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\textit{Draft Minutes of the 22nd GFAR Steering Committee}
Minutes of the 22nd GFAR Steering Committee Meeting held at Maputo, Mozambique on 27th and 28th November 2008

• Agenda of the Meeting is attached as Annexure 1
• The List of Members who attended the Meeting is included as Annexure 2.

1. Welcome remarks by the Chair

The GFAR Chair, Dr. Adel El-Beltagy indicated that the World is in midst of a perfect storm of food, fuel and financial crises. Agriculture globally is at a cross roads with complex issues requiring changes in its institutions and quick actions are needed to restore balance to various systems. There is a strong need in this situation to make agricultural research more dynamic and efficient and meet the challenges to agriculture arising from the current crisis. GFAR is part of a process for dynamic change in agriculture and this meeting is crucial to set the way forward for all of us.

2. Adoption of the Meeting Agenda

The draft agenda of the meeting was reviewed: As the CGIAR change report was delayed by the late arrival of Dr Solh, it was decided unanimously that the Regional Fora would present their progress reports instead. The proposal for the revised Agenda was moved by Dr Hamdan and seconded Dr Ghodake.

3. Approval of the minutes of the 21st Steering Committee at Montevideo

The Draft Minutes of the 21st steering Committee Meeting held at Montevideo on 31st July and 1st August 2008 were accepted without change. The motion for approval of the Minutes was proposed by Dr Ghodake and seconded by Dr Hamdan.

4. Actions Points Report (Agenda paper 22SC-08-03)

Dr Lantin recorded the appreciation of the CGIAR for the work of GFAR, especially the Chair and Executive Secretary, for their involvement in the CGIAR Change Management process.

5. Report of the GFAR Chair

The Chair, since his report at Montevideo, attended the STS forum at Tsukuba in Japan, where the participants were a mix of senior figures from science, policy and the private sector. The GFAR Chair was Co-Chair of a Workshop session on GMOs at the STS Forum. At the Forum, the need for capacity building in research to enable developing countries to take on advanced technologies was emphasized. Japan announced increased investment in science and society for Africa.
The Chair also attended the World Food Prize ceremony (also attended by Dr. Monty Jones as World Food Prize laureate), which included a workshop on partnership to cut hunger and poverty with a particular emphasis on the role of youth.

**Discussion:** The policy position of GFAR on GMOs was queried. The Chair responded that GFAR is a global platform whose position is that of the consensus of its constituents. The preference of use or non-use was the prerogative of countries but GFAR aimed to work through its constituents to increase human capacity to be able to understand these technologies and their implications and ensure that they were safely used.

6. **Report of the Executive Secretary on GFAR activities (Agenda paper 22SC-08-04)**

The Executive Secretary reported on activities over the year and in particular since the Montevideo Steering Committee.

The report was accepted. FAO also registered its thanks to GFAR for collaboration in the conservation agriculture meeting in June.

7. **Reports from Regional Fora**

**FARA (Dr Monty Jones)**

Key targets are institutional strengthening, in line with FARA’s Medium term operational plan, developing a business plan and securing a permanent office. Core activities included resource mobilization, including support from African governments, networking support and preparation for the 2010 FARA General Assembly. At present, pledges of $46 million have been secured to the multidonor trust fund of FARA, around 50% of this is to support the NARS, 6% the sub-regional organizations. North African countries have now joined FARA via the establishment of NASRO.

Strategic focal areas are:

- Advocacy and resource mobilization – including establishment of an expert reference group to help support country productivity programmes.
- Access to knowledge, via RAILS and innovation platforms, including the Coalition for African Rice Development (CARD), which aims to double rice production in 20 years.
- PAEPARD – has facilitated Africa-Europe programmes and planning for the EC and now may be extended to a second phase and to other regions.
- Institutional reform: S-S collaboration to promote innovation systems approaches to transform agricultural systems in Africa and develop the competencies and efficiencies of national systems.

**Discussion:** Closer links with FAO were advocated, in promoting development of indicators for extension systems, in planning future investments and in closer integration of agricultural research and extension planning.
AARINENA (Dr Ibrahim Hamdan)

Regional agricultural information systems and National agricultural research information management systems are under development, with training workshops on information.

New networks have been established recently in water use efficiency, agricultural biotechnology and plant genetic resources (the latter supported through the Crop Biodiversity Trust). For Linking Farmers to Markets, case studies have been developed on olives and vegetables, showing the value of farmers working together into new markets. In 2009 there will be a regional workshop on capacity building in information and an expert consultation to revisit research priorities for the region.

Discussion: In regard to linking farmers to markets, IFAP emphasized the need to link the profit motive in market chains with technical advances and sought closer cooperation between IFAP and the regional fora in this area.

