to be more sensitive to demand – from short-term urgent ‘fix’ to more long-term sustainable field project.	S- Greater buy-in from target audience L- Greater likelihood of collaboration and adoption of research products by poor communities
4. INSUFFICIENT GLOBAL AND NATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS	Partnerships between public and private sectors, between agriculture and other sectors and with civil society institutions poor	Need to change mind sets of all researchers to become more inclusive in their approach to poverty reduction – more people-centred as opposed to commodity research	Eg. By illustrating benefits of stronger and wider partnerships through case studies	S- Greater relevance of research to poor communities. L- Livelihoods of poor communities addressed – not solely those of commodity productivity.
5. NO INCENTIVES FOR CHANGE	No incentives in place to induce researchers to go the ‘last mile’.	Eg. Incentives required to transform ‘old’ and ‘new’ research into suites of pro-poor products that are understandable to discreet users. Changes in researchers value systems is needed as they are mostly based on publications	Donors and research administrators need to develop performance criteria which encourage researchers to undertake pro-poor research and to ‘deliver’ the products	S- More pro-poor research undertaken L- More research findings reach users ; increased benefits of research to development ; greater vfm
6. POOR COMMUNICATIONS	Amateur approach and low funding given to public-sector research communication – including extension services	More resources and professionalism to improve/innovative communications approaches - to undertake market research and to disseminate research findings to discreet audiences.	Eg. Change mind sets of donors and research administrators by illustrating benefits of greater investments in communications	S- More research findings disseminated to target audiences L- Greater levels of adoption of research. Greater value for money.

PROBLEM /TITLE	DESCRIPTION	WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE?	HOW CAN CHANGE BE EFFECTED?	WHAT WILL BE THE SHORT- AND LONG-TERM BENEFITS?
INADEQUATE/INEFFECTIVE M+E	Weak decision taking during course of research leads to poor delivery	Convince researchers that M+E key management tool to learn what works in research process - and change things if needed	Eg. Change mind-sets of researchers to embrace M+E through promoting field examples of its value to pro-poor agric. research	S- Early management decisions made on go/no-go L – Greater effectiveness of research and vfm
INADEQUATE QUALITY DATA AND EVIDENCE	Insufficient historical or contemporary data available to make decisions on priority research issues and/or impact	More focus on generating quality scientific evidence - greater role for field biometry of relevance to the developing world; and mining historical data	Eg. Greater involvement in smart data gathering and more training in applied statistical packages of relevance to pro-poor situations	S- Better decision making. More confidence in baselines and in impact of research innovations. L- Confidence in data leads to greater levels of adoption
LACK OF INNOVATION	Reluctance to take risk and try out innovative approaches to development by researchers and users.	Where conventional approaches no longer appropriate, need for research to be more innovative (new technologies, policies, practices and new partnerships)	Eg. More incentives put in place to innovate. Promotion of successful case studies.	S- New products to excite users L- Some innovations likely to effect radical change and improve livelihoods of the poor.

Table 3. Thematic and process issues of particular concerns to poor smallholder farmers in Eastern Europe

THEME OR PROCESS	DEFINE PROBLEM	HOW CAN RESEARCH HELP?	WHAT ELSE CAN BE DONE?	WHAT WILL THE OUTCOME LOOK LIKE?
ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF THE RURAL POOR (pp31-35 and Annex I – Europe Review doc)	Current agric. research largely focused on food safety and other issues related to joining the EU – and not on poverty reduction	By undertaking people (poor farmer) centred research rather than commodity or EU conformation based research	Urban poverty issues also much neglected and need to be addressed urgently by research and Govts (and the EU)	Enhanced ability of the poor to articulate and overcome poverty.
RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT (pp31-34 and Annex I, Europe Review doc)	Income generation from small farms insufficient to sustain reasonable livelihoods. Problem common in many developing countries too.	By innovating rural non-farm employment opportunities as complementary/diverse income stream to farm employment.	Research to facilitate greater participation with private industry and with Govt. to initiate rural based industries to sustain rural communities through employment	Diversified employment opportunities sustain rural communities – or provide guidance to exit farming.
INPUT COSTS (pp29 and Annex 1– Europe Review doc)	Escalating costs of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides	By generating guidance on best farm practices to cope with diminishing affordability of these inputs	Lobby government to provide subsidies to poor farmers to purchase inputs	Sustained/increased production despite increase in input costs

