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Opening Remarks

The Chair of GFAR Dr. Adel El-Beltagy opened the meeting by welcoming the participants.
He briefly indicated how crucial this meeting was in view of organizing GCARD. He thanked
the Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Dr. Ismail Serageldin and his staff for the invitation and special
privileges accorded to GFAR in organizing the 23rd GFAR Steering Meeting in the Nobel
Room of the Bibliotheca. He recalled Dr. Serageldin’s role as the pioneering architect and a
key founder of the Global Forum on Agriculture Research and also Dr. Serageldin’s keen
interest in following the development of the Forum. He then requested, Dr Ismail Serageldin to address the members.

In his address Dr. Sergeldin reviewed the need and rationale for establishing GFAR which was during his time at the World Bank. He started by stating the original United Nations (UN) Charter where people instead of governments were supposed to be the attention of the global UN community. He then went on to indicate how hunger and poverty in the 20th Century and now are a blot on humanity and its development. He celebrated GFAR as a notion whose time has now come and also emphasized that this needs to be reaffirmed continuously, with attention to the involvement of people and countries in all actions as a strongly bottom-up initiative. He also emphasized that real empowerment in development requires inclusion of people as policies are dictated by needs of people. The only Millennium Development Goal that is failing is that of abolishing hunger and poverty. He emphasized that the focus of agricultural research for development has to be on the resource poor, small holder farmers and producers who formed the majority of the poor all over the world. He also stated that there is now no time for rhetoric and empty promises from the global community and especially those engaged in ARD. Dr. Serageldin wished GFAR Steering Committee success in its deliberations.

Dr. Adel El-Beltagy again, on behalf of GFAR and on his personal behalf, thanked Dr. Serageldin to make it possible in spite of his busy schedule including International travel to address the GFAR Steering Committee and the Bibliotheca Alexandrina for inviting and providing the use of all facilities without charge to hold this important GFAR meeting.

Agenda of the meeting
The agenda was indorsed (see Annex I)

Minutes of the 22nd Steering Committee (Maputo)

The draft Minutes of the 22nd GFAR Steering Committee meeting were approved without change or amendment. (see Annex II)

Moved: Chair
Seconded: Dr Ghodake

Actions Taken Report

Dr Holderness reported on the follow-up actions taken in regard to items Minuted in the 22nd GFAR Steering Committee (SC) (Annex III). Specific issues raised for decision were:

NGO member

The repeated efforts by the Secretariat over recent months to contact NGO member Mr Sabio had been unsuccessful, the website of Heifer International is showing a vacancy announcement for Mr Sabio’s position and he is no longer listed as a staff member. The
office of Heifer International was inundated in recent floods in Manila, which has prevented further communication. It is concluded that he has left the organization and so can no longer be deemed to be representing NGOs in GFAR.

By the GFAR Charter, the alternate member, Mr Ali Darwish (Lebanon) thus takes on the role of representing non-governmental organizations in the Steering Committee and Mr Darwish was confirmed in this position by unanimous approval of the SC. A new alternate member will be requested from the NGO constituency. Mr Darwish was originally appointed by election from the NGO constituency in 2006. He is a member of the International NGO/CSO Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC network) and aims to engage with other networks through this mechanism.

*Decision: to accept Dr Darwish as the NGO member for a 3 year period starting at this meeting*
*Moved: Jack Wilkinson*
*Seconded: Ibrahim Hamdan*

**Private Sector member**

The Secretariat has repeatedly tried to contact the member for the private sector, Dr Arvind Kapur, but has been informed by his previous employers that he has left the company. A formal message from the Secretariat seeking confirmation that he no longer wishes to continue the role has not been answered by the deadline provided and this is considered his effective resignation.

The Secretariat has approached three private sector networks to become observers to GFAR and all have accepted:

- CropLife International – companies involved in plant science input provision
- PanAAC - small enterprises in Africa
- SAI Platform – major food and produce market companies

Together these represent and connect with three key dimensions of private sector involvement in agricultural research for development. Of these, only PanAAC representative was able to be present at the SC meeting, though all three have expressed strong interest in GFAR involvement.

Taking into consideration the presence of PanAAC representative at this Steering Committee Meeting, it was proposed that Ms. Lucy Muchoki, representing the PanAAC be invited to participate as a member of the GFAR Steering Committee till such time as decided by the Public Sector interested in ARD and for the GFAR Secretariat to organize a suitable representation from the private sector as soon as possible. This was unanimously accepted by all members.

*Outcome: Ms. Lucy Muchoki was welcomed as member of the GFAR Steering Committee representing the Private Sector to the meeting.*
Action: The Secretariat was requested to follow up with the 3 networks and obtain confirmation of their selected member and alternate from among the three entities as soon as possible.

The GFAR Chair

Dr. El-Beltagy presented his report on his involvement in a series of international meetings and his engagement in dialogs related to agriculture research for development. Those meeting included BioVision, the World Water Forum, Turkey, the 6th STS Annual Meeting, Japan and the World Food Prize in Iowa, USA. He also highlighted his represented GFAR in the CGIAR’s executive council and the change steering committee.

