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Present:

Monty Jones, GFAR Chair
Claudio Barriga, GFAR Vice-Chair
Raj Paroda, APAARI & GFAR Programme Committee and GCARD 2012 Organizing Committee Chair
Ibrahim Hamdan AARINENA
Dzhamin Akimaliev (CACAARI Chair)
Mario Allegri (GCARD 2012)
Alisher Tashmatov (CACAARI)
Ali Darwiche (NGOs)
Rodney Cooke (IFAD)
David Radcliffe (EFARD)
Philip Kiriro (farmers, EAFF and WFO)
Andrew Ward for the CGIAR Consortium (deputing for Anne-Marie Izac)
Jim French (deputing for the FORAGRO Chair)
Andrea Sonnino (deputing for Xiangjun Yao)
Mercy Akeredolu SASAKAWA West Africa coordinator, for GFRAS (observer)
Courtney Paisley (YPARD, observer)

Apologies: Lucy Muchoki (private sector), Catherine Guichard (EFARD Chair), Tiemoko Yo (FARA Chair), S. Ayyappan (APAARI Chair), F Awawdeh (AARINENA Chair), Philippe Choquet (GCHERA observer)
1. Chairs introduction

Prof Monty Jones, GFAR Chair, welcomed all to FARA and expressed his delight that GFAR SC was meeting in sub-Saharan Africa, for the first time since 2008. Maputo, in 2008, had been a major meeting with the reform of the CGIAR and had produced the responsibility for GFAR to implement the GCARD process. He welcomed all members, especially those joining for the first time.

The Chair commented that GFAR has positioned itself as a key institution to coordinate AR4D. GCARD is a key process in this. He emphasized the value of the relationship with the CGIAR and how this was improving all the time and was important to the success of both institutions. Nonetheless, there was always more to be done, particularly on advocacy for stakeholder involvement in the CRP processes.

The Chair welcomed all, noting that it was unfortunate that many of the Regional Forum Chairs had been unable to attend, but that these roles would be ably represented by the Regional Forum Executive Secretaries as their alternates.

As GFAR positions itself to spearhead the transformation of AR4D it is also transforming itself. The visibility of GFAR has increased significantly in recent years, now recognized by both the G8 (L’Aquila 2008) and the G20 (Montpellier 2011). GFAR was now also recognized and mandated to lead the development and implementation of the GCARD Road Map.

In the last few years, investment in GFAR’s processes has grown significantly and it has now become a very investable proposition. The GFAR Secretariat had grown from 2 senior professional staff to 5 and should grow further, but balancing this always with the need to support actions through the implementing agencies involved. Agriculture and food security are now at front stage in world affairs and the global institution of GFAR was now recognized and positioned to consolidate recent gains and tap new opportunities.

Expectations are increasing and GFAR as an institution must deliver on these. The Steering Committee has a key role to play in the success of GFAR. He commended the SC for its role and contributions, its support to the Secretariat and Chair and its astute and well thought-out contributions. For GFAR to now take advantage of the opportunities ahead, it requires support and guidance from all quarters. The Secretariat is now seeking the guidance of the SC on a series of key documents:

- The Medium Term Plan must make a compelling business case for further investment in GFAR and its constituencies. Those commissioned through GFAR must deliver on MTP results. The SC must therefore guide the Secretariat and help to define roles and responsibilities required, with key partners and targets.
- Stronger M&E processes are required to achieve and demonstrate outcomes from the work. For this it is essential to make the shift to outcome-based planning, implementation and reporting back.
Strengthening of GFAR’s oversight and governance, is required, with best practices adopted for clear and representative stakeholder inputs and feedback mechanisms. To this end the Chair was delighted to see representation now coming into GFAR for all key stakeholders, including advisory services and education, both constituencies for which GFAR works hard to help develop up effective networks of actors.

The Secretariat, Forum constituencies and Organizing Committee must now work to ensure the success of the GCARD. The survey of the last GCARD was overwhelmingly positive, but it is now necessary to structure the second conference to reflect the new challenges as the Roadmap intentions are put into practice by all concerned.

This meeting must provide guidance on resolutions and concrete actions expected from the GCARD. The SC must make sure all required actions are implemented and take responsibility for their own roles in this implementation. The outcome is crucial for GFAR and the GCARD and the SC’s contributions are needed to help guide all these processes.

He noted that this meeting would also celebrate Dr Rodney Cooke’s role in GFAR’s success, including signing the MOU between FAO and IFAD for the formal establishment of GFAR and championing and supporting the growth of GFAR.

2. Approval of Agenda

Rodney Cooke requested that the SC also considers the CGIAR Fund Office paper on membership of the CGIAR Fund Council, as this has implications for stakeholder representation in the CGIAR. The Chair also added the process for selection of the next Chair and representation of GFRAS. With these AOB amendments, the Agenda was approved:

Moved- Raj Paroda, Seconded – Claudio Barriga

3. Review of Minutes of 25th GFAR SC meeting

The Chair apologized for his absence from the 25th Steering Committee in Beijing, due to a clash of dates with externally-imposed FARA commitments, but thanked the Vice-Chair for having led the meeting so well. He noted that new participants were present, representing key stakeholders in GFAR. He also noted from this meeting the need for the SC to be formally amended to include:

- Advisory services,
- Education and
- the Fast-growing economies (BRICS etc)

and that it should also include independent advisers on finances and on governance.
No comments were received during the meeting. The Chair requested any minor editorial changes to be sent direct to the Secretariat (none received).

Minutes endorsed as stand: Moved: Mario Allegri, Seconded David Radcliffe

The Chair then described the actions of the last GFAR Management Team (MT) meeting. This was severely affected by snow, but he commended the MT members who had managed to reach the meeting. The meeting had been very successful despite the transport problems. The meeting had reviewed the key strategic documents presented: the Medium Term Plan (MTP), the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) strategy and the proposed Governance review. The MT endorsed the provisional budget 2012, subject to final approval by the SC meeting, as required to enable the Secretariat to implement actions. The MT also reviewed forthcoming meetings and venues for these meetings. Two Programme Committee meetings and this Steering Committee meeting were approved.

Since the last Steering Committee, the Chair attended the CGIAR Fund Council meeting in Seattle in March 2012 and advocated for stronger stakeholder involvement. A key outcome was that the Fund Council became convinced to support the GCARD2. The Fund Council had approved $800,000, with a further 100,000 potentially available on a performance basis, requiring specific deliverables and benefits for the CGIAR reform. Securing this funding was a big challenge, but the funds were eventually endorsed. The Fund Council requested a focus on stakeholder input to the SRF Action Plan.

The Global Conference on Women in Agriculture was held in Delhi in March, organised by ICAR and APAARI. The Chair commended Dr Paroda for doing a very good job in preparing the conference, with 760 participants from 50 countries giving a very rich diversity to discussions on how to close the gender gaps. It was decided that the next GCWA should take place in Africa in 2015.