FORAGRO (Dr Mario Allegri)

The FORAGRO reunion in Montevideo brought together the sub-regional operations and heavily emphasized institutional innovation and support for the regional R&D agenda. Family agriculture is a particular focus, as is knowledge sharing through information technology. Links with the ASTI programme are updating information on investment in the region. The region participated actively in the IAASTD and the INIAs programme with Spanish institutions and FORAGRO has been active in renewing the presence and purpose of the CGIAR. FORAGRO has also been increasing its inter-regional articulation via GFAR.

Discussion: The role of CSOs was queried. Dr Allegri responded that in the Latin America/Caribbean region these are mostly in the environmental sector, but FORAGRO has been linking actively with CSOs, particularly in the IAASTD.

CACAARI (Dr Hukmatullo Ahmedov)

The CACAARI plans to extend membership from the current NARI lead organizations to all research institutions, universities and farmers. Formation of NGO, Farmer organization and private sector forums are proposed. GFAR’s support is requested in providing a full time assistant for the Secretariat and a part time webmaster.

Discussion: The Chair requested that GFAR gives top priority to CACAARI as it had great needs as a newly established system that was seeking to become more inclusive.

EFARD (Mr Enrico Biccione)

EFARD was reviewed externally in 2006, through which it was decided that EFARD was valid at European level but would not organize national fora unless locally established and driven. EFARD provides a bridge to European capability, not a representative body and the need to open to others beyond research has been agreed. There will be no more triennial conferences and the role shifts to one of facilitating change among European researchers and
establishing better links with the south. In 2009 there will be a governance change with a new Secretary to be appointed in 2009 and probable funding linkage to EIARD. PAEPARD was highlighted as an innovative way to link Europe and the South, making use of new alliances for ARD at European level (ECART and NATURA).

APAARI (Dr Raghunath Ghodake)

APAARI’s work in promoting ARD through interregional and stakeholder partnerships was highlighted, including defining regional research priorities. These include natural resource management, conservation and use of genetic resources, linking farmers to markets and meeting protein demands in the region. Long-term research priorities are climate change, biofuels and management of crises such as invasive pests.

Biotechnology and biosafety needs have been addressed through a meeting this year co-sponsored by GFAR and linking with AARINENA region. Actions in information sharing through APAARIS had also received support from GFAR. The APAARI vision 2025 will need to be revisited soon and more inter-regional cooperation was foreseen, in particular addressing challenges such as linking farmers to markets and understanding the implications of biofuels. APAARI is presently self-sustaining through membership and other contributions but greater donor support was desired and GFAR’s help was requested in soliciting this.

8. Implications and expectations of the CGIAR Change Management Process for GFAR:

For the CGIAR, Dr Mahmoud Solh provided an overview of the change process and its implications for the CGIAR and its partners. These included:

- The shift to more impact-oriented programmes, with development impact delivered through partners.
- He commented that the voice of the South was not as strong as it should have been in the sub-committees involved in the change process, but these had nevertheless produced a plan with many opportunities for involvement through various funding ‘windows’ and a move towards multi-year funding.
- The proposed Fund Council will include funding countries from those in 4 regional fora.
- Policy advocacy with partners was recognized as a need, highlighted by the lack of system-level statements into processes such as the FAO High Level Conference.
- Effective partnerships were recognized as key elements of the success of the CGIAR and were provided with much greater emphasis than before. The process had recognized GFAR as the most appropriate institutional mechanism to achieve these.
- The proposed Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD) provided the platform for interaction between all stakeholders and creation of effective partnerships.
- The clustering and merging of Centers could be considered in future if seen as giving greater efficiency.
- The CGIAR’s work would move towards more integrated and large scale ‘mega-programmes’, leading towards defined development outcomes, these would be likely
to be selected by the new Consortium Board from a wider range of fundable proposals. The Board would also oversee their implementation by Centers.

In subsequent discussions, Dr Ren Wang briefly described the change process and its implications for GFAR. The CGIAR has engaged in dialogue with FORAGRO, FARA, AARINENA and APAARI around the change process. The Change Management process is seen as coming to a turning point with the proposal for fundamental change being put to the AGM.

Key elements include the Consortium, the new Fund and the biennial conference, to be led by GFAR. Principles of the change process are to be approved in the CGIAR AGM, with details worked through in 2009.