Responding to some questions regarding the value of these meeting, the Chair emphasized the importance of GFAR’s engagement with a range of emerging global agendas and establishing contacts with new partners. In this he was acting as an Ambassador for GFAR as required by it’s the Charter. The Chair preformed these duties even when he was supported by the Egyptian government (e.g. the BioVision and the World Food Prize meeting).

GFAR’s positions were queried on three issues to which the Chair gave the following responses:

The scientific community: capacity development needs and viable career structures were two key areas GFAR was addressing through the GCARD.

GMOs: GFAR’s positions were those of its constituents, which held diverse views. GFAR took a policy informing role based on knowledge generated through scientific research. In that role GFAR does not prescribe a specific policy, but fostering a dialog between the parties with the aim to ultimately benefit the rural poor.

The CGIAR change: GFAR’s perused the goal of opening the CGIAR system to greater inclusiveness. Such opening up will necessitate that CGIAR centres have a clearer focus of their research agenda on working with an enlarged set of partners to achieve developmental goals.

Activities of the Secretariat

Dr Holderness presented the report of Secretariat activities over the year to date, across the four areas of strategic focus of GFAR. The report included a summary of growing donor interest in the Forum and of activities to catalyse and support actions by GFAR stakeholders in each area.

The Chair formally thanked the GFAR Secretariat for their contribution throughout the year. It was recognized that the Secretariat had been kept at low cost but the magnitude of work undertaken was described as tremendous. It was emphasized that the steering committee should look at the support for the proper staffing of the secretariat in addition to the consultants. Further votes of appreciation were made by Drs Jones, Allegri and Al-Bakri during their interventions.

Specific issues highlighted in discussion:
G8 recognition
The very high level political recognition of GFAR by the G8 L’Aquila meeting, was welcomed and the contributions to this of the GFAR Chair, Steering Committee members especially Dr. Mario Allegri, Chair FORAGRO, the support provided by the Government of Italy, IFAD and UK-DFID in particular and the Secretariat were recognized by members. In light of the new political focus on agriculture and food security, the next step needed for GFAR was to advocate for increased funds being committed into global, regional and national ARD actions.

Advisory Services
The support being provided by GFAR to the development of a Global Forum on Rural Advisory Services (GFRAS) was debated. It was recognized that the weakness of extension systems in many parts of the World needs to be corrected. For example, in the recent face to face regional dialogue for the West Asia and North Africa for GCARD it was recognized as a key issue. For Sub-Saharan Africa, FARA had also indicated similar concerns and was supporting AFAAS as the advisory/extension ‘wing’ of FARA. The Central Asia and South Caucasus (CAC) Region and Asia Pacific Region had through their Regional Forums and GCARD Regional Reviews expressed similar concerns. Best practices in extension would need to go wider than the need to enhance the role of specific advisory services and include better connection between all those involved including agricultural research.

The Chair concluded that this agenda merited working with more than one entity such as GFRAS which was yet nascent and in formative stages and there were a number of other organizations active in this area, including FAO and IFAD, as also those from the South which needed to come together and champion this agenda. This also meant engagement with donor agencies to link the activities they were each supporting. He also noted that GFRAS at the moment as in its documents appeared to be a continuation of the Neuchatel Initiative which was not representative with actors from South and had an overwhelming presence of representation from donor agencies.

YPARD
The role of YPARD was discussed. The external review of YPARD had raised a number of concerns about the capacity and focus of YPARD that were now being addressed in a new business plan. As an initiative initiated through GFAR and addressing an important agenda it was felt that YPARD should be supported by GFAR, but that it would also need to quickly take on more of a hub role, linking in with a wide range of youth organizations & networks to broaden the reach and perspective to better address needs around ensuring viable, relevant and attractive educational agendas and careers in agricultural research and agriculture in development.

The representation of GFAR in policy processes and meetings was raised. Some members felt that it was difficult for people representing any one institution to also represent the GFAR platform. This needed to be considered further to provide ways to emphasize the multi-stakeholder nature of GFAR. Dr. Allegri also recognized the efforts of Dr. El-Beltagy and Secretariat, despite being a small team, in positioning GFAR in different venues. He highlighted the contribution of GFAR in the CGIAR reform, from the change process through to the Transition Management Team and appreciated both the Secretariat’s role in supporting change and their permanent support to the regional Fora.
Dr. El-Beltagy concluded by thanking the members of the steering committee who have participated effectively in different venue on behalf of GFAR, with special thanks to Dr. Allegri, Mr. Wilkinson, Dr. Paroda. There was consensus that representation of GFAR in diverse events by steering committee members in encouraged. This could be carried out through their institutional supported activities or sponsored directly via GFAR funds. Active mechanisms should be found to strengthen these representative roles.

**CGIAR Reform**

Dr. Holderness described the role of GFAR representatives in the Transition Management Team, the CGIAR Executive Committee (EXCO) and the processes of discussion such as the initial formulation meetings around the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and Megaprogrammes (MPs).