The Chair also took part in the GCARD OC in February and the program committee in Delhi in March. He thanked all involved for their support to GFAR.

4. Actions Taken Reports

The Steering Committee actions taken report was reviewed and accepted, noting that the GFAR 2011 Annual Report should be available in time for the GCARD 2.

Management team actions taken report

Issues arising were:

- Ms Agnes Kalibata, Rwandan Minister is on maternity leave which may affect the feasibility of the workshop on protracted crises.
There are now seven CRPs actively linked into the GCARD 2012 programme and these relationships are evolving all the time.

A large African Development Bank project had resulted from the GFAR – supported Zurich and Dublin meetings linking CGIAR and CAADP. This was now going forwards as a mapping exercise comparing CAADP investments, Agro ecological zones and the CRPs.

The European donors were thanked for ensuring FARA was included in the G8 document. GFAR had also publicized and highlighted into the G8 discussions the linkages between the G8 New Alliance agenda and the work of GFAR.

Linkages between the CGIAR and regional programmes in Africa were welcomed and APAARI and FORAGRO emphasised their desire for similar linkages in Asia and Latin America.

Partnerships with CGIAR CRPs were raised. Big differences were noted between programmes in the extent to which they were working with the Regional Fora. Concerns were expressed that earlier requests from the CRPs to the RF for support to the proposals were not now being matched by the commitment of CRPs to working with the RF in practice.

The next meeting of the Programme Committee is now proposed for 3 November, to set out programmes proposed for 2013.

Other suggestions received from SC members were that the International Seed Federation be brought into the discussion of farmers rights and breeders rights and the inclusion of learning from experiences with national legislation in India.

Work on agrobiodiversity was emphasized as being very important, with global and regional dimensions, as had been seen through the Suwon Declaration.

The Chair summarized the discussion outcomes:

The SC members must be realistic about the actual capacity available in the Secretariat and what tasks were appropriate for the Secretariat to deliver as distinct from the Regional Fora and other stakeholders.

It was recognized that further capacity was required in a number of the Regional Fora and ways of achieving this should be discussed further. He emphasized the significance of the foresight work and that all Regional Fora had been invited to take part in the Dublin capacity development event organized through FARA and GFAR.

On monitoring and evaluation, it was important to be able to track progress and that the Regional Fora should explore how they could each now move forward in taking on M&E roles and responsibilities for their own work.

The GFAR Annual Report was needed before GCARD 2. This also now needed human interest stories from the results of GFAR-commissioned work, based on adopted technologies and how these changes benefited people on the ground.
The Chair also requested donor agencies to fast-track funds identified for GFAR, to enable delivery of the GCARD.

Partnership with the CGIAR’s programmes and participation of the CRPs in the GCARD process are very important developments that are all the time strengthening links through earnest and open discussions of the CRPs with wider partners, through the GFAR mechanism. He described this as the best period so far for these relationships and commended the CGIAR Consortium for now seeking real discussion in a way not seen previously.

For the GCARD it was very important to select the right people, who can effectively contribute to the meeting and take forward real collective actions as deliverables resulting from the discussions in the key areas involved. He also emphasized the significance of farmers’ inputs to the meeting.

Dr Paroda complimented the Secretariat for their actions and reports, commenting that actions are clearly happening and that this was now being recognized by all sectors. He highlighted the need for GFAR’s work to become still more visible. Dr Hamdan complimented Harry Palmier’s work in helping to develop the AARINENA regional strategy for genetic resources and the work of Ajit Maru in supporting regional work in Information and communication management.

Dr Sonnino also complimented the Secretariat on the work done and emphasized that GFAR was recognized as a more and more important partner for FAO. He highlighted the G20 MACS (Meeting of Agricultural Chief Scientists) meeting that was due to take place this year and address a proposed 5 point agenda: open access to scientific literature, open access to genomic data, interchange of germplasm and agricultural innovation systems. He requested GFAR to become fully involved in this MACS mechanism.

The Chair thanked and commended the Secretariat staff for their visibility also in support of the Regional Fora, CGIAR Consortium and Fund, stakeholder groups and in the G8 process at global level. Together these had really put GFAR on the map. He also commended the quality of meeting reports as good, concise and to the point. He summarized that the Secretariat was doing a very good job and urged them to continue to provide good assistance to all GFAR constituencies and in links with bodies such as the G20.

Actions:

Secretariat to prepare the Annual Report, with input from Regional Fora and GFAR stakeholders

Chair & Secretariat, with FAO, to build on earlier links with G20

Regional Fora to consider how to increase and sustain their own capacities in foresight and other key areas and to explore how they can improve their own M&E processes
5. Report of the Programme Committee Chair

Dr Paroda reported that the PC were happy that the Roadmap, as the product of GCARD 1, had become the central driver of the work of all involved in GFAR. To minimize travel costs, the GFAR PC had met in Delhi in March, following the Global Conference on Women in Agriculture. GFAR stakeholders from a wide range of sectors and regions were represented, together with the GFAR Chair and Vice-Chair.

- It was recognized that the Gender in Agriculture Partnership (GAP) gives good visibility to GFAR and should be actively pursued as an initiative.
- Partnership with the CGIAR was growing continually, as were stronger practical links with FAO such as the GAP, knowledge sharing (CIARD), agrobiodiversity and joint actions promoting advisory services through GFRAS.
- A direct interface was required between the GFAR Chair and the new Director General of FAO, for FAO Regional Conferences to take up the messages of the GCARD Roadmap and to make use of the structured mechanisms of the G8, G20 and Rio+20, for which the Chair and Secretariat have done much already. The PC also sought a structured programme of work that ensured links between the work of GFAR, FAO and the CGIAR, such as already exists in the examples of CIARD and GAP.
- The GCARD agenda brings out key areas of coordination and inter-regional action in research-for development partnership, foresight and capacity building and a strong gender focus.
- During the PC, work was highlighted from each region, providing an impressive series of actions. The Global Foresight Hub was highlighted as a major achievement going into GCARD 2, which received much enthusiasm from EFARD, FARA and the CGIAR but for which others would also wish to participate in these actions and bring regional learning from the process.
- The PC had endorsed that the impact of all actions by Regional Fora should be determined and guidelines for doing this will be helpful.
- Actions were now geared around the GCARD Roadmap and stakeholders were taking these forward on specific issues. For example, APAARI are now addressing climate change issues and climate-smart agriculture in partnership with CCAFS and WMO, are addressing agrobiodiversity through next steps to implement the agreed Suwon Framework and addressing food-grain security in conjunction with CIMMYT and FAO.
- Full regional summaries are available with the Programme Committee minutes.
- For the CGIAR, the change management continues to shape new roles including now strengthening of the gender programmes, which is drawing on the GAP partners and GCWA outcome recommendations to now address these issues through the CGIAR’s gender specialists.
- The SRF action plan is now being developed with ISPC and it is expected by the Consortium that ISPC should also build partnership with the Regional Fora and diverse stakeholders in this process.
The PC Chair expressed the need to also see the practicality of foresight, including near-term targets & prioritization. He welcomed the appointment of Thomas Price to strengthen linkages with civil society, family farmer organizations and the private sector.