THEME OR PROCESS	DEFINE PROBLEM	HOW CAN RESEARCH HELP?	WHAT ELSE CAN BE DONE?	WHAT WILL THE OUTCOME LOOK LIKE?
SMALLHOLDER PRODUCTIVITY (pp32+34, Europe Review doc)	Research too commodity or disciplinary biased and not focused on the small farm system	Need for technological packages to improve husbandry and productivity of smallholder systems	Farm business training and advisory services required to complement technological packages	Increased production from small holdings and greater contribution to livelihoods of the poor
POOR COMMUNICATIONS	Extension of information to farmers in Europe not effective	Critical to understand the needs for information of the several discreet audiences involved between poor farmers and consumers.	Revitalise the advisory services to address needs of farmers and other value chain institutions	Professional approach adopted to communication leads to high levels of adoption of research products by users.
SOCIAL EXCLUSION ISSUES	Marginalisation of the old, the young and women in particular in poor rural communities due to poor access to economic resources and services.	More inclusive research required to include social reform packages as well as agricultural and technological fixes.	Stronger and more innovative partnerships formed between sectors (agriculture, education, health, social services etc) at ministry and 'field' levels	Greater contribution of all members of rural society to development and poverty reduction.
ISOLATION OF RESEARCHERS (pp	Agric researchers have been isolated from global dialogue and partnership for many years	Change in process needs investigating.	More encouraging hand of collaboration from Western Govts would help	No need to reinvent wheels. Application/promotion of information from elsewhere. More effective contribution to development
DOMINANCE OF TRANSITION CHANGE ISSUES, 1990 -> (pp31-35, Europe Review doc)	Political and economic reform changes dominate Govt. policies. Greater inequality of poverty.	By prioritizing research issues which affect rural agricultural communities	Dealing with the 'political irrelevance' of the poor through greater advocacy.	Increased focus of attention on the R+D needs of resource-poor farmers and associated rural communities
INADEQUATE FUNDING OF PRO-POOR RESEARCH	Inability to change research approach due to low investment in research by public and private sector.	Focus on demand-led research rather than basic research. Exchange/share databases with western European countries; promote researcher mobility/training; co-finance purchase of equipment/consumables	Need for greater advocacy. More lobbying of Govt and private sector to promote the benefits of investments in agric. research. (EU providing some support through FP7 Capacity Programme but more needed.	Research able to address national poverty issues. Reduced levels of 'brain drain and 'brain-waste'.

Table 4. Additional key thematic issues raised/discussed – remaining gaps in research

PROBLEM OR DRIVER	HOW CAN RESEARCH HELP?	IS IT A SHARED INTEREST IN EUROPE AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES?	IS IT CURRENTLY ADDRESSED BY ARD? GAPS?	HOW CAN RESEARCH BE IMPROVED IN THIS AREA?	CAN RESULTS BE PUT INTO USE EASILY	WHAT WILL OUTPUT + OUTCOME LOOK LIKE?
POOR ACCESS TO MICRO-CREDIT	Finding ways to improve the provision of all forms of financial services (credit, insurance) for poor rural communities is highly researchable	Common to a number of Eastern European countries and developing countries	Only a modicum. Appears to be a gap.	Closer linkages with private and public institutions that provide financial services - micro-credit, insurance etc	Yes – although the benefits/costs of financial services need to be clearly explained to potential users.	Greater investment in agriculture leading to innovation, risk taking and development
NARROW APPROACH TO PRO-POOR AGRICULTURE	Research restricted to sub-components of the production system typical mixed-farm enterprise more difficult to address than single commodity approach – but systems research highly researchable	Reductionist tendencies in global research -have resulted in poor understanding of integrated nature of on-farm production systems.	Very little – needs boosting	Greater integration between disciplines and promotion of applied farm system research	Yes, provided the results are presented to users in a simple integrated (what-if scenario)manner	More resilient and sustainable innovations on farms
WASTAGE OF RESOURCES AND COMMODITIES	Highly researchable	Yes – a global issue driven largely by ignorance	No. It doesn't appear in ARD priorities	More systems research to assess the wastage and the contribution of processors	Usually yes if financial benefits can be illustrated	More food and input resources available for consumption/sale and use
POOR DISTRIBUTION AND TRANSPORTATION	Highly researchable area. Particularly the economics of commodity transportation to users, processors and markets can increase prices by >60%	Issue of concern to isolated rural communities in eastern Europe as well as the developing world	Yes – but not significantly so.	Engagement by agricultural researchers with infrastructure, processing and marketing institutions.	Yes – provided researchers work closely with the local/national transportation industry	Result in greater access by the poor to cheaper agricultural inputs and to commodity markets
IS GM RELEVANT TO THE POOR FARMER?	20 of the 25 countries sowing GM seeds are in the emerging markets. Brazil, India and the Philippines are investing heavily in the "gene revolution." Need research to determine relevance to poor farmers	Yes although legal constraints exist against the use of GM in certain countries	Don't know	Need for researchers and policy makers to take an objective approach to assess economic and other benefits /disadvantages of GM crops to the country.	Farmers may be more positive than government	Evidence to date suggests that GM based crops only of value to commercial farmers. Little evidence of use of GM or their value to small farmers – but need for objective research.
ACCESSING DATA AND INFORMATION ON TECHNOLOGIES, PRACTICES, POLICIES	Much shelf-based information in need of research to mine its value for ARD – and reduce the frequency of 'reinventing wheels.'	Yes, common problem globally. Eg the slewing effect of the BRIC countries on mean cereal production in the developing world.	Don't know but suspect very little done as donor funds do not encourage this topic.	Need mix of knowledge managers, agricultural researchers and communications professionals to implement this work	Yes, potential quick wins and good value for money.	Reduction in duplication of research, rapid production of research innovation, potential for producing suites of finding for selection by users, sense of completion of research investments

