21ST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

31 JULY 2008 – 1 AUGUST 2008

Draft Minutes of the 21st GFAR Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of the GFAR 21st Steering Committee Meeting held on 31st July and 1st August 2008 at Hotel Radisson, Montevideo

The participants of the GFAR 21st Steering Committee Meeting are listed in Annex 1.

Welcome Remarks by the Chair

The meeting was opened by Prof. Adel El-Beltagy, Chair, GFAR. In his introductory remarks he welcomed the participants to the meeting and thanked the hosts, FORAGRO, Dr Mario Allegri and Dr Enrique Alarcón for arranging the GFAR Steering Committee Meeting at Montevideo and for the substantial and valuable discussions during the FORAGRO meeting. He mentioned the global food crises and the need to deliver new knowledge effectively to end users. He also welcomed Sra. Maria Teresa Dobao of INIA, who was representing EFARD and Dr Pamela Anderson, DG of CIP, who was representing the CGIAR Alliance in the meeting.

1. Adoption of Agenda for the Meeting


The draft agenda for the meeting was reviewed. Upon Dr Cooke’s request, as he was scheduled to depart later in the day, this agenda was modified to address Item 5 on GFAR and the CGIAR Change Management Process, prior to all other Agenda items. At the request of other members, on the second day, the agenda item on “Global Advocacy: Maputo 2008, High Level Meeting and Major Conferences 2009” was moved to follow discussions on “Shaping Tomorrow’s agriculture Today: Putting GFAR Business plan into Action”. Item 8 was deferred for consideration at the next meeting due to pressures of time. The adopted agenda of the GFAR 21st Steering Committee Meeting is attached as Annex 2.

5. GFAR and the CGIAR Change Management Process


The Chair outlined GFAR’s response to the CGIAR Change Management process and ran through the paper ‘The CGIAR and the Global Forum for International Agricultural Research’ which had been prepared previously with input from the Steering Committee. The paper was now formally endorsed without change.

Dr Cooke summarized the CGIAR Change Management process, emphasizing that he saw the transformation of the CGIAR as a key aspect of GFAR’s work in facilitating research for development. He described how this process responded to a recognition that support to the system had stagnated and become increasingly restricted, despite the recognized importance of agricultural research. Dr Cooke then described the series of working groups and planning meetings that were leading to recommendations for consideration by the CGIAR Executive Council and then the CGIAR AGM. He emphasized that this required a new output-oriented research agenda that addressed targets based on regional importance and key production systems, delivering towards development targets rather
than research outputs. He also described how the use of science to achieve development objectives would be the focus of a proposed science forum in 2009.

Prof El-Beltagy questioned whether the new CGIAR would better serve the other constituents in agricultural research for development? He invited comment from around the table:

**CGIAR and partner’s perspectives**

**IFAP**

Mr Wilkinson emphasized the need for research on new agendas such as climate change and asked how the review was looking at system effectiveness in furthering the adoption and use of current research to ensure that research outputs reached to farmers. He emphasized the need to show relevance and effectiveness on the ground and highlighted that the Latin America & Caribbean region was showing how having farmers as integral to research organizations was delivering real impact.

**CACAARI**

Dr Avetisyan supported this point, emphasizing that farmers were not feeling the results of research today. He requested that the CGIAR system paid attention to establishing, and keeping updated, a knowledge bank of agricultural innovation ideas, available to all. He also emphasized that innovation from farmers should be more highly valued and disseminated via GFAR.

**APAARI**

Dr Ghodake considered the current change management process to be restrictive and over-defensive. The focus should be on how research contributes to world development and he felt that the system should be opened out for wider participation.

**FORAGRO**

Dr Alarcón questioned the timescale and asked what was required of GFAR this year. He emphasized that the Regional Fora wanted to play a role, addressing the 4-5 main priorities of each region. The Regional Fora looked to GFAR as a mechanism for all, to provide a vehicle to take these recommendations through to policy makers etc., but recognizing also that these processes take time to come to fruition.

**NAFAR**

Dr Davidson pointed out that, rather than investing unrestricted funds, donors had made their own decisions by going direct to specific researchers to solve a problem. Many CGIAR researchers are now fully funded through their own efforts, which also made a system-based approach harder to organize.
AARINENA

Dr Hamdan queried how the change would affect CG relations with GFAR, the stakeholders and the Regional Fora? Their interactions were considered mixed and unclear at present.

Dr Cooke responded that the problem of some donors buying just the services they wanted was recognized and that the process required involvement of all partners in transforming research systems to achieve deliverable impacts. The role of farmers was recognized by IFAD also, through their farmer’s forum and it was important that farmers became actively engaged in international research.

Governance and innovation systems

Dr Wang highlighted the change process and emphasized that the CG system wanted strong voices from stakeholders to give a sharp focus to activities. The process is now at a critical stage, with options for funding, governance and mobilizing partnerships on the table. Involvement of national programmes to date had been limited as there was as yet no substance to be discussed, but this would change as options became clearer. Dr Wang requested that GFAR’s constituents acted quickly on the findings and discussion as these were released, so that change could be smoothly achieved. He questioned whether a new system could be achieved without changing the organizational and governance structure of the Centers and requested GFAR input on center governance structures also. Other issues for consideration were determining the limits of what could be covered under the proposed fund and that there was a wider need for a global fund for ARD that GFAR should work to pursue.

FARA

Dr Kyetere emphasized that some of these governance changes were already happening among the Centers in Africa with greater coordination between Centers. He expected to see these reflected in outcomes.

Dr Wang then outlined various new governance models put forward, which reflected a desire for more system-based operation, but with various degrees of independence for the Centers. Most discussion of funding was revolving around a new central multidonor fund. He emphasized that stability in funding was a key issue for research planning. The target set was USD 1 billion p.a. and the new fund would exist to channel resources to large programmes of research. Dr Wang also emphasized that even though this fund was only a small contribution in terms of solving all the agricultural problems of the world, it represented a vital change in the ARD system. He also recognized that there was a real gap in getting technologies through to farmers.

In response, Mr Wilkinson emphasized that farmers should receive more attention and be listened to by the system for priority setting. Dr Alarcón emphasized the need to now look beyond research itself and consider wider innovation systems. These involved many more actors and needed appropriate governance and funding also. He considered that the CGIAR had to have a strategy to allow others to take part, by which other partners could take technology through to end use. He felt that the visioning statements should show where other partners fitted, but that at present these did not. There was also a need to look
at all gaps in relationships between the CGIAR and other GFAR constituents and examine whether new formal arrangements should be developed to bridge these. He highlighted the FAO High Level Conference commitment of $6.5 billion, emphasizing that this required extensive reorganization of institutions and their inter-relationships to create effective conduits and mechanisms for it to be used in a short time.