The MTP draft was reviewed by the Programme Committee in great detail, distinguishing how activities could be attributed at global and regional levels. The MTP still requires some further revision with specific inputs required from all sectors. Activities include taking forward the GAP, climate change, agrobiodiversity, CIARD etc as well as specific actions for the GCARD process.

For the GFAR budget, the PC had identified that the most pressing need was for GCARD2. Unspent balances on existing regional LOAs were to be used in no-cost extensions. At the time of the PC there was no detailed programme request for expenditure in the second half of 2012. This has to still be addressed.

The Chair thanked Dr Paroda for his comprehensive summary.

In response:

Andrew Ward added that the CGIAR Consortium considered that the PC meeting was very positive and encouraged GFAR to include direct support to the CGIAR SRF Action Plan. The CGIAR wanted to engage in electronic consultation with GFAR’s other stakeholders in advance of the GCARD and this was felt to be a much better way of organizing such a dialogue. He also noted that the CGIAR has now developed a set of intellectual assets principles to help examine where the private sector can best aid delivery.

Rodney Cooke emphasized the vital importance of impacts in taking the MTP forwards. All programme reports needed to be publicly available. He also questioned when and what would be required of the SRF Action Plan.

Mercy Akeredolu saw the value of the MTP process and wishes to see GFRAS directly involved as advisory services are an important sector in the AR4D continuum. (The activity requests put forward by GFRAS had been fully incorporated in the plan, but had not been received when the meeting documents were printed). She emphasized the importance of having GFRAS directly involved in the Programme Committee and Steering Committee.

Philip Kiriro also emphasized the need to involve farmer networks and to achieve this, for support to be provided to networks as such partnerships are expensive to run. He emphasized that there should be strong linkages established with farmer networks at regional level and again at global level (The Secretariat has built links with WFO and presented on GFAR at the first WFO meeting).

Claudio Barriga highlighted the need to further engage the private sector and encourage investment in breeding in particular. He also welcomed the move from extension to advisory services as reflecting the change from state to private and civil actors.

Ali Darwiche responded to this that it is important that the motives of private sector involvement were clear and would lead to positive impacts.
The Chair summarized the outcomes:

- That he had sought a meeting with the new FAO DG when he was last in Rome, but that had not been possible.
- The extra USD 100K available from the CGIAR is based on the deliverables to be achieved. Travel support was limited this time as several donors did not wish to see core funds used to support travel costs and assumed that individuals and organizations should seek their own resources. To satisfy these needs, the Programme Committee had thus decided that the Consortium should decide upon how these funds should be used, in consultation with the Secretariat.
- Clarity was requested from CGIAR Consortium as to the process to be followed for the SRF Action Plan and the role sought for the GCARD in this. Was GCARD endorsement requested or simply discussion? GFAR and the GCARD Organising Committee would be very pleased to be involved in enabling consultation.
- Foresight, capacity building and partnership are the three crosscutting themes of the GCARD and the active participation of the CGIAR is sought at all levels, to pave the future direction of the CRPs. The Regional Fora should actively engage with the CRPs to ensure linkage.
- GFAR had expressed some concerns on the intellectual assets policy of the CGIAR. These included concern at the limited licence provisions and the need for these procedures to be transparent and clearly understood. GFAR is very supportive of smallholder interests and global public goods principles in such arrangements. The GFAR Secretariat has commissioned a study, with ITPGRFA, CGRFA and the CGIAR Consortium, on the role of farmers rights in relation to the CGIAR Intellectual Assets Principles.
- The Chair highlighted the new development of a joint science agenda and agricultural research in Africa that now linked the CGIAR and the CAADP. This had developed through meetings co-supported by GFAR.
- In future, all decisions of the Fund Council will be circulated to all in the GFAR Steering Committee to ensure their awareness.
- The GCARD Roadmap needs to be distributed by all GFAR stakeholders and by all means.
- The GAP was launched in Delhi and now needs to be made operational. Gender is a central theme of the GCARD.
- Impacts and monitoring and evaluation are key issues for GFAR. The Regional Fora and others should examine how they intend to contribute towards the Roadmap and achieve tangible results.
- There is a need to diversify sources of support to the Regional Fora. GFAR can help support stakeholders, but should not be seen as a central donor agency. Regional Fora should themselves move forward to generate funding. An example was provided by CAADP, providing a comprehensive strategy and framework for utilising funds in a region.
Similarly, PAEPARD had been a very valuable mechanism for developing Africa’s capabilities and abilities to respond to EC calls in particular. Links between Africa and Brazil were another valuable route which also relieved the direct burden on GFAR. It was good to see CACAARI now developing its own regional strategy with support from GFAR, which should very much help to strengthen CACAARI.

- There was strong general welcome for advisory services, via GFRAS, to be formally included within GFAR's governance, this will form part of the charter revision underway in the governance review.
- The issue of stakeholder representation is rapidly evolving and representation of all sectors should be reviewed in the governance review. The Chair reiterated that he felt the Steering Committee should be amended to include GFRAS, the BRICS/MACS, education and a finance expert and a governance expert.

Actions:

*Chair* to meet FAO DG at earliest available opportunity

*Consortium* to advise on allocation for the 100K USD performance-related funding and on SRF Action Plan process and expectations of stakeholders

*RF* are advised to engage directly with CRPs to build practical relationships

*Gender in Agriculture Partnership* to be made operational by *Secretariat, FAO, CGIAR and RF in first instance*

*Future Fund Council outcomes* to be circulated to SC by *Secretariat*

*Regional Fora* to examine their delivery of Roadmap actions and how they will be monitored & evaluated. Also to seek to broaden their funding bases and develop regional/sub-regional strategies as in CAADP model.

*Farmers/breeders rights study* to include practical national examples

*Inclusion of wider stakeholders* to be directly addressed in *Governance & Charter review*

6. Medium Term Plan Framework

The Chair sought general impressions of the revised framework from the Committee and their endorsement of the rationale:

- Philip Kiriro welcomed the rationale and emphasised that farmers would wish to be included directly in the framework.
- David Radcliffe welcomed the separation of activities of the Secretariat from those of stakeholders.
- Nikita Eriksen-Hamel agreed it was a very thorough plan with an impressive quality and quantity of activities and buy-in. However the document had become lengthy and difficult to read through and there were some overlaps between outputs and indicators. The risks and assumptions also still needed to be included.
- Ibrahim Hamdan considered the MTP a very inclusive list of actions, although some RF activities were not included e.g. the Olive Network should now also be included here.
- Jim French highlighted the need to prioritise among the actions and for the Regional Fora to reflect and specify what activities they themselves can each do to further the processes through to national systems.
- Rodney Cooke considered this to be a good work in progress, translating the roadmap into six outcome areas and answering earlier concerns on the Secretariat's role vis-a-vis other stakeholders. He noted that the Regional Fora should now fill out the basis of each action to match. The inputs from others at present are uneven and often superficial and sporadic. The indicators need to be made smart throughout the document.
- Raj Paroda noted that all Regional Fora had been asked to input the activities in which they would like to be involved and the context for these in the plan builds up from these regional demands. The Program Committee has had limited scope for de novo inputs as the Steering Committee had endorsed the general principles already and given direction as to what they would wish to see included. He recommended that a consultant be hired to review the framework in more detail and take out any ambiguities and further refine the framework. This could be endorsed electronically among stakeholders. The budgets to be assigned against different activities still require further work. Dr Paroda also asked for the 4 pillars of GFAR activities to be brought in upfront in the document to keep clear sight of GFAR's roles.
- Andrea Sonnino recommended that the Secretariat homogenizes the inputs down to a standard level and then redistributes the document for final input.