Dr Hall then added further detail on the status of discussion and planning around the future programmatic focus of the system.

Dr. El-Beltagy reported that the change process began as a means of looking for future modalities and partner linkages to reinvigorate the system. The GCARD concept was born out of this commitment. He welcomed the Fund Council being inclusive of GFAR and considered the latest formula better than the previous EXCO, as there was now equal representation of North & South voices. However, he felt the results-based ‘Mega-programmes’ were being rushed too much, which defied the logic of the change process. There was a strong need to join the GCARD and the SRF processes, which entailed real consultation in each region about the programmes. The role of GFAR was recognized in the relationship of associated investments required at different levels. The SRF study had concluded that for every 1$ spent on international agricultural research there needed to be $10 or more needs to be spent on agricultural research for development and innovation systems to achieve the needed impact. This was recognized as the value of the GCARD in looking systematically at national AR4D needs.

The concept of the GCARD as including a means of accountability for the value of international research in development was welcomed by the donors, as this created a joint responsibility for research products being translated into development outcomes.

Policy advocacy for agriculture and for agricultural research for development was still regarded as a real battle that cut across all investments. The role of the Independent Science and Partnerships Council was discussed and it was felt this should aim not to work on practical partnerships which was a role for regional forums and GFAR, but primarily on advice to funders for CGIAR programs.

The intersection of development of the GCARD process and the megaprogrammes was seen as a key linkage and part of the CGIAR’s new focus on helping to make development happen, in a broader role than before. Aligning the two was difficult to achieve in practice and the SRF development was tougher than had been anticipated. The first draft of the SR was described by Dr Hall as reflecting a product that was primarily the product of 6 people, rather than having already gained wide buy-in.
Dr Jones expressed concern that at the time of the Africa face-to-face meeting the documents from the SRF team were not available and no senior figure from the CGIAR was prepared to actually present the strategy. Dr Hall responded that there had indeed been problems with the draft at the time of the Africa face to face meeting and that the CGIAR Alliance itself had at the time just received the draft. He recognized that this had been problematic but was a legacy of how difficult these processes were in practice. The Africa face-to-face meeting was recognized as a collective failure of the CGIAR. However, later consultations had gone better as the Alliance had become more comfortable with the ideas contained.

Discussion recognized the need to put the SRF in the larger context of the GCARD. The steps to join the two need to be worked out and colleagues in the regions wanted to be consulted more about the proposed programmes. GFAR is seen as central to these processes and the repositioning of GFAR post-GCARD will be important to its future roles.

It was clearly summarized and agreed by all that the CGIAR is one component of the AR4D systems addressed by the GCARD. The changes proposed via the GCARD define more clearly how the CGIAR can play a better role as a partner to national systems. GFAR’s role changes also. Assuming the CGIAR change processes are accepted, these will be focused on the needs of resource-poor farmers and links with responsibilities of national governments to invest and create the enabling environment for the needs of the poor to be met. The role of the GCARD is recognized as vital; past top-down processes of planning and prioritization in the CGIAR had little traction amongst their partners.

The need for national engagement was recognized by all and that this had to now go beyond commodity-based thinking and deal with issues such as risk management also. There was clear belief in the work of the CGIAR, but also strong recognition that commensurate commitments and increases were required by countries if these development objectives were to be met. The GCARD approach of putting people rather than technologies at the centre of thinking was welcomed by all. It was also recognized that the funding sought by the CGIAR was still a small amount compared with that required elsewhere in national and regional research and innovation systems. GFAR’s value was seen in bringing that wider focus and policy advocacy.

Outcome
Dr. El-Beltagy concluded that the future focus and positioning of GFAR post-GCARD should remain as the central mechanism enabling these processes of partnership and programme development around the world, as well as mobilizing and engaging all GFAR’s constituencies in policy advocacy. The practical development of these programmes would not occur until 2010, which was when dialogues would need clear coordination and linkage with all sectors and clear, sharp articulation of demand through the GCARD process and its follow-through.

GCARD
Dr. El-Beltagy stated that the Day 1 high level segment of the meeting aims at strengthening the capacity of the national AR4D systems in developing countries. The lack of support for these national systems was an impediment for agricultural development and hence the welfare of the economies of several developing countries. The wealth of knowledge generated at OECD member countries and the CGIAR can not be put to use due to the weakness of the national systems. He anticipates the active participation of the invitees of this day to focus on the following:
a) the importance of strengthening the national systems of the developing world as part of the global agenda,
b) greater sharing of information and skills and strengthening stakeholder inclusion at national, regional and global levels,
c) investment sources, commitments from international and regional development agencies, policy makers from developed and developing countries.
Those issues will form three separate Davos style roundtable.

In response, queries were raised from the SC on the linkage to other days of the GCARD and how Day 1 outcomes would become operationalized in harmony with the other days.

The Chair described that the opening would be with confirmed high level speakers from the UN and France. This was proposed to be followed by three discussion panels.

Invitations were being addressed to Councils of Ministers and cross-sectoral representation, including Ministries of Science, UN Agencies. The Chair sought support from the SC members in identifying panel speakers and individuals from key Ministries and from the CGIAR.