Dr Anderson encouraged GFAR to be very proactive in this process and examine the role that GFAR should be playing and determine what needed to be done to strengthen GFAR in order for it to be able to do so effectively. The CGIAR Alliance welcomes a reinvigorated GFAR and is asking GFAR to come forward to take on important functions on the global scale. Agricultural research for development needs a voice; all Centers are reducing their Board sizes and it is not feasible to combine oversight of governance and stakeholder representation. Therefore the Alliance feels that a stakeholder platform is increasingly required to become a voice for the Centers. The Alliance therefore wants GFAR to become the voice of all stakeholders. Nonetheless, the Centers did expect to see different faces, beyond those who had been associated with international agricultural research for a long time. She sought strong representation from farmers, NGOs and a richer representation in the Research Fora, so that GFAR became a truly inclusive platform in practice. This would provide a voice that could articulate demand and priorities, for both short term and longer term research.

Dr Anderson also emphasized the role of GFAR in helping the CG to change the way it works with other institutions. There is a strong need to move away from linear processes of technology transfer and to reorganize the agricultural research ‘business’ to enhance impact. She cited Dr Willem Janssen’s speech in the FORAGRO meeting in which he emphasized the need to insert research into innovation systems, which, unlike mutating research into innovation, was not a linear process. Dr Anderson asked GFAR to help change perspectives and behaviour by identifying principles/rules of good behaviour and good partnership and using the instruments in the CGIAR system to help push those. She saw these activities not as a transaction cost but as one of the real costs of doing effective business. GFAR’s role would help partners to get to know each other again in this new environment. Relationships would be very variable; some NARS were efficient, others less so, but she saw a real need for GFAR to help CGIAR engagement with national innovation systems. She also saw a need for change in donor behaviour, to develop partnerships and agree rules of engagement from the pre-project phase.

**Funding for agricultural research for development**

The Chair cited his dialogue with IFAD and FAO on the need for a fund to support agricultural research for development, especially in the national systems. He recognized the need for effective national systems as conduits for technology adaptation from the CGIAR. He emphasized that the Regional Fora were now changing, albeit some more rapidly than others and stated that in his opinion, the optimal model involved farmers, NGOs and the private sector as well as public research and extension institutions.

From the perspective of CSOs, Mr Darwish considered there was a problem of policy, in terms of i) how decision makers channel the funding and its misappropriation in national systems and ii) that policy makers did not allow other perspectives on issues. He asked GFAR to consider using its structure and relationship to FAO to influence governments and government processes.
Dr Alarcón pressed members of the Global Forum to work more proactively in fostering change. Innovation systems had been a focus for a long time now, but GFAR’s structure had to be improved to include more stakeholders as well as national research systems. FORAGRO had opened itself out to others and recognized this process needs trust among partners. He felt that if structures did not work at any level within the Global Forum they should be closed and reopened in a different form. He also sought the involvement of YPARD to bring the voice of youth into GFAR. He recognized the need to engage the private sector more effectively, an area where many public research organizations lacked experience and offered to share the FORAGRO experience with other groups.

**Research and rural development**

Civil society organizations felt strongly that the process needed to establish better connection between research and development. Mr Wilkinson commented favourably on the report from the Partnerships Working Group and emphasized the need to establish effective extension systems and look at research in the bigger picture, in particular in regard to how to reach small-scale farmers. He felt the problem of the system was that it was accountable to donors, but not to farmers and recommended that various tools and instruments be used to condition the CGIAR funds for an explicit partnership focus. The system needed ways to recognize and reward good partnership behaviour as part of its performance management, with indicators of partnership success and added value.

Mr Sabio emphasized the need for a shared vision. He welcomed the revised vision being aimed towards development objectives, which made it more appealing to NGOs and showed more common ground than before. Effective partnership of the CGIAR with civil society required the development agenda to be very clearly on the table. He welcomed GFAR becoming more active and emphasized that more engagement was also needed in action research at national and community levels. Mr Darwish advocated that the CG Vision should include a focus on food policies as the current crisis is due to distribution and markets as well as productivity. Dr Wang responded that this issue was factored into the 3rd strategic objective within the new vision.

**Institutional capacities and scaling up/out**

Dr Ghodake questioned whether the CGIAR system really accepted that there were capacities elsewhere in the ARD system that required effective partnership for its work to succeed? He saw a basic need for the CGIAR to accept the need for partnership in its work.

Dr Anderson responded that there was a real need to document partners and understand relationships and that the Science Council had previously been asked to determine the relationships and capacities in national systems. She felt that the system had a rich network of advanced research institutions as partners, but less so those of emerging economies. Partnership for effective delivery is seen as the key challenge.

Dr El-Beltagy mentioned that many in the ARD community felt that the recent IAASTD had missed the chance to look at capacities at national level. He emphasized that GFAR is a movement to increase linkage and optimize relations between partners and that we should therefore treasure inter-regional cooperation.
Dr Ghodake felt that many developing countries now have national programmes that are integrated with civil society organizations, but that donors are not supporting national interests in research; multinational institutions were supporting development objectives but not linking in associated research; this was both a national and international concern.

Dr Anderson cited work at CIP that had, through an IFAD grant, mapped national systems related to project take-up to establish the institutional topography and determine intervention points for getting information out. She recognized that the global ARD system was hugely compartmentalized, with complete disconnects in the global architecture and that making these links was a need that GFAR was helping to fill. However, this needed to be more widely supported by donors also.

Sra. Dobao highlighted the ERA-ARD programme which was mapping European capability, linked to the Regional Fora through a Southern Advisory Group. She emphasized the need for Regional Fora to engage with all stakeholders and that this needed strengthening at both national and regional levels.

Dr Alarcón highlighted the loss of ISNAR’s functions and the need to look at institution building and capacity building in each CGIAR Center. Technology transfer was not originally part of the research agenda during the establishment of regional research bodies but he felt that there was now a real need to involve all other stakeholders and avoid past problems. He felt that international systems should not be working through to local level and that it was better to focus on an innovation systems approach. Mr Wilkinson strongly agreed and recommended defining a plan for uptake as an essential element of every research activity. Dr Echeverría requested that GFAR examine the big changes that had occurred in extension concepts and bring together lessons of what has been learned from new models being applied in different regions.

Dr Wang summarized that this had been a very rich discussion and he was taking home the message that GFAR was reinvigorating itself, with new ideas and new voices. He welcomed that GFAR was becoming more inclusive of civil society organizations, and the voices of farmers and users. He sought continued interaction and close links with the CGIAR and input to the CGIAR change management process.