The Chair summarized that the MTP needs revisiting by all stakeholders in a defined timeframe especially on outcomes indicators and budgets and commitments by stakeholders themselves. This MTP is for three years and activities should next be broken down by year. Where Regional Fora and other stakeholders have not yet sent inputs they should do so straight away and the Medium-Term Plan must be available by the GCARD 2 for the Steering Committee to approve this as follow-on actions on the Roadmap.

The Chair highlighted that activities and resourcing are always very sensitive issues, but that the Steering Committee should recognise the significant progress made in the MTP. Further work was required on the document but he emphasised that should not just be carried by the Secretariat but that all in the SC have a responsibility for its refinement and the associated commitments.

He recommended that the format was revisited to produce a logframe defining what was being done, with clear indicators against each output. Inputs will also be required from
those stakeholders who had not yet provided theirs, notably the CGIAR and FAO. He agreed that GFAR should be going to Uruguay with a finalised document, edited for consistency and also stating the contributions and commitments of the Regional Fora and other stakeholders under their own MTPs as to what they are themselves investing in these processes. He recommended for the timeframe that the final document should be prepared by October 2012 and that the document should cover the period 2013 to 2015. For the budget it was recommended to build from the existing annual budget, projected over the next three years.

Raj Paroda agreed that the document should show contributions from stakeholders themselves and in what areas GFAR was being asked for support in addition to these commitments.

Rodney Cooke agreed the MTP should be a three-year plan, emphasising how the work fitted with GFAR's catalytic role. As the GCARD was now so close it was questionable what more could be achieved within 2012. The six outcome areas covered many activities and it was important that the Regional Fora and other stakeholders determined which of these were most important to each and provided detailed indicators of what outcomes they were themselves going to achieve.

The Chair proposed that the Secretariat should circulate the document again, offering a three-week period for further input along the lines suggested and prepare the MTP for approval at the Steering Committee at GCARD2. The Secretariat should liaise with Committee members to synthesise their requests, homogenize the layout. The plan should be finalised in consultation with the Program Committee Chair.

**Actions:** Secretariat to revisit the MTP frame and re-circulate to SC members for their further inputs and intended commitments, within a defined 3 week period

*MTP To be revised to produce a more condensed logframe over 2013-2015*

### 7. Monitoring and evaluation strategy

The Chair introduced the need to measure impacts of GFAR across all areas of operation including transforming and strengthening institutions, advocacy and catalysing collective actions for impacts on the ground. He recognised that GFAR has a unique role which makes it difficult to find a ready model to fit and so the proposed monitoring and evaluation strategy brought together both quantitative and qualitative measures including changes in institutional policies and individual behaviours.

Dr Holderness described the proposed strategy, as endorsed by the GFAR Management Team.

- Andrew Ward reflected that the monitoring tool should also be a lesson-learning process for all stakeholders own activities, describing how the CGIAR consortium office faces similar challenges - important features were catalysing resource
efficiencies, outcome mapping and capturing the story as it progresses. He was very keen to continue to interact on this as a shared area of interest and need.

- Ibrahim Hamdan considered it difficult to produce appropriate measures for the Regional Fora as it was a challenge to demonstrate impacts within a three-year timeframe.

- Mercy Akeredolu agreed that impacts were long-term and could not be quickly demonstrated, but that it was possible to show outputs and outcomes within the period of the MTP. Learning needs should also be highlighted and it was also important to build some baseline measures from which to measure change.

- Rodney Cooke reminded that the Management Team had already approved the TORs. He expressed concern that M&E was now essential for GFAR and so need to be taken up at all levels. The approach proposed was rational and the external evaluation of the CGIAR had previously dealt with similar challenges of differentiating spheres of influence from direct accountability.

- Raj Paroda highlighted that M&E should include stakeholders, with participation of farmers in the M&E of programs and activities. It was important that GFAR's programs became more strategic so that longer term impacts could be seen. He questioned how to show the Regional Fora were moving forwards and whether they had themselves ever been evaluated. This should also be considered within the TORs for the external review in 2013.

- Andrea Sonnino considered that the same methodologies could be used as for DFID itself, in particular basing the evaluation on understanding of objectives and beneficiaries. For example, the direct beneficiaries might include the Regional Fora, in turn impacting on national systems and in turn on farmers. The metrics to be used should not be global statistics but behavioural change as intermediate indicators.

- Andrew Ward reflected that the consortium had been advised not to try to determine impact on the ground but to show tracking of actions towards measurable impacts on the ground and likely probabilities of linkages to impacts.

- The extent of consultant time required was discussed, the proposed 60 days was questioned. In general it was felt this was suitable for the first year but should be reduced after that.

The Chair summarised that it was essential that GFAR has an effective M & E process in place and regularised to measure impacts. This requires a composite blend of qualitative and quantitative measures. For the review it was important to be aware of changes achieved due to GFAR over the last 15 years and it was essential to have the M and E strategy already in place. Some of the older Global Partnership Programmes of GFAR e.g. on information and communication management, Agrobiodiversity and local innovation could be examined over a longer timeframe for their impacts. This requires comparison from a baseline from 15 years ago through to the present day.

It was also important to consider direct beneficiaries and those reached through others and to include determining the effects of processes of institutional strengthening of the Regional Fora and CGIAR. This requires appropriate attribution and the recognition of
GFAR’s role by all GFAR stakeholders. The blended models used should work in light of these considerations and the learning dimension of M&E could be the most valuable part of the process. Monitoring and evaluation is a must for GFAR and the approach proposed is good.

The Secretariat should proceed for the first year of implementation of the strategy. This was endorsed with the above reflections.

Endorsement was moved by Ibrahim Hamdan, seconded by Rodney Cooke and unanimously approved.

The Chair summarised that he was confident that GFAR is putting structures in place to create a stronger GFAR with strengthened components. GFAR plays a vital role in the path for change and impact, across the board from global to national impacts.