Some members of the SC responded that there was concern over ‘Summit fatigue’ in a number of agencies and that a Statement would be preferred to a Declaration as Declarations required extensive development prior to the meeting and there was reluctance to dilute the ‘bottom-up message of the GCARD’. A high level event was recognized as a good thing but that there would be a lot of work involved. This should be a showcase to get the meeting going, not something that deflected from the regional and CGIAR focus.

The Chair responded that the focus of the whole day is on strengthening national systems and this applied to their public, private and civil dimensions. Media companies and press coverage would cover the whole meeting as one, including Day 1.

The focus of the panels was discussed, in terms of the meeting flow it would have been better to have these as concluding sessions, but high-level individuals prefer to be at the start of such meetings. It was also felt that high level individuals would not stay for the whole day so would be difficult to formulate them into panels as they would also wish to meet the press. It was suggested by several members that half a day would be more appropriate. A 10.30 start was felt to be more appropriate for a Sunday meeting as there would also be security screening as well as a reluctance of high level participants to start too early.

While increased investment was sought by the AR4D community, Ministers would not want to give the same message twice and had already made such commitments in the FAO Summit and elsewhere; the specific messaging would be important. It was felt that the message should be tight and not too all-embracing. The SC agreed that presenting the GCARD as a launch from dialogue into real action would be a strong message – after all the furore of the food crisis, here was the opportunity for action. Delivery on the commitment to investment to secure medium-long term futures for the poor was then an appropriate message.

French farmers could arrange local food spaces in the meeting to highlight local production.

The Chair assured the SC that the planning and specific invitations needed and merited specific attention by a sub-group of the Task Force, but that the logistics etc would be
arranged as a unified process for the GCARD, delivered by the Task Force. Day 1 would now be developed into a workplan. The media/communications agency would now need to be contracted as soon as possible so that a clear message was established across the entire meeting and was consistent across all parts. If round table sessions could not be fitted, then key speakers and respondents were preferred.

**Outcomes**

- A 2-3 page concept for day 1 would now be prepared by the Task Force sub group with support from GFAR Secretariat, elaborating on these ideas.
- The TF sub-group would just be concerned with the invitations and programme for this day.
- For protocol, the French government would invite again those whom they wished from the group identified.
- It was recognized that the Steering Committee needed to retain periodic oversight of the process but that the Task Force needed to be able to operate effectively in moving the various processes required forwards.
- The World Bank was funding the GCARD in order to obtain wide endorsement of the CGIAR’s plans and this needed to be clearly incorporated in the planning.

**Overall process to GCARD Montpellier**

The process was summarized by Dr Jones, including the value of the e-consultations and regional face-to-face meetings.

In response, the SC emphasized the need to see a change of modalities and mindsets as well as greater building of linkages.

**Outcome**

- There was need to ensure that both civil society organizations and the private sector were effectively represented in the Conference, as well as balance gender representation.
- It was emphasized that the conference should incorporate effective balance among all entities, not be dominated by any one group.
- The global e-consultation to be developed by the global authors would provide further opportunity for public input on specific questions, using the networks now built up in each region.

Region-by region presentations outlined the key features of each regional review and consultation. In each case, these were presented by the relevant regional consultant, introduced and supported by the Chair of the Regional Forum. Details of these reports are in Annex IV.

**Europe**

Dr Richards presented the regional paper. Key features included the new recognition of high (and increasing) levels of absolute poverty in parts of Eastern Europe itself. Food security was considered as important as financial indices of poverty. European research systems were thus
seen as having two roles to play, within Europe and out to other regions. A strong focus on inclusive systems was required.

The SC recognized that Europe now had to be considered both as an aid donor and as a region with specific pockets of poverty that also needed to be addressed. They commented on the need to be consistent with use of data projections and highlighted the need for getting previous research into widespread use, which would require long-term strategies and actions.

Asia-Pacific

Dr R.B. Singh presented the regional paper. Key issues identified were that the smallholder farmers of Asia could match those of Latin America in productivity, but that they also had greater challenges in accessing resources as well as in rural unemployment and a lack of entitlement of the poor for access to land and water. These complexities led towards a need to reconcile local innovation and modern technologies and to bring specific research focus to the needs of the poor.

In discussion, it was recognized there was clear need to increase capacities in the region and to cross-link agricultural policies and programmes with those of other regions. The trade-offs between farmgate prices and those in towns were recognized, bringing the need to both elevate the status of agriculture and bring specific focus on the poor.

Central Asia and Caucuses

Dr S. Beniwal presented the report. The Central Asia and South Caucasus region faced particular challenges in emerging from centralized planning to alternative systems. This required effective collaboration, partnerships and linkages as well as investment in the agricultural and rural sector, while also addressing the needs of farmers displaced by conflict. Concerns were expressed that the CGAR’s presence in the region has had a strong benefit, but that this could be abandoned in the CGIAR’s reform processes.