Dr Wang also suggested that the CGIAR’s own vision should specifically emphasize the value of partnership for the CGIAR’s role. After discussion, a proposed new CGIAR vision statement was agreed by the Steering Committee as a recommendation from GFAR:

‘A primary international research organization that mobilizes science and technology to enable the partners to achieve the global vision’

Dr Wang also highlighted the need to take these key words into action and that it was important that the CGIAR should have a road map for delivery into development outcomes, not assume it should do the extension itself. He cited the example of hybrid rice in China, a major success for the national breeding programme that had enabled China to feed 18 million more people than through conventional rice, but noted that 95% of this rice contained genetic material originating through IRRI. He recognized limitations in capacity within the centres due to funding cuts and the need to work
pragmatically to solve real problems through effective partnership and to increase dissemination of research products.

One approach to this will be to engage partners from the beginning in designing and planning programmes. Dr Wang cited by example a request from Japan for a programme to significantly increase rice production in Africa. He requested that GFAR assessed and identified similar such needs in each region to give tangible targets for international action and also identified potential contributions of partners from the beginning of programmes.

Prof El-Beltagy summed up the discussion, emphasizing action points as being:

1. *The Regional Fora were requested to follow up on the previous GFAR-CGIAR document with specific comments relating to their region’s top priority issues and needs.*
2. *To formulate opinions from all Regional Fora and stakeholder constituencies on what they want to see from the new CGIAR.*
3. *To consider roles of other stakeholders in relation to the CGIAR and how they might together achieve development impact in addressing major programmes.*
4. *The Chair encouraged processes of direct regional consultation with the CGIAR wherever feasible and encouraged all stakeholders to consider their relationships to the CGIAR and how these could be enabled through the mechanisms of GFAR.*

**Welcome remarks to GFAR from FORAGRO**

On behalf of FORAGRO and Uruguay, FORAGRO Chair Dr Mario Allegri formally welcomed the Steering Committee to Montevideo and stated that FORAGRO was honoured to have this opportunity for international engagement and sharing of ideas. He expressed his thanks to all for their attendance.

**2.0 Approval of Minutes of the 20th Steering Committee Meeting**


The Minutes of the 20th Steering Committee Meeting were submitted to the Committee for approval. Dr Alarcón requested the mention of a discussion on CGIAR in FORAGRO to be noted on page 5. Members queried where to find the Annexures mentioned in the minutes. It was clarified that the Annexures were circulated electronically and are available on EGFAR: [http://www.egfar.org/egfar/website/new/eventpage?contentId=1711](http://www.egfar.org/egfar/website/new/eventpage?contentId=1711)

The minutes of the 20th steering Committee were approved without amendment, except that indicated by Dr Alarcón.

Approved: Dr Hamdan
Seconded: Dr Ghodake

There were no matters arising from the minutes that were not covered elsewhere.
3.0 Action taken report from the 20th Steering Committee Meeting by the GFAR Executive Secretary

Dr Holderness presented the report (Annexure 4), summarizing activities taken to follow up on each of the issues raised in the 20th Steering Committee meeting.

Dr Campbell enquired about GFAR’s engagement in the CGIAR Challenge Programs. Prof. El-Beltagy indicated that there was great variation in the extent to which GFAR had been invited to become engaged with the Challenge Programs of the CGIAR. He also mentioned that in a previous instance, GFAR representatives in the Challenge Programs did not provide adequate feedback to GFAR. He expected all GFAR representatives to provide feedback to both the CGIAR and to GFAR’s governance. Dr Wang stated that the CGIAR follows an agreed process for approval of Challenge programs. In the second cycle the challenge program on Climate Change has been approved, the project on desertification (‘Oasis’) has been rejected and the challenge program on high value crops is being evaluated.

Prof. El-Beltagy emphasized that GFAR should be included in the development and management of the Challenge Programs from the start if these were to truly open out to involve other partners. Dr Echeverria stated that over a period of time partnerships have increased in each of these programmes, for example in the climate change programme that links the CGIAR to outside specialists. Dr Ren Wang also informed the meeting that CGIAR Executive Council had delayed starting the 3rd cycle of evaluating proposals for the Challenge programs while the CGIAR Change Management Process was underway.

Dr Wang also commented on the Action Taken report and stated that the CGIAR commended GFAR’s participation through its Executive Secretary in the Change Management Programme. He sought stronger links between the CGIAR and GFAR and requested that at the Maputo AGM, GFAR should organize a consultation on the CGIAR change management findings. He indicated that the format of the CGIAR Annual General Meeting is also to be changed. He proposed that GFAR, with the CGIAR, should from 2010 organize a biennial forum or consultation in which the CGIAR participates with other ARD stakeholders. The Chair, GFAR welcomed this move by the CGIAR and indicated that it was a step forward in the GFAR-CGIAR relationship.

Dr Holderness requested all Fora to consider the feasibility of regional consultations on the CGIAR Change Process in advance of the Maputo AGM. The CGIAR Change Management Documents would be very near finalization by the time of the Maputo AGM, so by then consultation would be more about putting processes into action than the fundamentals of change.

The partnership between GFAR and the ASTI Division of IFPRI was discussed. ASTI was anticipated to provide information that optimized investment in ARD. GFAR and ASTI should develop an appropriate program for this information to be captured and used towards fostering greater investment in ARD.
**Action Points**

1. GFAR and CGIAR Secretariats to work together to develop a consultation on the CGIAR change management process at the CGIAR meeting in Maputo, December 2008
2. GFAR to plan towards a biennial multistakeholder forum process, in collaboration with the CGIAR, to understand and address strategic priorities in agricultural research for development.
3. GFAR to build linkage with ASTI programme towards understanding investment needs and returns in agricultural research for development

**4.0a Report of GFAR Chair**

The GFAR Chair reported his activities (Annexure 5). The Chair participated in CGIAR Change Management processes, the FAO High Level Conference and the Global Diversity Trust Fund Meetings. In addition he took part in strategic meetings including those of EAGLES and BioVision, citing the latter as having particular scope for more young scientists to attend.

After the presentation, Dr Hawtin, on invitation from the Chair, further explained how the Global Diversity Trust Fund operated in conserving germplasm resources and described the establishment of the Norwegian seed vault. He emphasized the scale of trust fund investment required (ca. USD 500 million) to achieve these aims and secure the worlds genetic resources, and sought the support of GFAR’s stakeholders to do so.

Dr Echeverria requested that the GFAR Secretariat should also participate in Science Council meetings and help to strengthen the central programme advisory system for the CGIAR. The Chair endorsed this request and highlighted the relevance of a joint approach to determining returns from investment in research.