*Action: Secretariat to employ expert consultant and move ahead with introducing M&E strategy across all GFAR’s work*

### 8. GCARD 2012

Raj Paroda introduced the session as Chair of the Organizing Committee, a role he had taken on at the request of the Steering Committee. He reported that, to date, there have been 7 teleconferences and 2 face to face meetings among the Committee and recorded his appreciation for the Committee’s work. He recognized that this was a big challenge, especially following the success of GCARD 1 and the diversity of perspectives involved between regions and sectors. The framework was agreed to follow the Roadmap core themes, in particular those that were most immediately actionable – improving prioritization through better foresight, increased investment, better and more equal partnership and development of capacities required at all levels.

- Strong appreciation was recorded for the Government of Uruguay’s support to the GCARD2 and for the strong support provided by the GFAR Secretariat.
- The OC has moved forward, recognizing that this is a challenging task. The agenda was continuing to improve, based throughout on the GCARD Roadmap and CGIAR SRF/CRPs as the two guidelines for the Conference.
- The strong focus of the event will be that of the practical steps being taken to increase the impact of innovation on smallholder livelihoods, reorienting the research & innovation agenda to focus on requirements of smallholders and their livelihoods.
- Pre-conference meetings were also being prepared, which could significantly enhance the scope and preparation of the conference and the focus throughout was on developing up joint actions to be delivered over the subsequent 2-3 years.
- The current phase was identifying potential speakers, for which all the Regional Fora and stakeholder sectors were being requested to now put forward names. A list of plenary panellists had also been drawn up. The conveners were very actively working
in direct partnership with the CGIAR to ensure the GCARD also met the needs of the GCARD Reform.

Responses noted from the SC were:

- Ibrahim Hamdan suggested that the RF should meet together in a pre-meeting to produce the slides to be presented by the GFAR Chair in the opening plenary.
- Mercy Akeredolu hoped that the e-discussions planned prior to the conference would also harvest information from those unable to attend the GCARD.
- Philip Kiriro requested that farmer organizations should have opportunity to present directly in the sessions.
- Claudio Barriga felt it important to welcome all self-sponsored participants. Mario Allegri responded that this was recognized, but with the proviso that space was limited and the stakeholder balance should be maintained.
- The scale of the event was queried. Dr Paroda informed that 500-700 people would be ideal here.
- Andrea Sonnino commented that the number of participants was not a good indicator of success, the quality of discussion was more important, which required workable groups. He felt the number should be limited and focused on those bringing the voice of different sectors, not have too many voluntary participants.

The Chair summarized that there was a need to see balanced participation from different sectors and scales in each category, with a demarcated ratio among sectors and more participants expected from Latin America. It was agreed that the maximum number should be 700 participants, while working to enable others to connect and engage via the internet.

He advocated for good marketing of the event. The RF should circulate flyers from the event to all concerned. There is a need to sensitize those offering to be self sponsored that there may not be a guaranteed place.

Space for a pre-meeting should be made available to the RF, to outline what they are doing in relation to the GCARD Roadmap and report activities and their outcomes.

For impacts, it was important to highlight how the GCARD is making an impact through a process of current and future GCARDs, which should themselves be shaped and adapted to purpose. This required a paper on GCARD impacts and process.
Mark Holderness presented the overall framework for the Conference.

SC Responses:

- Rodney Cooke highlighted the critical need for having the background papers ready by September. These must be structured, focused and based on good preparatory papers.
- Andrea Sonnino commented that the structure is well balanced and that the papers should be condensed to make them accessible – less than 10 pages per main theme is preferred. E-consultations on these can be useful but have to be properly prepared using existing networks and social media.
- Andrew Ward highlighted the role of social media during the conference.
- Raj Paroda emphasized that the framework had been discussed and agreed by the Organizing Committee, although no doubt it could be further improved upon. Specific speakers were still being developed and had to be looked at critically, to ensure a balance of stakeholders in the programme.

The Chair expressed concern that after many teleconferences and 2 face to face meetings the OC were still not coming to the SC with a final programme to endorse and that it was essential that the programme became clear cut. The main programme had to be approved now as the agenda. He considered a 5 page document per theme should be enough for all issues to be presented and supported the idea of an e-conference prior to the GCARD. He also agreed a gender balance of participants should be sought, but recognized also the challenges of achieving 50:50. 40:60 could still be acceptable.

- Raj Paroda responded that the SC has already agreed the overall outline and structure of this living document and that the SC was asked to endorse the overall agenda, not every detail of the sessions. It was already the case that each sub-theme would have one paper, but it should be decided whether there should be 1 paper per theme or 6 sub-theme papers.

The Chair questioned when the SC would be approving the detailed programme and whether the OC would be taking responsibility to improve the agenda without further SC endorsement being asked for.

- Andrea Sonnino felt the SC must approve the agenda as is, giving the OC scope to refine the content, but the full structure is OK and should be endorsed, recognizing this is a living document.
- Rodney Cooke commented that robust editing was required to the agenda to ensure clarity and the number of explanatory words should be reduced.
- Ibrahim Hamdan commented on the need for a pre-meeting for the Regional Fora before the Conference, to summarize actions taken in delivering on the Roadmap. Important issues would then be taken into the plenary by the GFAR Chair.
- Raj Paroda reinforced that he would wish to have SC approval of the outline agenda provided. As a living document, the detailed content will require further refinement.
for clarity and expected outcomes. The Core Groups needed to now be responsible for refining and making these specific for each subject.

- A structured discussion was sought for each session, building from introductory presentations towards defined outcomes of agreed collective actions over the 2 years ahead. All stakeholders were being actively asked for what they wanted to present, to finalize the list of presenters as soon as possible (3rd column in the detailed agenda). The OC would be meeting on the next day to refine these elements. It was also important to determine who will Chair and facilitate each session.

**The Chair summarized that he would like the SC to endorse the programme outline on pages 10-12 of the document, with editing to reduce repetition and clean up as a simple and succinct document.**

The outline programme was unanimously endorsed, with the OC asked to revise as recommended by the SC.

Moved: Claudio Barriga

Seconded: Andrea Sonnino

**The themes and subthemes of the programme were also endorsed.**

Moved: Andrew Ward

Seconded: David Radcliffe

*Actions:*

*OC were requested to meet on the next day and fine tune the programme.*

*Secretariat, OC Chair and OC core groups to take forward detailed planning of sessions.*

*No further SC approval would be required from this meeting, but the SC would wish to see the final version shared for any input to the OC Chair.*

Mark Holderness (for Robin Bourgeois), Harry Palmier and Ajit Maru gave brief presentations highlighting key features of each theme within the GCARD.

The Chair thanked the presenters for a good view of what is planned then invited comments:

- Mercy Akeredolu queried the division of sub-themes that had put investment with capacity development
- Jim French - Capacity development should include curriculum development
- Rodney Cooke sought clarification of working groups vs core groups?
• Jim French – highlighted the initiative of Earth University in exploring new curricula, conclusions from which would be very relevant.