It was concluded that this region could either become a hot-spot of problems or become the granary of the world, depending on politics and processes followed over the next few years. The creation, sharing and transfer of knowledge to small farmers will be essential to successful development. The role and support of GFAR in strengthening regional capacities was recognized and appreciated.

The SC commended the broadening of the institutional base of CACAARI and recognized that policy reform was a strong thread in the needs identified. The CGIAR was requested to play a more effective capacity building role in the region.

Latin America & Caribbean

Dr Trigo presented the report. FORAGRO had mobilized a wide cross-section of stakeholders in the region. The face-to-face meeting had involved 75 participants, from Monsanto to indigenous NGOs. It had clearly recognized the need to involve civil society in research as a key component for turning research into innovation and innovation into impact. Key bottlenecks remained the yield gap between research and practice and the lack of an integrated approach to value chains. The meeting was felt to be a much more matured debate than in previous meetings, with much more voice to civil society and the private sector.
The CGIAR megaprogrammes were felt to be disciplinary areas at present, not addressing specific problems. There was no comparative advantage recognized for the CGIAR in areas such as diets, nutrition and health.

In general the regional dialogue has taken a fresh look and considered small farmers to be part of the solution, not part of the problem. This was recognized as needing a major rethink on institutional innovation and roles and the processes of agricultural research. This was considered to be a crucial role for GFAR and FORAGRO.

West Asia & North Africa

Dr Habbab presented the report. Cross cutting needs were aligning research with development needs, for capacity development and the growing challenge of climate change. Key challenges included a lack of trust between farmers, extension and research and a low public awareness of agricultural issues and the need for innovation.

New partnerships required were with farmers and grass roots organizations, with opinion leaders and to work more with women farmers. Key messages focused on climate change impacts and the vulnerability of natural resources in the region. The e-consultation had not been as broad-reaching as desired, it was hoped this could be redressed in the global round.

There was a growing awareness of the need to put farmers in the midst of the dialog for agricultural development priorities.

Africa

Dr U. Mokunwe presented the report. Of Africa’s 987 million people, 61% are rural and 51% depend solely on agriculture for their livelihoods, but 236 million are undernourished. Sub-Saharan Africa is the only region where the absolute number of poor and hungry is increasing, with 16.5 billion spent on food imports in 2007. The Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) is Africa’s response to this situation. Key gaps are in a poor capacity for innovation (5 countries possess 40% of the agricultural research capacity, while some have less than 10 agricultural scientists). Also there is a lack of coordination between research and extension and too much focus on challenges, rather than practical opportunities.

The e-consultation called for greater understanding and coordination of CAADP and FAAP, with alignment of government commitments towards these. There was a strong need to emphasize farmer empowerment and in particular on women and youth and for ARD actors to embrace the interests of the wider community, not just research outputs. This would require more development oriented research, more work on areas such as post harvest technologies, market access and the better use of local innovation.

The value addition through the GCARD process was seen as aiming to ensure a greater focus on issues most relevant to poor farmers and consumers, with research embedded in the development agenda and funding systems aligning research with development and international research effectively aligned with regional and national agendas. In meeting these aims, the GCARD is seen by Africa as a mechanism for putting into practice the goals of CAADP and the key principles espoused in the FAAP. It was emphasized that the CGIAR
must base its work on priorities established by Africa and African stakeholders expressed their strong hope that the GCARD process will guide and drive the reform process envisaged by the CGIAR.

In discussion it was valued that the consultations had reaffirmed the CAADP, but this was not yet central to all African governments planning and would require further engagement with Finance Ministries.

**GCARD 2010**

The outline framework of the Conference was discussed:

- **Day 1** is a high-level summit focusing on the development policies, investments and changes required to strengthen dynamic and effective national agricultural research for development systems.

- **Day 2** will focus on opportunities and priorities from each region. These will be mapped against the findings from the CGIAR SRF to determine fit and the roles of the CGIAR by its partners and intended beneficiaries.

- **Day 3** will examine the tools and changes necessary to make agricultural research systems more effective in impacting end-users and how to boost learning and change across regions, to ensure that research that is most suitable can be sourced from around the world, human capital strengthened and incentives instituted for focus on impact for the poor.

- **Day 4** will wrap up with an agreed Action Plan to strengthen AR4D on which to deliver the regional priorities. A Montpellier Declaration will be produced highlighting actors, roles, accountabilities, behaviours and modalities required for more effective development.

**Outcome:**

*These principles of the overall framework proposed for the Conference were approved unanimously by the Steering Committee.*

*Moved: Adel El-Beltagy*  
*Seconded: Monty Jones*

The detailed programme was then discussed by the SC.

**GCARD Conference Day 1**

The Chair outlined the key focus of Day 1 which aims to empower national systems to make a difference in development.