**4.0b Report of Activities of GFAR Secretariat**


Dr Holderness presented this report (Annexure 4), which summarized a wide range of activities addressing areas agreed by the 20th Steering Committee. These were presented thematically in terms of:

1. Shaping tomorrow’s agriculture today: Consensus building and advocacy for action on agricultural research and innovation priorities
2. Institutions for the future: Strengthening the institutional capacities of GFAR and its stakeholders
3. Fostering innovative and strategic research partnerships: Promotion of global and regional partnerships for collaborative research and innovation.
4. Agricultural knowledge for all: Knowledge and communication for agricultural research and innovation

This format was welcomed by the Committee as clearly articulating the relationship between GFAR’s objectives and activities.
Mr Darwish asked why there was a need to create regional networks of NGOs, when international NGO networks already existed. He also wanted to know about the engagement with the private sector, to ensure that private sector motives were clear. Dr Maru explained that the formation of regional NGO consortia was to strengthen the role of regional research bodies as true multistakeholder fora, bring greater legitimacy to GFAR from each of its regional constituents. Also, these were consortia dedicated explicitly to agricultural research issues, rather than wider rural development.

The Chair further responded that the private sector is a complex entity and engagement is a complex issue. It included greatly differing segments of large, medium and small entrepreneurs. In the CGIAR, the private sector committee is made up of 8 members. Mr Wilkinson felt that GFAR should decide which private sector segments it wants to engage with. He recommended a paper should be circulated by the Secretariat on principles for this engagement, to develop a process for GFAR to engage with the private sector. Dr Alarcón stated that in FORAGRO, the private sector was represented by 3 members: one from the producers, one from agro-industries and the third from private foundations for agricultural research. He also congratulated the Secretariat for the work done in a short period and thanked GFAR for its support to FORAGRO on institutional innovation. He also stated that ‘Linking farmers to markets’ was an important activity for the LAC region and sought increased momentum and action to formalize the LFM activity.

Dr Echeverria suggested that GFAR’s Steering Committee should establish clearer and narrower priorities. From the Science Council perspective, information sharing and global advocacy were much more important roles for GFAR than programme implementation. He also wanted GFAR to explore mechanisms of financing research. He suggested also that GFAR should take up the concept of the mobilization of science, as the CGIAR had struggled to address this as a centralized function. This was also an area with much scope for GFAR in lesson learning by comparing regional ARD systems and identifying regional public goods.

Dr Hamdan commended the support GFAR had given to regional forums for technical and funding support in ICM and for interregional cooperation in Biotechnology. Nonetheless, he was concerned that the role of the Secretariat at present was an almost impossible task and recommended advertising for new positions in advance of the availability of funds.

Mr Wilkinson (temporarily chairing the meeting), suggested that there must be a balance between projects and other activities and that positions should be addressed in the finance section. It was recognized that the GFAR Secretariat’s capacities were finite and the principles of GFAR’s operation were that activities should be carried out largely by GFAR’s members working in the global framework. Funding issues were addressed by a separate paper under finance.

Dr Ortiz commended the Secretariat on the activities undertaken, but also felt that the GFAR Secretariat was stretched across too many activities and needed clearer guidance on key objectives from the Steering Committee. It was the responsibility of the Steering Committee to ensure that the operational burden was shared among GFAR’s constituents and that each played their role.

Prof. El-Beltagy emphasized that the Secretariat was doing what had been agreed and endorsed by the Steering Committee. He recognized the need to rationalize the tasks.
assigned to the Secretariat and divide the labour required among the GFAR constituencies.

Mr Wilkinson highlighted that stakeholders from particular groups sometimes found it difficult to represent their own and GFAR’s role in meetings across a range of areas. He therefore wanted the GFAR work plan to focus on issues relevant to a Global Forum and of high international visibility.

**Action Points:**

1. **GFAR Secretariat to develop a paper on mechanisms by which to engage with the Private sector.**
2. **GFAR Secretariat to draw from suggestions made, offer priorities for GFAR and GFAR Secretariat activities and revise the Business plan to give higher priority to addressing high profile issues and activities related to global advocacy.**

### 6.0 Meeting the Challenge of the Global Food Price Crisis

The Chair introduced this item, emphasizing that the Global Food Crisis has several causes including changes in consumption patterns, the increase in the cost of oil and inputs, increased production of biofuels, market speculation and policies followed by national governments. His opinion was that all the stakeholders of ARD should look at the issues related to the Global Food Crisis and offer solutions through use of science, technology and agricultural innovation. Following the Chair’s introduction there was a very rich discussion on the topic:

For farmers, Mr Wilkinson expressed his concern at the very simplistic view often taken on the biofuel issue, stating for example that the increase in rice prices cannot be explained by biofuels as rice is not used for biofuel production. Further, market data did not match simplistic assumptions of production incentives and subsidy impacts in different parts of the world. He felt that governments should instead consider the current crisis as an opportunity to improve farm economics, invest in research and in agriculture.

Dr Hamdan emphasized GFAR’s advocacy role, for innovation in policies and productivity in various areas of agriculture and for capacity building in farmer innovation and post harvest processing (as was discussed by FORAGRO in its recent reunion). This included innovation in trade and linking farmers to markets. Regional and international organizations needed to foster such initiatives via GFAR.

Dr Ghodake considered this an ideal opportunity to increase investment in agricultural research: countries such as Papua New Guinea are benefiting from the increase in commodity prices and can re-invest in agricultural knowledge, science and technology. He felt issues should be considered first at country level and from these develop a global agenda. He wanted GFAR to take the long term perspective in such considerations.

Dr Kyetere pondered what was expected to be the outcome of this discussion. He emphasized that stakeholders should go back to their constituencies and act, not just
discuss the issues. He recommended that a GFAR position paper was formulated from these actions. The Chair highlighted the need to work across the GFAR platform and develop a collective voice on these issues.

Dr Avetisyan emphasized the global importance of this issue. The CAC region was also affected by this crisis, although it also had considerable potential to increase production. He supported the development of a GFAR position paper. In his opinion, production and productivity were diminishing and the population was increasing in recent years. For CACAARI region, biofuels were not considered viable when produced from foods. He felt that GFAR was the logical place to provide real answers in addressing the situation, but recognized the complexity of the issues. He suggested developing a global repository of technology-related information as one of the responses to improve agriculture.