• Philip Kiriro – asked the conveners to prepare powerpoints for all sessions so that these can be easily captured by the SC for future reference and use. On foresight, commented that the framing should be on how farmers can benefit from future opportunities and ensure their futures. He welcomed the inclusion of land issues as highly connected to natural resource management. Also emphasized the importance of growth, through agriculture-led economic growth for small farmers and questioned whether current growth is actually feeding and servicing the lives of the poor.

• Andrea Sonnino – emphasized the importance of capacity development and the need to change mindsets on capacities, welcoming the GCARD as a very good forum to discuss this approach. He considered the framework to be very effective in creating the enabling environment for capacity development and emphasized the need for focus on changing minds on skill sets, not just training of individuals.

The Secretariat responded that:

• Sub-themes were divided to balance the sessions, investment and capacities are very closely linked. It is recognized that partnership and capacity development are linked in many ways.

• Curriculum development is directly addressed in session C2.2

• Working groups were a term introduced to summarize those who are creating detailed content for a particular sub-theme session – the term has now been dropped to avoid confusion.

• Earth University are already included as part of GCHERA and flagged as a potential contributor to the session. Curricula are the focus of YPARD and GCHERA also and one area of desired curriculum focus is entrepreneurship.

Raj Paroda as OC Chair responded that the presentations were clear and reflected the innovative nature of the conference. He recognized that the identification of speakers requires more work and inputs from the OC and in establishing desired impacts. These lists should be completed by the end of June. He also sought more clarity on the writeshop basis in relation to the Global Foresight Hub. He emphasized the intention to bring out the best initiatives on food and nutrition security, sustainable use of natural resources etc. The next challenge will be for those expert in each area to create the background papers for each theme and sub-theme.

The Chair summarized that these were very good presentations and gave a clear insight on what is proposed. The Conference covered key themes from the Roadmap.

Each sub-theme creates an audit of actions required in each area, what those involved are currently addressing and what gaps need to be addressed.

This has to be seen as a global action plan and show also how the opportunities presented can be addressed by those active in each field. There may be 3-4 gaps to be
filled in each area, to be moved forward over the 2 years ahead by the leading agencies involved in each.

The Chair recommended background papers of 5-10 pages maximum for each theme.

The Conference will need to address these issues and determine how to resource and take on these themes. He also called for presentations to be limited wherever feasible, to maximize the time for discussions. He also highlighted the critical need for capacity development in developing countries, recognizing that GFAR’s actions here were still just a drop in the huge ocean of needs.

Actions: as summarized above

GCARD 2012 Participant sponsorship

- Ibrahim Hamdan expressed his concern at the reduced direct sponsorship for participants from different regions compared with 2010. He also queried why the North African countries were being included solely under the AARINENA allocation instead of being considered in FARA also.
- David Radcliffe queried the basis by which allocations should be achieved between Europe and North America.
- Rodney Cooke asked about support from CTA.
- FORAGRO also reflected that there had been more participants sponsored in 2010 and requested more support from GFAR now.
- Andrea Sonnino felt that numbers for the education sector could be overestimated and could perhaps be reduced, to increase allocations in other sectors
- Andrew Ward emphasized the need to prioritize those most qualified, most relevant and best placed to take forward actions in each sector after the GCARD conference. He proposed the additional USD 100K available on a performance basis could be used to support others that may help achieve the overall balance across regions.

The Secretariat answered that:

- The level of sponsorship funding was a decision of the donors and stakeholders in the CGIAR Fund Council, which includes Regional Fora representation. Some donors have explicitly said their funds should not be used for conference travel and alternative means should be found to engage stakeholders around the world. The Secretariat will continue to actively pursue other sources of support for sponsorship. IFAD were thanked for their offer of additional support. Other resources should also be sought by all GFAR constituencies through their own connections with regional providers, foundations etc. Further support through existing GFAR core funds is possible but will reduce other programmatic activities which are already under much pressure for support. The Europe/N America division is arbitrary, recognizing that there will be speakers and key sectoral representatives from the north who are unable
to obtain funding and will need to be considered for GFAR support. The Secretariat is in active discussion with CTA on possible support. Regional allocations can be adjusted where countries fall in two regions (N Africa with FARA and W Asia with APAARI) The principle was of all AR4D sectors being included from each region.

The Chair summarized that the overall number of sponsorships should be kept as they are, but asked the Secretariat and all constituencies to continue to solicit additional resources for the GCARD, e.g. from CTA and use these to increase sponsored numbers where possible. The N African allocation should be shared 50:50 between FARA and AARINENA (i.e. 3 from FARA for N Africa). EFARD and N America should be addressed separately. The Secretariat were asked to review conference cost lines such as communications to see whether additional funds could be released from those costs, but without jeopardizing communications. He also re-emphasized the OC Chair’s earlier point that Regional Fora should also actively look for resources to bring participants to the GCARD, particularly from regional banks. Regions and stakeholder constituencies, should identify those from each region to be sponsored as soon as possible.

Actions: Stakeholder representatives and Regional Fora to resolve sponsored lists as soon as possible, taking into account inclusion of speakers and committee members.

9. Gender

The Chair introduced the discussion on gender, emphasizing the significance of this issue for Africa and recruitment of a gender specialist in FARA.

- Dr Paroda summarized the GCWA event and its tremendous impact and the formal establishment of the Gender in Agriculture Partnership through GFAR, among all the national and international agencies concerned.
- Andrew Ward highlighted the need for GFAR to look beyond gender in research and research uptake and to consider also transformational issues required for gender equality and creating real opportunity for rural women, as had been highlighted in the GCWA.
- Rodney Cooke felt that while important, this would require involvement of other partners such as UN Women and IFAD and the need to consider GFAR’s particular role in agricultural knowledge and research and how this can be positioned in relation to these agencies and their wider dimensions.
- Mercy Akeredolu highlighted that the MEAS programme has included a lot of work on capacity development for women in advisory services. She wished to see focus on how family based organizations can gain greater market access and how women’s educational opportunities can be enhanced.

The Chair summarized that gender is a key area for GFAR to take forwards and that GFAR Secretariat should take a lead, working with Regional Fora and other parties to
strengthen the gender balance in agriculture, for which the GCWA had made a very good start. GFAR should find its own niche in agriculture and agricultural research for development systems.

The Chair commended the leadership shown by ICAR, APAARI and GFAR in this initiative.

Action: Secretariat, to work up a concept paper on GAP implementation among the main organizations involved, for the SC to consider at its next meeting.

10. Governance Review

The Chair introduced the session highlighting the urgent need to review the composition of the Steering Committee to incorporate advisory services, education, the fast growing economies and experts in finance and governance.

He reflected that the subsidiarity principle is very important and that representatives should be designated by the stakeholders concerned. There is a need to devolve responsibilities and resources to the lowest effective level for impact. The SC were asked to adopt the Terms of Reference for the governance consultancy that had previously been endorsed by the Management Team and give the go ahead for the Secretariat to recruit.