- The need for a high level day was supported by all, but strong questions were raised as to how to achieve this in the most effective and deliverable way.
• The SC responded that day 1 should focus on the investment case alone as other elements were picked up elsewhere. The expected outcome should be to raise expectations and enable donors to show how they are trying to commit to their pledges after L’Aquila and give high level politicians the opportunity to act on pledges made.
• The dialogue on AR4D may be better pulling attention back to the hunger MDG and focusing attention on existing agreed goals.
• It was felt that the titles used were not yet attractive and needed to be strengthened and made more specific, with a clearer 1 paragraph summary on the purpose of the day.
• There is need to have opportunity for key speakers to say how we are going to change the research community and set out the new frame needed.
• It was important not to try to cover too much in one day.
• The proposed eminent speaker should aim to focus AR4D to deliver food security in a world of climate change
• The partnership element needed to show linkage with all relevant policy efforts, e.g. GPAFSN, G8 and rise above a technical meeting to show the linkage of research to development impact.
• It was also important that farmers & civil society were able to speak on day 1
• The peace and prosperity theme was understood, but it was felt this could be further elaborated to include its defining issues such as pressure on use of water and natural resources.

Outcomes

• Task Force or TF working group to review titles and bring out the focus on strengthening national systems (public, private & civil) and empowering development through knowledge
• TF working group needs to consider if 3 panels are realistic
• The focus should be on turning promises into action and commitments as to what needed to be done.
• The final panel should also better align agricultural research into development.
• Clearer decision processes are required to decide on the programme. It was resolved that a working group from the GCARD Task Force, headed by the GFAR Chair for this day, would review and further develop the day 1 programme and circulate to the Steering Committee for their endorsement.

Day 2:

The initially proposed basis was felt to be too dominated by presentations and more space was needed for feedback from participants to create a livelier interaction. This needed to be balanced with a good overview of regional findings and the need to bring out key investment and action areas across each region. The meeting should avoid revisiting the regional findings in depth, these would be fully available as written reports by the time of the Conference.

It was also important to incorporate adequate integration of the CGIAR SRF into the bigger framework. The broad flow desired is one of the regional demand side first, then incorporation of the impact mapping from the CGIAR SRF, then discussion and integration as
an overall action plan, with small groups discussing the linkage of the two and leading to the overall synthesis from the global consultants.

The proposed revision comprises:

Morning
- 10 minute presentations per region on defined demands and needs in agricultural research for development, presented to a common template.
- Followed by breakouts, possibly as a ‘market place’ approach, on where research might best play a role in meeting these needs, as a real opportunity to bring people into the conversation and highlight success stories.
- Reported back to plenary

Afternoon
- Presentation by the CGIAR SRF of areas of need in which agricultural research, within the mandate of the CGIAR, might best play a role.
- Followed by breakouts that sought to find areas of common ground and opportunity between ‘bottom up’ and ‘top down’ views and link supply opportunities to demand in different contexts.
- Reported back to plenary

These would together highlight the thematic fit and gaps between the wider global frame and the specific role and ‘offer’ of the CGIAR.

Sessions would each seek a balance in stakeholder representation and allow for effective interaction through electronic media with those unable to be present at the meeting.

Day 3

The Global Authors will first present their findings and vision of the future action plan required to address systematic issues of investment, capacity building, access to new technologies, ideas and knowledge, stronger partnerships among diverse actors and better focus on the needs of the poor and on system sustainability. This would set the scene for discussions of key issues on Day 3 and finalization of an action plan and declaration on Day 4.

8 topics were highlighted, as developed and agreed by the Task Force from past processes such as the Delhi GFAR Conference, the WDR and IAASTD and the FAO Summits and from the working groups conceptualized by French partners as the host nation. These themes aim to explore the key areas of intervention required for agricultural research systems to deliver better in practice against development aims. These were:

1. Changing research partnership practices and funding for greater impact: learning from innovative partnerships and mechanisms linking research with end users and development processes (GFAR/CGIAR workshop in Kenya February 2010 and Agropolis case studies)
2. Highlight the role of women in research and of research to benefit women (Issues paper commissioned via CGIAR Gender & Diversity Group and partners)
3. Revitalizing research for the future: re-examine capacity needs, education priorities, career incentives and value systems in research & extension (Issues paper commissioned via YPARD and Agropolis pre-GCARD workshop)

4. S-S learning: examine the implications of fast-growing economies (BRICS etc) as learning experiences for others and now as technology providers to other countries (CAAS/GFAR workshop in China February 2010, presentations from countries concerned)

5. Revitalizing advisory services through collective advocacy, learning and knowledge sharing among the new actors in advisory services

6. Making better use of what is known: increasing access, availability and relevance of information from research and local innovation among the poor (Issues paper from December Hyderabad workshop of FAO, GFAR, APAAARI and CGIAR)

7. Future scope – foresight, predicting needs and the role and use of new technologies and knowledge (Agropolis and outcomes from Science Forum)

8. Sustaining knowledge through the market: the role of the private sector in generating knowledge and technologies relevant and accessible to the poor (SAI platform, AGRA, CropLife, outcomes from FAO Conference and FAO Private Sector Forum)

The role of civil society had been considered as a separate focus group, but it was agreed that this was a cross-cutting issue that needed to be incorporated in all. This theme was replaced by the focus on better access to existing knowledge from science and local innovation. Groups needed to be well briefed to generate action plan elements and identify what baseline data was needed for subsequent evaluation after 5 years.