Sra. Dobao stated that Europe felt that the crisis was caused mainly by bad harvests, increased demand by China and India and low stocks of rice. Biofuels covered <2% of available land and Europe had reverted ‘set-aside’ land back into agriculture in response to the crisis. She felt that there were political reasons behind the response to the food price crisis. The European view was that there was potential for biofuel production from marginal land, but not from foodgrains. She informed the meeting that the ERANET mechanism could produce a common proposal on bioenergy via ERA-ARD.

Dr Alarcón for FORAGRO emphasized that this debate on big issues and agendas was exactly what GFAR should be doing. In the LAC region, the issue was not the rise in food prices but the speed at which they increased. The region is abandoning the view that biofuels and food production are competing. He felt the crisis was a structural problem caused by lack of investment in agricultural development and by speculation on prices. The rise in prices has not benefited the small producers and the food price crisis will particularly affect the poor, increasing the number of poor in the region by 10-12%. FORAGRO would share its position paper with other regional fora, each of which should be considering their own food sovereignty and food security. In his opinion, the problem was political, economic, technological and caused by a lack of vision. He felt that GFAR should play a critical role in debating and raising awareness of the need for appropriate agricultural investment to address these issues. Dr Risi informed the meeting that PROCIANDINO has established country led initiatives on climate change, biofuels and food security towards these aims.

Mr Darwish stated that he had attended an NGO Conference that was being held parallel to the HLC in Rome. Non-governmental organizations were disappointed by the HLC declaration and he offered to share the NGO declaration on the topic. He also sought a GFAR position paper on these issues. Mr. Sabio stated that communities and families were severely affected and he also wanted a GFAR position paper.

Mr. Wilkinson felt that the food crisis was a solvable problem and indicated that IFAP had a position paper: the farm community wanted a strategy of growth to be implemented by Governments. He felt the food crisis was an opportunity for small farmers and he wanted the constituency of GFAR to come up with an advocacy position on the issue which indicated what should be done through agricultural research, practical plans and through getting knowledge to farmers.
The Chair concluded that all the regional fora and sub-regional fora should discuss the issue and GFAR should bring all the views together, to objectively pinpoint and tackle the issues and set the coordinates by which to move forwards. Dr Holderness presented the statement prepared by GFAR Secretariat and released at the High Level Conference on the Global Food Crisis. This was agreed to form the basis for shaping a further position paper, with inputs from all GFAR’s constituents.

Dr Kyetere requested that policy issues should come out strongly in a position paper. Other elements requested by the Committee for emphasis in a position paper were:

- productivity and efficiency in agricultural production and mechanisms to deliver these;
- a direct statement from GFAR that provided an aggressive strategy for creating hope and addressed specific needs such as reducing post harvest losses, recognizing also that poor farmers suffered through low prices
- a paper developed from each region, acceptable to all and with actionable points.
- a paper that included use of on-the-shelf technologies.
- linkage with the response of the CGIAR.

Dr Holderness indicated that significant international finance was now committed for countering the food crises and the Forum should offer real suggestions on how this investment should be used in terms of knowledge issues. Dr Ghodake suggested that knowledge sharing could be enhanced at regional and community levels through use of these funds.

The Chair clarified that the paper would be aimed at policy makers.

**Action Points**

1. **GFAR Secretariat to solicit perspectives and desired actions from each region and stakeholder grouping and from these responses develop a position paper responding to the food price crisis, with actionable points.**

7.0 **Shaping Tomorrow’s Agriculture Today: Putting the GFAR Business plan into Action**


The Chair introduced the item as part of a continual review of GFAR’s strategic direction. This takes place at Steering Committee Meetings, the Triennial Conference and recently at the Retreat to develop GFAR’s business plan. He stated that there was an ongoing need to discuss the overall future strategic direction of GFAR, to reposition GFAR in view of newly emerging issues and to improve ways of working together as a collective movement.

Dr Holderness presented a paper summarizing the strategic areas identified through previous meetings to start the discussion. He addressed each of the four key GFAR themes separately, the paper raising questions for consideration under each:
1. Global advocacy and shaping tomorrows agriculture
2. Institutions for future needs
3. Fostering Innovative and Strategic partnerships
4. Agriculture knowledge for all.

Discussions followed under each topic:

**Global Advocacy and shaping tomorrows agriculture**

Dr Holderness highlighted the key finding of the external review that GFAR needs to focus more on fostering dialogue and debate on ARD issues and on advocacy for viable, effective and valued national agricultural research systems.

Dr Davidson felt this was the most important function for GFAR and he welcomed the focus on linking science and society. Dr Echeverria agreed that a) enabling a global platform for sharing and learning and b) creating a common advocacy platform on ARD were key roles for GFAR. However, they questioned whether the Global Forum should explicitly be seen to provide a voice for the poor as rural communities encompassed both the poor and others.

Dr Ghodake stated that there was a need for stakeholders to establish clearer mechanisms to implement GFAR activities and to reflect their own activities in the form of GFAR outcomes.

Sra. Dobao recalled that when GFAR was formed it was to bring all regional forums, which represented all ARD stakeholders at the national and regional levels, together and to add value at the global level. Each regional forum should be a microcosm of GFAR principles. She felt that a lot of work still needs to be done on this regional representation and on the communication mechanisms linking the regional agendas.

Dr Alarcón felt that FORAGRO, as GFAR had, faced a dilemma between whether to be a forum to discuss, dialogue and advocate or to implement projects. GFAR created the opportunity to share regional visions and create global visions with stakeholders elsewhere. He saw GFAR as a global reference, enabling interpretation of the regional vision in the global picture. GFAR would shape new priorities and understand demands of the world and could be used for advocacy within a clear thematic strategy. He wanted to see the value of inter-regional cooperation highlighted as a core mechanism for advocacy. He felt the GFAR mechanism should also be proactive on agendas, to create regional ownership of issues that could then inform national systems. FORAGRO sought closer alliances with other Regional Fora and he saw GFAR as providing a platform for ideas, a space for formulation and establishing the first step in programmes, yet it should not be running those programmes. However, he recognized the dilemma that these initiatives could not be left alone completely as they required energizing.

Dr Echeverria felt that GFAR’s function in advocacy was key to its value. It was not a role of lobbying or asking a particular donor to fund a project, but in setting the global agenda in agricultural research for development. He said his dream was that in the next food crisis, Prime Ministers would come to GFAR to be informed, rather than just to intergovernmental process. The CGIAR also wished to align with GFAR and the Science
Forums of the CGIAR should also form an input into GFAR. He emphasized the value of high profile GFAR meetings for getting activities flagged to the wider community. The real role and value of GFAR should be in working on 2-3 major themes to set the global agenda, most other activities could be done by others. On the question of placement of staff from stakeholder organizations to strengthen the Secretariat he was supportive, but also flagged the need to ensure their work transparently complemented that of GFAR.