In response:

- Courtney Paisley highlighted the need for youth to also be directly represented in the Steering Committee.
- Nikita Eriksen-Hamel considered the TORs to be very good, he appreciated the structure and approach. They also needed to include revision to the Charter and inclusion of the GFAR programming/budget cycle in the Charter.
- Rodney Cooke agreed with Nikita’s comments and felt the review was overdue and important. It needed to be in place ahead of the external review.
- Philip Kiriro asked that the Charter be reviewed in depth in view of other current practices elsewhere and that the Charter should be made available to different constituencies so that they could see where they would wish to see improvement. Efficiency was also important – to consider why some stakeholders such as farmers aren’t able to position themselves to participate effectively and what support is needed to enable their mobilization at different levels and to capture their inputs into GFAR processes.
- David Radcliffe agreed this was an overdue and important review, which should also look closely at the current management structures in GFAR, the role of the Chair and the various committees and determine what is required for efficient operation and what is an optimal size and role for each.
- Mercy Akeredolu highlighted the need for better gender balance
The Chair summarized that there was general acceptance of the study as a very important exercise, this was a good time to review and see how can strengthen the existence and functioning of GFAR.

The proposal to proceed with the review was moved by Claudio Barriga, Seconded by Jim French and unanimously endorsed, with inclusion of the additions/amendments proposed above.

Action: The work was agreed to take place in 2 phases, The Secretariat was asked to go ahead with recruiting the consultant, without further reference being required to the Steering Committee.

11. GFAR Budget

The budget summaries were presented by Mark Holderness. In response:

- Ali Darwiche questioned how consultants were employed and requested wider advertising of significant consultancy roles when these were available. He was pleased to see support to Prolinnova.
- Ibrahim Hamdan also expressed his concern over cost rates for consultants and that there was not enough funding from GFAR for Regional Fora to undertake programmes they would wish beyond the GCARD.
- Rodney Cooke appreciated cash flow concerns, but the first priority for expenditure must be the GCARD costs. He recognized the high costs of management consultants from the North but also emphasized that reputations were important to the credibility of reviews. The budget layout was accepted as being clearly presented and consistent.
- IFAD indicated their willingness to provide USD 200K further toward the GCARD costs.
- Raj Paroda considered this a much better budget turnout than had been anticipated in February. The GCARD must be the first priority for expenditure, but it was important to invest also in the rest of the GFAR programme. He was concerned that travel costs budgeted for GCARD could be underestimated at present and suggested reducing media and communications costs to ensure participation of the sponsored numbers anticipated.
- Programme funding projections were much lower at the time of the Programme Committee meeting in March so the Secretariat was asked to look into the availability of resources and requests for programmatic expenditure and match these accordingly. However, some of the actions proposed by constituencies did not figure in the programme of GFAR as set out in the Roadmap and MTP and so could not be supported. He felt there was now a need to re-examine the proposed programme expenditure for clarity and a proper match to the Roadmap and MTP and that actions commissioned directly through the Secretariat such as foresight work should also link with actions of Regional Fora wherever possible.
New work proposed to pilot farmer-commissioned research grants was particularly commended.

Mario Allegri recognized the budget as clear and comprehensive, with a high quality of information. He urged for more resources to be used and solicited for GCARD2. He flagged also that IADB, IDRC, IICA and the Ibero-American INIAs partnership were all being approached locally for GCARD support from within the region.

Andrea Sonnino strongly supported the farmer-commissioned research action. He highlighted that donors were very reluctant to fund conferences and the need to contain costs for GCARD2 and reflect on the value and best use of international meetings, to reduce costs and the environmental footprint in GCARD 2014.

Mercy Akeredolu thanked the Secretariat for a good and comprehensible report. She felt strongly that media and communications costs should not be reduced as this was a vital part of impact and generating further support for future initiatives.

Djakin Akimaliev expressed strong support for the GCARD Conference and the work of the Secretariat in supporting regional actions both financially and technically. He was content to approve the budget.

The Chair summarized that SC members appreciated the report with some reservations about specific cost items. He noted the cash flow situation although the overall budget is healthy. The 40% used for the Secretariat and governance was justified and appropriate. He recognized concerns over international consultant rates and asked the Secretariat to review procedures for recruiting consultants.

Because of the GCARD, funds for Regional and other programmatic activities were on the low side this year and Secretariat were asked to review programme opportunities based on requests from stakeholders and look to adjust where possible, by reducing GCARD costs or increasing income. The host country’s support to GCARD was noted and appreciated. He appreciated that media and communication costs could potentially be cut back, but this needed to be balanced with ensuring visibility of the programme and not reducing the quality of the message.

The Chair requested approval of the budget, recognizing in this the need for a review of programmatic expenditure based on requests from Regional Fora and constituencies in line with the MTP and availability of disposable funds. He requested that the Secretariat do so in consultation with the PC.

The Budget was accepted unanimously.

Action: Secretariat to review available programme budget and review allocations against 2012 requests received in consultation with PC, based on MTP objectives and balanced across GFAR stakeholders and funder expectations.
12. Selection of next GFAR Chair

Prof. Monty Jones steps down in March 2013. A Search Committee was formed to seek a new Chair. Those identified for this Committee, subject to their agreement, were Xiangjun Yao, Raj Paroda, David Radcliffe, Lucy Muchoki and Nikita Eriksen-Hamel. A Chair is to be identified from among this group to lead the process.

*Action: process to be set in place*

Valedictory for Dr Rodney Cooke

The Chair described Dr Cooke’s great contribution to GFAR over the years. His considerable leadership and his role as a pillar of support for GFAR were unsurpassed. Dr Cooke had been Chair of the GFAR Donor Support Group from 2002 and had increased donor support considerably. He had always been a member of the Management Team and Steering Committee. As Chair, Monty Jones had always tremendously valued the inputs made by Dr Cooke to these Committees and his commitment to GFAR, as well as having been counsel and adviser to the Committees and the Chair. He had promoted GFAR’s visibility and helped to steer the implementation of the GCARD process. Prof Jones was concerned that his departure would leave a difficult void to fill and he would wish to continue to draw on Dr Cooke’s advice in the future.

Dr Cooke responded, thanking the Chair and Steering Committee for their generosity. He recalled how IFAD had always been a core supporter of GFAR since its founding through the patronage of Ismael Serageldin as World Bank Vice-President. IFAD supports rural poverty reduction and smallholder farmers, which are directly the agendas addressed by GFAR.

He was pleased that GFAR had moved ahead over the last 10 years and a lot had been achieved – recognition by the G8, G20, the GCARD Roadmap and from this the derivation of the Medium Term Plan are very solid achievements, but GFAR cannot be complacent, the need for results and impact remain strong drivers.