Each will run as parallel sessions, at present aimed at 4 sessions in the morning and 4 in the afternoon. A plenary session will then present outcomes from all sessions.

The exhibition, running throughout, will focus on common issues and development challenges facing countries of the Mediterranean basin.

**Day 4**

It was also recognized that the opportunity for a global e-consultation was desired to enable voices to be heard before the Conference. In particular, this could focus on wider feedback on specific elements of the proposed action plan and on drafting of the Declaration of principles, modalities, norms and behaviours required for research systems to deliver more effectively into development impact.

The proposed Declaration would be aspirational, aimed at those involved in agricultural research for development from all sectors and set out a set of key principles and behaviours expected and against which actions and progress could be judged. These would include guiding principles for researchers, their partners in development actions and those funding their work. The model identified is that of the Paris Declaration and its inherent principles of subsidiarity and mutual accountability. It will need to be concrete enough to be followed into action, with a strategy for follow-up through successive GCARDs. The Declaration was recognized as a celebration of change in agricultural research for development systems and of self-developed performance standards. It represents change and commitment at all levels.
It was recognized that the core principles of the Declaration would need to be agreed by e-consultation and wide circulation prior to the event. It was seen as a celebration of change in the AR4D system and an outline of expected performance standards in the changes required. It should also have scope for implementation at regional and national levels.

A synthesis of outcomes would be needed each day. Day 4 will conclude with a synthesis of conference outcomes and a formal handover to the incoming GFAR Chair.

**Outcome:**
*The detailed programme was endorsed in principle as above, the GCARD Task Force will now put together the required details for these sessions and bring back for the Steering Committee for their formal approval.*

**Media & communications**
A tender is being prepared for a professional company to manage the relationship with the press, the public outreach and dissemination of messages from the meeting.

**GCARD Management mechanisms**

The relationship between the GCARD Task Force and the Steering Committee was explored in detail to improve the processes of decision making required to deliver the GCARD as there were felt to be overlaps in governance between the two bodies (which themselves have a number of members in common).

It was agreed that the Task Force should put together the detail required and make specific decisions on content and actions required, while the SC gives overall oversight and signs off on the broad policy and strategic issues of principle. Monthly reports would be made from the TF Chair to the SC and decision points as considered relevant by the TF Chair would be considered endorsed via a no-objection basis within a certain number of days of receipt.

**Outcome**

The Secretariat was asked to come back the following day with a summary of responsibilities of the SC on the GCARD, relative to the Task Force. This was agreed as:

*GFAR Steering Committee will be responsible for strategy & policy for the GCARD and for endorsing the programme as formulated by the Task Force. The TF Chair will personally keep the Steering Committee updated each month on operational decisions made by the Task Force, actions which would be considered endorsed by the SC on a no objection basis within 3 working days of receipt.*

*The Task Force (and through them the Secretariat) will be accountable for delivery of all aspects of the meeting and its preparation, with the sole exception of the Day 1 selection of invitees and detailed programme development, which would be led by the GFAR Chair and a working group drawn from the TF.*

**Scale of GCARD Conference**
The demand for an increased number of participants above the original expectation was recognized. At present around 650 attendees are being requested by different sectors. This carries a direct cost implication and there is need to determine the maximum number that could be afforded and work back to an acceptable composition.

The SC resolved that cuts in anticipated numbers should be made now to acceptable budgetary levels and following a rational ratio between different sectors. A desired maximum total of 600 participants was agreed, provided the budget could sustain this.

Outcome
TF to determine acceptable ratios of participants among stakeholders and manage this through pre-registrations. Regional Fora to identify potential participants from each sector in each region, building on the consultations and ensuring an appropriate balance of sectors and of gender.

Future implications of the GCARD for GFAR role and governance
There was need to take stock of the implications of the GCARD processes for GFAR’s future role, which may include revision of the Charter and governance mechanisms to better reflect the needs and role of GFAR as determined by the findings from the GCARD process and Montpellier Conference, in particular in mobilizing further dialogues with stakeholders at all levels and sectors and in monitoring and evaluating progress against the Declaration and Plan for change in AR4D communities worldwide.

Outcome
It was agreed that the Montpellier product would frame what comes next and the Secretariat should not be asked to take on this additional task before Montpellier as this would add to an already ‘near-impossible’ workload. However, this should certainly be addressed after Montpellier.

Private sector in the SC voting session
Representation in the closed session where voting may take place was discussed by the SC. The three constituency organizations that had been approached as observers and could potentially represent the Private Sector in the Steering Committee had all been approached in recent weeks but had not yet resolved among themselves which should become the formal representative member of the SC. It was known by all three that Ms Lucy Muchoki was present at the meeting as an observer for the private sector.

Outcome
Given the importance of having the private sector’s perspective, after discussion in the SC, it was unanimously resolved that Ms Muchoki should be invited to formally represent the private sector as voting SC Member for this meeting. The longer term selection of the next member for the private sector would be made by and among the private sector constituency representatives subsequent to this meeting.