Dr Avetisyan completely supported GFAR being identified clearly as a Global Forum and to focus on future issues rather than on present problems. He could see great potential in GFAR to develop agriculture at both global and regional levels. He also wanted to be able to learn from experiences in other regions, for example in how to link farmers and markets. He wanted all members to look at the practical mechanisms of making GFAR work, especially with the regional forums, so that GFAR was active with regional forums continuously, rather than from meeting to meeting. He also pointed out the language problem in communication between CAC and other GFAR stakeholders. He felt GFAR must connect research and society, but that media were needed to connect the two.

Action points from Chair’s summary.

1. There was extensive support for the prime value and purpose of GFAR being to set the forward-looking global agenda in agricultural research for development.
2. The need for GFAR to work in the 6 UN languages was recognized, but this would take time to develop.
3. The principle of subsidiarity of objectives from local, to national, to regional to global levels should flow through all activities.
4. Exploration of specific staff placement opportunities to enhance the GFAR Secretariat is encouraged and should be explored among all stakeholders.

Institutions for future needs

Dr Holderness referred to the conclusions of the 2006 Triennial conference and subsequent Review and Business Plan, which had all highlighted a crucial need: shaping the international agricultural research for development agenda with a focus on the poor requires new capacities and new ways of working in ARD, with wider inclusion of civil society (NGOs, farmers, private sector) in the direction and implementation of agricultural innovation systems.

Dr Ortiz initiated discussion on this topic. He described how the agendas set by Regional and Global Forum needed to be taken up by organizations such as the CGIAR and that it was crucial that international research was shaped by its constituencies. He also highlighted the need to improve opportunities for women scientists. Dr Echeverría fully agreed with these aims but wondered about concrete actions for the latter. Sra. Dobao felt this was an important issue for GFAR and that there were too few women in the research and innovation system at all levels from farmers to policy makers.

Dr Allegri emphasized that all stakeholders must be participants in research, including involvement of both public and private sectors in national planning. It was crucial that research was demand-driven in order for it to be relevant and that increased funding was mobilized through stakeholders working together in GFAR, supported by evidence from
Dr Alarcón also emphasized the need to move away from concepts of NARS, into demand-driven and market-responsive National Agricultural Innovation Systems. Dr Ghodake strongly agreed with the need to change institutional thinking and ways of working to improve engagement with market demand, including innovation systems thinking. Proper understanding of demand-driven ARD was essential for development of national agricultural innovation systems to meet agriculture’s future needs.

Dr Risi commented that over the last 20 years the agricultural sector had faded away while the environmental sector had flourished. There was a need to pull these forces together and show the value of agriculture in environmental service and its value to society. He felt that the agricultural community had been too timid in using new tools to increase production among small farmers. He also felt that it was important that GFAR brought in the education sector as part of the shaping of new institutions and agendas.

Dr Davidson proposed that GFAR should help the reformed CGIAR in their decisions on future research priorities, through discussion at global level among GFAR’s wider constituency. For example, the balance between environmental and agricultural issues required consideration and there was a need to bring in voices from outside the CGIAR to shape the agenda. Dr Kyetere appreciated the concepts of institutional change but also felt that GFAR needed to turn these concepts into practice. Mr Wilkinson felt GFAR stakeholders should analyse the current status of national systems and initiate new agendas for action to develop effective, well-resourced systems that meet the needs of the future.

Dr Echeverria requested GFAR to develop a position note to clarify the concepts now being widely discussed around institutional change, including the history of how these concepts had evolved. This should be put on the web as a common resource. GFAR had a role in advocacy for change but further thought was required as to what materials would help stakeholders to achieve this. He also suggested that young people should do so through YPARD as part of this process.

**Action points:**

1. **GFAR Secretariat to commission a web-based summary paper on new institutional thinking and its implications for change in national research and extension systems.** This paper to form a basis for advocating for, and supporting processes of change, to create institutions and innovation systems that are demand-driven, market responsive and take account of environmental and social dimensions of new knowledge.

**Fostering Innovative and Strategic Partnerships**

Dr Holderness summarized GFAR activities that stimulated new thinking and new partnerships via practical action in the Global Partnership Programs (GPPs). He also highlighted how the DURAS Program had used Program Funding to foster innovative partnerships across a range of themes. However, several issues arising from these programmes needed to be considered. Among others, there was a need to re-examine operational mechanisms for fostering innovation systems and exchange of knowledge through South–South partnerships, in line with the findings of the GPP review.
There followed a detailed discussion on GPPs. Dr Echeverria emphasized that mobilization of science via GFAR was a key issue and he recognized the value of fostering partnership through funding. However he questioned the extent to which these programs were donor-driven or conversely, the extent to which they were being supported by donors. The Chair responded that the GPPs were driven by the concept and were multi-regional in scope. Donors were encouraged to support these initiatives; they had the strength that they were initiated among partners and fostered through a real desire for partnership to address significant development issues. It was suggested that fresh ideas, such as those included in the CGIAR Challenge programs, should be catalysed, channelled and prioritized through GFAR before consideration for scale-up and implementation via the CGIAR.

Dr Ortiz supported the suggestion of an explicit CGIAR linkage: an open call in the last round of Challenge Programs had led to much frustration as 50-60 initiatives had been proposed, but only one or two taken forward. He felt that GFAR could articulate real issues that could be taken forward and supported the principle of GPPs to review and prioritize demands and foster partnerships. Priority programmes could then be tabled as potential larger programmes, for which resources could be mobilized using the capacity of the CGIAR.

Dr Alarcón agreed with these principles, but also questioned the basis by which some GPPs had been developed through GFAR but had then gone off on their own track. He felt that GFAR needed to retain a degree of oversight of these programmes as a Global Forum as they provided an expression of interregional cooperation. He sought clarity on the pathway by which they should be developed and adopted. Dr Miguel García, specifically discussing the Linking Farmers to Markets (LFM) GPP proposal, felt that the Partnership Programmes needed clearer guidance on expectations and rules of engagement and a clear pathway and responsibilities as to how they should be taken forward. The process had apparently not been clear to the LFM Interim Steering Committee, which saw itself as a consultancy group that had not felt authorized to execute the programme. The process had also become complex across the regions involved. Dr García felt that GFAR should establish clear responsibilities and expectations for GPP implementation, execution and funding from the outset. This request was supported by Dr Alarcón.

Dr Maru responded that LFM was one of the highest priorities of GFAR but that unlike others it had suffered from extensive changes of personnel involved and had shown an inherent tension in the balance between its research or development focus. The normal process is that the proposed programme had to first be endorsed by the Interim Steering Committee and then by the Programme Committee before being put to the Steering Committee.