13. Any Other Business

CGIAR Fund Council

The Fund Council paper on the composition of the Fund Council was discussed. It was considered important that GFAR should express an opinion on this. The composition had been agreed in 2009 to ensure a regional balance and broad representation and was now being reviewed.

The SC agreed that GFAR should recommend that the representation should continue to be balanced between North and South and to make use of GFAR and the Regional Forum seat to bring in perspectives of stakeholders into the FC discussions and decision making processes.

*Action: Chair to express this to the Fund Council*
Annual Report 2011

The Secretariat was tasked with compiling this in advance of the GCARD 2012. They should contact the Regional Fora and the directly-supported programmes and networks to solicit input on key achievements and impacts. The Secretariat was given the go-ahead to hire a consultant author for this task. The Regional Fora should be requested to contribute to a time bound deadline of one month. The emphasis should be on impacts rather than activities and with pictures of actions on the ground.

Action: Secretariat to propose the report format, for input from the RF and others.

Representation of Advisory Services and other sectoral representation in GFAR

It was recognized that GFAR was a founder member of GFRAS, had a role in GFRAS governance and was a directly funding supporter of GFRAS actions, but that the role of GFRAS in GFAR had not yet been formally defined.

GFRAS welcomed that the GFAR MTP now directly included GFRAS’ actions and the GFRAS constituency were very willing to take an active part in the GCARD, with their resources.

After a brief and positive discussion, the Chair summarized that the Steering Committee Members very much welcomed GFRAS into GFAR’s work. He recognized that the Charter needed urgent revision to embrace GFRAS and other sectors that had requested roles in GFAR’s governance and that this was the subject of the imminent governance review. Rather than the piece-meal revision of the Charter, it would be preferred to wait until the governance review had reported and then make the changes required coherently. Until that time of a formal change, GFAR would welcome GFRAS representation as a permanent observer able to participate in all SC meetings.

Farmer representation was also discussed and the implications of the collapse of IFAP. The development of the World Farmers Organization was broadly welcomed, but it was also recognized that this did not as yet have wide representation from the South, nor of smallholder farmer organizations. Until this becomes clearer a mechanism of regional representation is preferred, which could be rotated by agreement.

The Chair summarized that representation of farmers around the world should be addressed within the governance review and appropriate mechanisms proposed for this taking into account the needs for legitimate representation and global coverage.

Action: GFRAS and rotated regional farmers organizations to be given permanent observer status pending forthcoming Charter review
Conclusion

The Chair closed the meeting, thanking all Committee members for having covered huge ground in a very friendly and conducive atmosphere. This had covered 3 outstanding strategic documents for GFAR: the Medium Term Plan, the M&E strategy and the Governance Review. Strategic planning had covered foresight, partnership and capacity development as expressed through the GCARD 2012 Conference.

The Medium Term Plan represented a big step forward for GFAR’s planning processes and led towards outcome-based actions among all GFAR stakeholders, in line with the GCARD Roadmap. He highlighted the Global Foresight Hub as an initiative created by GFAR and which was a very good development towards more strategic thinking in GFAR’s processes and which should subsequently result in a strategy document.

GCARD and the Roadmap are flagship activities for GFAR and GFAR’s success is linked to the success of the GCARD process. So all involved in GFAR should do everything in their power to ensure the success of GCARD 2. This also required the impact of GCARD 2 to be demonstrated through its outcomes.

Expectations on GFAR are constantly rising, so it is important to also tighten its governance, review the Charter and be prepared to adjust it as required and bring in AR4D sectors such as advisory service and education that at present were not directly represented. Improved governance should also include a mechanism for self-evaluation of the Steering Committee’s members,

A committee has been established to search for a replacement for the Chair at the end of his period of office.

The CGIAR is recognized as a key constituency in GFAR and also as the number one partner for national systems because of the strong functional links involved, which required give-and-take both ways, a relationship which the GFAR mechanism is uniquely placed to facilitate.

Relationships with the G8 and G20 had been strengthened and GFAR needed to tap into their resources and linkages at all opportunities. New G20 initiatives offered potential links to advanced science capabilities that could benefit all. The BRICS countries were also seen as key partners in GFAR that should also be directly recognized in the governance.

The Chair closed the meeting, thanking all present for a very productive meeting.
# 26th GFAR Steering Committee Meeting – Summary table of actions arising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee Actions Taken Report</strong></td>
<td>GFAR Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat to prepare Annual Report, with Input obtained from Regional Fora and GFAR stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair &amp; Secretariat, with FAO, to build on earlier links with G20</td>
<td>Chair, GFAR Secretariat &amp; FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Fora to consider how to increase and sustain their own capacities in foresight and other key areas</td>
<td>Regional Fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Report of the Programme Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair to meet FAO DG at earliest available opportunity</td>
<td>GFAR Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consortium to advise on allocation for the 100K USD performance-related funding and on SRF Action Plan process and expectations of stakeholders</td>
<td>Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RF requested to engage directly with CRPs to build practical relationships</td>
<td>Regional Fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender in Agriculture Partnership to be made operational by Secretariat, FAO, CGIAR and RF in first instance</td>
<td>GFAR Secretariat, FAO, CGIAR and Regional Fora in first instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Fund Council outcomes to be circulated to SC by Secretariat</td>
<td>GFAR Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Fora to examine their delivery of Roadmap actions and how they will be monitored &amp; evaluated. Also to seek to broaden their funding bases and develop regional/sub-regional</td>
<td>Regional Fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Medium Term Plan Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat to revisit the MTP frame and re-circulate to SC members for their further inputs and intended commitments, within a defined 3 week period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP To be revised to produce a more condensed logframe over 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR Secretariat &amp; GFAR stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat to employ expert consultant and move ahead with introducing M&amp;E strategy across all GFAR’s work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>GCARD 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC were requested to meet on the next day and fine tune the programme. Secretariat, OC Chair and OC core groups to take forward detailed planning of sessions. No further SC approval would be required from this meeting, but the SC would wish to see the final version shared for any input to the OC Chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCARD Organizing Committee &amp; GFAR Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop concept paper on GAP implementation among the main organizations involved, for the SC to consider at its next meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Governance Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work was agreed to take place in 2 phases. The Secretariat was asked to go ahead with recruiting the consultant, without further reference being required to the Steering Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GFAR Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat to review available programme budget and review allocations against 2012 requests received in consultation with PC, based on MTP objectives and balanced across GFAR stakeholders and funder expectations.</td>
<td>GFAR Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.1</th>
<th>Selection of next GFAR Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process to be set in place</td>
<td>GFAR Chair Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>CGIAR Fund Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair to reflect SC opinion on FC composition to the Fund Council</td>
<td>GFAR Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13.1</th>
<th>Annual Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat to propose the report format, solicit input from the RF and other stakeholders and supported programmes.</td>
<td>GFAR Secretariat with Regional Fora and GFAR Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13.2</th>
<th>Sectoral Representation in GFAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFRAS and rotated regional farmers organizations to be given permanent observer status pending forthcoming Governance Review.</td>
<td>GFAR Chair and Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>