

30 March 2010: 10:30 to 13:00

Parallel session on Mega Program (MP) Climate Change and Agriculture

Bruce Campell introduced the session and his presentation can be viewed [HERE](#). Globally, agriculture will be negatively impacted by climate change due to increased temperatures, droughts and floods as well as sea level rise. Agriculture is also a large contributor of CO₂-emissions and hence there is a need for a more climate-proof agriculture. Opportunities exist to link farmers to carbon markets in order to reduce agriculture's emissions.

The content of the MP on climate change is proposed to cover four streams of work:

- 1) Adaptation to current climate variability and risk (e.g. seasonal forecasting, risk insurance, understanding regional food supplies, etc.)
- 2) Adaptation to progressive climate variability risk (long-terms shifts in global cropping systems)
- 3) Poverty alleviation through mitigation in agriculture (reducing CO₂-emissions, carbon storage in a pro-poor way, REDD-plus agenda)
- 4) Vulnerability assessments and policy work (to include agriculture, livestock and fisheries in climate change policy and global debate)

The place-based work would be done through the NARES and national stakeholders. In developing the MP, the focus will be at regional level to understand the priorities, develop scenarios with stakeholders and to roll-out priorities over time and place. At global level, stronger partnerships with the Climate Change community will be formed, as well as with partners having capabilities currently not available in the CGIAR system.

In a plenary discussion it was clarified that there will be climate change specific work under the other MPs. Concerns were raised about the importance of regional coordination and consultation in the further development of this MP. The past Challenge Program only focused on certain hot spots and ignored climate sensitive regions (such as Central and West Asia and North Africa). The MP is expected to address all regions. It was stressed that the MP should look at community-based adaptation and beyond food production, but focus on resilience building; the agenda for adaptation would need to be set locally.

Two rounds of interactive group work focused on:

- a) The scope of the MP, what is missing, what should be done or not be done?
- b) The regional versus global priorities and how to link these?

Key-messages from participants on the emphasis and scope of the future MP were rich and varied and included the following:

Position the program well and define added value of CG - build on previous best practices - focus on community-based adaptation and traditional knowledge systems - go beyond the food agenda - focus on resilience, livelihoods and climate forecasting for poor farmers - learn from disaster risk reduction community - emphasize land-use agenda in mitigation - do not overlook mountainous areas - use ICT for capturing and managing knowledge - build new partnerships with climate science community - establish strategic links with other MPs - build capacity of national systems - increase CG's role in global policy development, awareness raising and advocacy.

Important trade-offs were discussed, such as the need to balance the MPs activities between short-term climate risks versus progressive long-term climate risks. Questions

were raised whether to solely focus on adaptation, and perhaps - in certain areas - to not include mitigation in the MP's scope. The framing of climate change adaptation within national development planning was highlighted and the links with infrastructure, trade, disaster risk reduction and ecosystem resilience.

Working groups for Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Latin American Central and West Asia and North Africa discussed regional versus global priorities (click [HERE](#)). Common themes were the heterogeneity in the regions and the need to interpret regional models on a national and local level. Considering this heterogeneity, the MP should focus on common and scalable methodologies across sub-regions and globally. The building of capacity at national and regional level cannot be over-emphasized enough for the MP to become successful.

The final plenary focused on partnerships and funding: a mapping of research efforts and good practices was deemed necessary. Partners would need to be identified upfront and involved continuously, rather than adding for example policy makers, extension services or NGOs for dissemination at a later stage. The importance of farmer-driven innovations in extension and the increasingly better organized farmers were recognized as assets to build on. It was proposed that the regional organizations would play an important role in the priority-setting process and supporting regional and national capacity building and perhaps monitoring and evaluation.

Specific vertical climate change funds were discussed. However, since climate change is such a broad cross cutting topic, the number of such funds would become senseless. However, the agricultural research community would need to learn from for example the health and climate science community in mobilizing funds. Also, national AR4D communities could benefit from the programmatic climate change development funding, which will become available in the near future. Finally, more transparency and harmonization in climate change related research funding would benefit its efficiency and effectiveness.