The Chair summarized this as a useful discussion and that greater care was required in ensuring that GPPs were in line with GFAR principles and that the proposers were aware of the implications and responsibilities of operating within a Global Forum. The proposed principles for GPPs were agreed and approved, with modification to principle 1 as below:

1. **Build on on-going activities and strong institutional commitments around new ideas to conceptualize and address inter-regional or global concerns.**
2. Are endorsed by partners in the regions concerned as aligning with their highest agricultural development priorities

3. Involve more than one region and link with the regional fora concerned

4. Include financial resource commitment from the regions concerned

5. Set out a clear pathway by which development impact will subsequently be obtained and show a specific focus on how the poor will benefit from the activity

6. Are developed and championed by a multistakeholder group, responsible and accountable for the implementation of the programme and ensuring that GFAR principles are maintained throughout

7. Directly involve partners from both research and wider society, representative of diverse backgrounds and perspectives and adding value to what the bodies concerned could achieve by themselves

8. Work to also cross-link related initiatives initiated and developed by the partners concerned

9. Demonstrate impact on individual and institutional behaviours in opening research systems out to new partners and perspectives

Knowledge for all

Dr Maru introduced this theme. There was consensus that the sharing of knowledge was complementary to advocacy and that these should be the two main areas of GFAR’s activities. This included the need for GFAR’s website to be improved and become a resource for understanding the international ARD system and to provide access to statistical supporting data (e.g. of FAO, ASTI) and not just technical data.

GFAR’s role in learning systems was also discussed. It was agreed that GFAR should not be involved in general education as this was too broad an agenda, but that GFAR could usefully play a role in helping to define the knowledge agenda required in agriculture and in sharing information towards learning for all. The Committee requested that some parts of the section on GFAR’s role were redrafted to reflect this focus and bring the right balance to the document. GFAR’s action in the area was otherwise approved as in the document.

The Chair summarized that education and learning were important issues going forwards. However, GFAR should focus its contribution here on the reorientation of the learning system, acting as a think tank and advocating change to re-energise the system.

Action points:

1. The document to be modified and updated as agreed and circulated to all Steering Committee Members.

8.0 Modalities for Operation, Linkages and Information Flows (Postponed for Next Steering Committee Meeting)
The Chair introduced the topic of the proposed High Level Meeting which was similar in intent to the Lucerne Meeting of the 1990s, in raising awareness and mobilizing resources for investment in national innovation systems. He felt the meeting should try and answer questions such as: What are the problems in delivering science and innovation to the poor? What is the role of National governments? How to unlock the impediments? This theme had been prioritized also in discussion with Lennart Båge, President of IFAD, Jacques Diouf, Director General of FAO and with Kathy Sierra, World Bank Vice-President.

The meeting was discussed, with the consensus that GFAR, along with FAO and IFAD, should pursue the organization of the meeting, provided that institutional commitment was apparent among the partners. Participants, who should be at a Ministerial level, would be requested to dialogue, recommend and commit to the outcomes of the meeting. Mr Wilkinson emphasized that the meeting should reflect GFAR’s composition and the specific problems in linking science and innovation to the poor, identifying the practical steps and resources required for this to be effective.

The 2009 Conference on Biotechnology proposed by the FAO was also discussed. This meeting aims to address how to increase the accessibility of biotechnology to benefit the poor. GFAR’s focus should be in ensuring that this was a demand-led process that first identified what specific challenges the use of biotechnology were seeking to resolve and examined biotechnologies in the context of how they compared with alternative approaches in bringing about similar development outcomes. It was decided that GFAR could play a role along these lines in the organization of this Conference with FAO.

The possible GFAR 2009 Triennial Conference was discussed. A change in the format was agreed so that the meeting formed the culmination of discussion among the GFAR constituencies that then led to a plan of action, rather than being a stand-alone conference. The proposal by the CGIAR for GFAR to lead on organizing its Forum with the CGIAR was also discussed. The role of GFAR is seen as separate from, but highly complementary to, the CGIAR in this regard. Dr Alarcón welcomed opening doors to the CGIAR but felt that the meeting needed a different flavour from previous CGIAR annual meetings. Dr Ortiz made clear that donors did not want to see two similar but separate events. It was mentioned that France may wish to support such a Forum, to be held in Montpellier in 2009. The members requested the Secretariat to find out the extent of support that France could be able to provide and report at the next Steering Committee Meeting.

Dr Ortiz informed the members that a Workshop on Understanding International Public Goods will be held in the morning of 27th November 2008 at Maputo. GFAR may wish to join and organize a panel for this event.
Action points

1. GFAR Secretariat to pursue organization of High Level Meeting
2. GFAR Secretariat to discuss closer linkage with the CGIAR Secretariat towards organizing international forum meetings
3. GFAR Secretariat to find out France’s commitment for Forum Meeting in 2009.
4. GFAR to plan its Statutory Meetings taking into consideration the Workshop on 27th November 2008 at Maputo.

0.9 GFAR Financial Statement


Dr Holderness presented the GFAR Financial Report from January to June 2008 and explained the figures, including the detailed analysis of previous annual figures that had been undertaken this year to resolve previous accounting issues. He also mentioned that he was seeking a credit line from IFAD in advance of retroactive EC payments, to overcome an anticipated cash flow deficiency this year. This action was endorsed by the Committee.

The overhead of 10 percent charged by ICARDA on fund management was discussed. It was felt by the members that this charge was high and should be renegotiated. Dr El-Beltagy clarified that pass-through funds would be charged at 4 per cent and not 10 per cent by ICARDA. This was considerably below the normal CGIAR rate of 22%, but some felt this was still high and that management of such funds should in future be put out to tender for others also.

The Chair emphasized the difficulties in getting funds disbursed and how the FAO Financial system and other administrative processes are considered very complicated for GFAR’s purposes. The Chair proposed that GFAR should explore establishment as an independent international legal entity. The GFAR Secretariat was asked to provide a background paper, with external advice, for taking up this issue at the next Steering Committee meeting. Such an agreement would require signature by at least 3 countries, including the host country.

The cost of organizing GFAR Programme Committee Meetings (flagged to meet twice per year) was discussed. The Committee felt that the travel costs were becoming excessive for these meetings and that it was also desirable that the Programme Committee should meet by conference call in advance of the Steering Committee. It was therefore recommended by the Steering Committee that the Program Committee should instead meet through tele- or video-conferencing. The GFAR Secretariat was asked to look at creating the facilities for these types of conferencing, which would also enable more frequent meetings of the Programme Committee if required.