Report of the Global Author Team (GAT)
Dr Uma Lele presented the draft report outline (Annex V) on behalf of the GAT, recognizing that the GAT and GCARD faces challenges of meeting and managing high expectations. The
outline emphasized a focus on meeting challenges of different needs of national agricultural research systems, of addressing small farmers and of making relevant technologies available and relevant to the poor.

The report contained a strong emphasis on bottom-up processes and thinking and of countries needing to make their own commitments to agricultural research for development if the current situation were to change. It required a focus on reaching developing country policy makers in terms they could value, to increase the impact of the changes proposed by GFAR constituencies.

It focused particularly on the need for a realistic diagnosis to be developed of capacities and needs required to transform agricultural research for development systems at national level, including the investments required and capacities needed at policy, institutional and human levels and of the role of the CGIAR in strengthening national systems. The focus should not be on specific technologies, but rather on strengthening capacities in each country to make their own decisions and policies on the use of specific technologies. It was proposed to work from typologies of NARS and their various forms of need for strengthening depending on the extent of resources and agricultural market development.

This included a renewed focus on client orientation, addressing small farmer issues and making existing knowledge and technologies more accessible and available. The GCARD process should not aim to bring out NARS priorities, but to see how NARS can be strengthened to better identify and embed these in wider development investments.

The SC thanked the team for a very good job in a short space of time and accepted the outline as a useful basis to build towards the desired action plan and declaration.

Specific comments in feedback included that:

- There was need to have much greater inclusivity of the farmer community in NARS and farmers specifically at the centre of research processes.
- Markets have changed dramatically. Market and value chain research should be included as a stand-out item, identified from all the regional processes.
- The Declaration should be made to ourselves as all those involved in the AR4D community on the need for research reform and challenging ourselves to deliver on commitments made in our own behaviour.
- Development impacts in general required more promotion as the key focus of research.
- There was need to align investments way beyond research to also include infrastructure and finance for the enabling environment for impact.
- The idea of a global consideration of the ‘state of the art’ in national systems was appreciated as a good basis to bring renewed recognition of the role now required of the CGIAR in capacity building for the NARS, which were themselves the delivery mechanism towards development impact from international investments. This brought a clear role going forwards for GFAR and the GCARD as the ‘honest broker’ mechanism by which these links could be openly discussed going forwards.
- Partnership discussion should include consideration of the quality of these relationships and recognize the heterogeneity among national systems
- Metrics would be required for measuring change
- Aligning investments needed to go way beyond research funding alone.
• GCARD in future needed to look beyond advocacy to also include knowledge management, lesson-learning and greater emphasis on value chains and market knowledge
• There was need to find a way to address the limiting factors identified on p6 of the draft
• Comments were requested from the regional fora and other constituencies on the draft outline
• There was need to define frameworks such as CAADP and the MDGs as commonly-agreed pillars on which to hang interventions. These would need to be developed as part of the process if they did not already exist.
• It was questioned whether we yet have the form of wider partnerships right to do business in a new way and there was clear need for wide buy in to these constructive ideas.
• The agenda for the Montpellier conference needs to help reinforce the flow of the action plan and declaration development and endorsement

GFAR Financial position

The Chair reported that the Management Team had considered the financial report from the Secretariat to be very substantive. While there had been concerns over financial reports in past years, the Management Team was now very pleased with this advance in the presentation of accounts and much credit was due to the Secretariat for this.

The direct commitments from the World Bank (CIF), EC, DFID and FAO received in 2009 had been particularly welcomed as well as the associated investments from the Government of France, EC and the Asian Development Bank for the GCARD processes. A number of new donor agencies had now also begun to discuss support GFAR (DGIS, Irish Aid and Italian Government), with commitments under discussion of up to five years and were in particular showing strong interest in supporting civil society-science linkages via the GFAR mechanism.

Other members of the SC also commended the Secretariat on the growth of income which represented a tremendous improvement in the budget and provided a much more stable footing from which to start planning forwards. The expenditure plans proposed for 2001-2011, associated with specific areas of work in GFAR’s Plan of Work, were endorsed by the Steering Committee.

Outcome

*The Financial statements were approved without change.*

Moved: Ibrahim Hamdan
Seconded David Radcliffe

Announcement of next GFAR Chair

Dr Monty Jones was selected as the next GFAR Chair by decision of the members of the Steering Committee. Dr Jones will take up the role at the end of the GCARD 2010 on 31 March 2010.
Dr Jones was congratulated by the SC, alternates and observers. It was recognized that he already has a highly demanding role with FARA, but Dr Jones made clear in his acceptance that he intended to commit significant time and effort to GFAR’s success and to work in an open and inclusive manner, engaging with all the partners.

Report from the Closed Meeting

The report from the closed meeting was made by Chair, GFAR. The minutes of the closed meeting are included as Annexure.

Closing Remarks
In closing, the Chair thanked all participants for what had been a very rich few days, in particular in relation to receiving the outcomes of the vital processes of regional consultation, and the global author team report and in the further development of the GCARD plans. He congratulated Dr Jones on his election as the incoming Chair and wished him every success in this role.