PROBLEM OR DRIVER	HOW CAN RESEARCH HELP?	IS IT A SHARED INTEREST IN EUROPE AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES?	IS IT CURRENTLY ADDRESSED BY ARD? GAPS?	HOW CAN RESEARCH BE IMPROVED IN THIS AREA?	CAN RESULTS BE PUT INTO USE EASILY	WHAT WILL OUTPUT + OUTCOME LOOK LIKE?
PRODUCTION of APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS	By identifying the relevant mix of production, social and sustainability indicators which encourage small farmers to engage with research and adopt research products.	Yes, agric productivity indices (eg. output/ha or /unit investment) not always compatible with pro-poor agriculture.	Don't think so	Appropriate and achievable indices need to be identified by research which are compatible with both agricultural research and the development of the community.	Yes.	Higher adoption rates by users of new technologies and practices
GENDER AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION	By investigating the influence of segregating youth, women and the older generation in rural society on its resilience and survival.	Yes, particularly between rural communities in eastern Europe and the developing world.	Yes – but inadequate	Research needs to address the needs of the wider rural community - be more people-centred research rather than commodity centred	Yes	Greater inclusion by segregated members of society in development and consequently greater sustainability.
URBANISATION CHALLENGES	By investigating how land shortage in rural communities oblige many young people to 'emigrate' to urban centres in search of work	Yes, although the problem is better articulated in Europe as rural unemployment rather than urbanization.	Very little	Focus research on non-farm rural employment options and engage with private and government sectors to establish more rural industries	Yes	Reduced emigration and greater development of rural communities and sustainability of rural environments.
PERCEPTION OF RESEARCH IN SOCIETY	Researchers need to embark on a charm offensive to cultivate better linkages with other members of a value chain.	Yes, accusation that researchers tend to be top-down and arrogant fairly universal	No	Greater emphasis on 'listening' and in demand-led research agendas	Yes, theoretically	Greater buy-in from participators of field research and users of research findings.
UNCERTAIN ROLE OF AGRICULTURE IN DEVELOPMENT.	By illustrating the benefits of agricultural research (and better agriculture) to poverty reduction through evidence-based examples.	Yes, a global issue.	No	Need to promote the role of agriculture in development through greater advocacy – to Govt. , decision makers and the media.	Yes, theoretically	More funding
POOR LINKAGES BETWEEN EDUCATION , MEDICINE, AND AGRICULTURE	Case studies that illustrate the benefits of inclusive research on the livelihoods of rural communities cf agricultural research alone.	Yes, a global issues	Very little	Bring together sectors and agree on priority pro-poor issues in need of resolution – and devise cross- sector research plan accordingly.	Yes by users – but faces much reluctance from researchers	By dealing with these 3 critical issues in an integrated way, there is a greater likelihood that research will have positive impact on poverty reduction