The basis for the figure additions presented in Table 3 of the Financial report was questioned. This query was resolved by Dr Maru.

Dr Alarcón asked about the relative payments made to the various Regional Fora and stakeholder groups over the last 2 years. The GFAR Secretariat will provide this information to the next Steering Committee.
The GFAR Secretariat was congratulated and thanked for the clarity of the Financial Report.

**Action points:**

1. *The GFAR Secretariat to provide a paper for taking up the issue of GFAR as a legal independent international entity at the next steering committee meeting.*

2. *The GFAR Secretariat was asked to look at creating the facilities for tele and video conferencing for the Programme Committee.*

3. *The GFAR Secretariat to inform members on details of payments made to various forums and stakeholders.*

Closed Session

Secretariat Staffing

The Chair introduced the subject with the need for a sturdy secretariat to meet the needs of a fast-developing Forum. He stated that funding was now opening out and this created the possibility to fill up positions in the GFAR Secretariat that had not been possible earlier without the resources.

Dr Holderness explained that the financial situation had not previously allowed filling of the financial officer position as FAO required funds to be available in advance of recruitment. The Committee now recommended appointment of a part-time financial officer.

The Committee also reasserted as a priority the replacement of the Programme Officer role made vacant by the departure of Mr Schiavone.

Dr Ajit Maru’s contract renewal was discussed. Dr Mark Holderness recommended the renewal of contract and raising his grade to P5. The recommendation was endorsed unanimously by the members.

Donor relations

The Chair introduced this section, highlighting that the added value of GFAR in inter-regional collaboration also required commitment from the regions to achieving these aims and additional funding to achieve these aspirations. It was the responsibility of all GFAR stakeholders to work together, show the added value of GFAR and generate funds for GFAR’s activities. He outlined some of the recent shifts in donor perspectives on GFAR, including that of IFAD, which was now exploring closer linkage, Scandinavian countries which were now open to dialogue, while wanting to see substantive activities on the ground and IDRC, which had previously been a supporter and was now expressing renewed interest in GFAR through the processes of change in GFAR.
Dr Ortiz suggested that some donors may prefer to fund inter-regional activities alongside other activities such as special projects around the outcome of the APAARI climate change meeting. This approach was supported by Dr Kyetere, who recommended that funds for GFAR activities could be accessed through stakeholder organizations as a line of support included in stakeholder programmes. The Chair felt this should be pursued as a matter of commitment to the GFAR ‘club’ and suggested it could also be possible to introduce a fee for membership. Dr Ghodake felt that many developing country programmes on innovation systems could pass funds through GFAR, enabling a management overhead to support GFAR’s activities. Dr Hamdan felt that any fee would have to be limited to around USD 3,000 p.a. across the board.

Dr Ghodake felt that donors needed to better appreciate the role and contribution of GFAR. Dr Ortiz questioned why the CGIAR was not itself providing any funds to GFAR. He recognized the role if GFAR in mobilizing all stakeholders and providing a service for the donor constituency also in agenda setting. As GFAR was now being asked to fulfil these roles it should also be supported to do so. It was essential that GFAR was provided with the resources to go with the responsibility. This was echoed by Dr Alarcón, who emphasized that GFAR’s important work had to be properly resourced.

Dr Davidson reflected that, for example, CIDA was wary of giving unrestricted funds and wanted to identify particular activities, with a package of proposals (but not projects) required. It was crucial that all constituencies showed their commitment to GFAR. He recognized that the commitment and credibility of GFAR is increasing rapidly, but the Steering Committee also needed to be careful to ensure that they could fulfil what was proposed. He saw a need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation processes for programmes operated under the GFAR umbrella and recommended a link to the CGIAR SPIA process.

The Chair summarized that GFAR’s success was dependent on collective efforts among the GFAR constituencies to fund GFAR, using whichever mechanisms were available to each.

**Closing Remarks**

The Chair summarized that this meeting had achieved a great deal:

- Key issues of the global food crisis had been explored and all the constituencies engaged towards addressing this challenge. The subsequent position paper would require responses from all as soon as possible and converting into a public document.
- Options around the legal entity position would need to be explored.
- Stakeholder meetings around the CGIAR Change Management Process were encouraged and the Regional Fora were urged to make good use of any suitable opportunities for such discussion with the CGIAR in advance of the CGIAR AGM.
- Suggestions from the GFAR constituents on how to save costs and raise funds for GFAR were appreciated.
- The Chair thanked the Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretariat of FORAGRO for their preparation and facilitation of the meeting
The next meeting would be held in Maputo, around the 26-27 November

Responses
APAARI felt there had been much very positive development since the last Steering Committee. Dr Ghodake congratulated and thanked the Chair and Secretariat for their efforts. These sentiments were formally echoed by EFARD and CACAARI.

On behalf of FORAGRO, Dr Allegri expressed his deep appreciation of GFAR’s presence in Montevideo and thanked GFAR and all other constituents for their contributions to a successful meeting.

Concluding Remarks of the Chair
The Chair concluded the 21st Steering Committee Meeting by stating that the meeting had achieved its goals. He thanked the hosts, FORAGRO, Dr Mario Allegri and Dr Enrique Alarcón for organizing the meeting, the staff of FORAGRO and INIA, Uruguay, the members of the Steering Committee and Observers for participating in the meeting and the hotel staff who supported the organization of the meeting.
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## Annex 2: Revised Agenda for the 21st GFAR Steering Committee Meeting held in Montevideo, Uruguay
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09h30-11:00</td>
<td>Welcome remarks by the Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Adoption of Meeting agenda</td>
<td><em>GFAR-21SC-08-01</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 GFAR and the CGIAR Change Management Process</td>
<td><em>GFAR-21SC-08-05</em></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>2 Approval of Minutes of the 20th SC meeting</td>
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<td>3 Action points report from 20th SC meeting by the Executive Secretary</td>
<td><em>GFAR-21SC-08-03</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>4a Report of the GFAR Chair, 4b Executive Secretary on GFAR Activities till July, 2008</td>
<td><em>GFAR-21SC-08-04</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13h00-14h00</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h00-15h30</td>
<td>6 Meeting the Challenge of Global Food Crises</td>
<td><em>GFAR-21SC-08-06</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h30-16h00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Meeting the Challenge of Global Food Crises (Cont’d)</td>
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</table>
### 1 August 2008

<table>
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</tr>
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<td>8 Modalities for Operation, Linkages and Information Flows (Postponed to Next Meeting of the Steering Committee)</td>
<td>GFAR-21SC-08-08</td>
</tr>
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<td>13h00-14h00</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>14h00-15h30</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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