**Discussion on the CGIAR Change Process/Management**

- The Committee raised a range of issues around the implications of change for GFAR, the lack of stakeholder voices in the change process itself and whether the balance of power in the new structure would sit with the Fund Council or the Consortium Board. Dr Solh answered that the lack of effective partnership had been recognized as a past failing of the system and that there was also a need to redress past skew towards the influence of the donors.
- Dr. Solh emphasized that the CGIAR AGM was to be replaced by the GCARD and that this would be organized through GFAR with more stakeholder representation than before and would be influential in shaping priorities, direction and partnership for the system.
- The relationship to Regional Fora was raised. The WG2 report on partnership was viewed as excellent, but required bringing into practice, with costs for GFAR and the Regional Fora included as part of the essential costs of doing research for development. In response, Dr Solh emphasized that the implementation into reality would be crucial for the change plan.
- The relationship to the Center Boards was queried. Dr Solh responded that it was also possible that GFAR could take on seats on Centre Boards as actions became more coherent.
- The status of the GCARD was queried and why GFAR was being asked to take on this responsibility before a formal decision was made by the CGIAR AGM. Concern was also expressed at the disappearance of the GFAR Triennial Conference.
- The Committee also questioned how GCARD would relate to the system and the setting of priorities. Dr Solh responded that GCARD provided the overall umbrella opportunity for discussion of agricultural research for development and so the use of the GFAR mechanism was a natural progression.
- The Chair commented that discussion around the GCARD had not agreed a process, but it was recognized that the CGIAR needed a larger development framework for its work. The GCARD could be a positive or a negative for GFAR to organize. This was generally felt to be a great opportunity for GFAR as a whole, but that there was a need to know the functions now expected of GFAR in the new structure.
- Concerns were expressed by FAO that the current structure of GFAR was not ready to take on these challenges and GFAR itself would need to be remodelled.
The GCARD was agreed to, but recognizing that additional responsibilities require additional resources.

Discussion on the CGIAR in GFAR:

Dr Ren Wang, Director of the CGIAR, led discussion of the role of the CGIAR in GFAR. Donors to the CGIAR have high expectations from a “revitalized” GFAR (the terms repositioned or strengthened were preferred by the GFAR Steering Committee), with great expectations and great challenges in the platform playing a leading global role on behalf of the ARD community.

The CGIAR recognized it formed one component of GFAR, which provided the CGIAR research to be embedded in global dialogues. The biennial Conference (preferred name Global Forum/Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development) would be led by GFAR in close collaboration with the Consortium.

It was recognized that these changes brought great expectations and great challenges for all GFAR’s constituencies and that rapid strengthening of representation in each sector was required from all involved, in order to meet the challenges ahead for all the constituencies represented in GFAR.

Donor commitment would be essential – and this depended on donors coming to the table in support of the reforms to the CGIAR and of GFAR. It could be possible for GFAR to be funded through a mandatory proportion of funds flowing through the CGIAR system, so that GFAR maintained its independence but could still manage its roles. This would require ‘no-strings’ funding. Although not in the form of cash, the Regional Fora also emphasized the value of the networks of connection they mobilized into the Global Forum.

- It was requested that the role of the Regional Fora should be assured in the CGIAR’s development of partnerships.
- It was agreed that GFAR’s constituent networks needed to have capacity to analyse and bring together relevant documents and data to make regional planning meetings meaningful.
- The new partnership approach of the CGIAR was strongly endorsed, provided this was followed through on an open and equitable basis and included allocations for partners as an integral part of doing research for development.
- The reasons for doing away with the CGIAR AGM were queried.

Dr Ren Wang responded that:
- The donors should be willing to provide financial resources to strengthen GFAR as a body of value to all.
- Each year the CGIAR was spending $2-3mn on the AGM, excluding the cost of participants and he personally hoped that the GCARD would be less costly.
- He doubted that the whole cost of the GCARD would come from the CGIAR fund but the new Fund was intended to provide for programmes and partners, to a level of up to 50% of the unrestricted funding available to Centers.
• One challenge for the CGIAR was in funding new mechanisms for evaluation of programmes involving partners as this needed to be an independent process and so partners could not evaluate themselves.
• The GCARD and engagement with partners were key challenges in the reform proposal.
• The AGM was not a business-effective mechanism as it required consensus among 64 members and so it was often impossible to agree on statements etc. The GCARD was seen as a forum to talk about challenges etc, not as a place to make decisions on the CGIAR’s business operation.

For the CGIAR Science Council, Dr Echeverria added that:

Mobilizing advanced science also now comes in the new mandate of the Science Council (ISPC) of the CGIAR and GFAR’s partnership is requested by the ISPC for the proposed Science Forum in June and the partnership operation of the ISPC itself.
• Dr Echeverria very much welcomed the combining of the AGM and GFAR conferences
• The WG2 report was a great contribution, although the challenge now was in how to achieve these aims.
• The key need was to promote better partnership for the relevance and quality of science
• Partnership should include that with advanced research institutions and not just S-S
• The ISPC would have a foresight and guidance role that would also need to link closely with GFAR.
• A flyer for the Science Forum will be circulated to the Steering Committee.

Action: GFAR Secretariat to establish linkage and engage with development of the Science Forum to meet the needs of GFAR’s stakeholders

Chair’s Conclusions:

• There was no objection in principle from the Committee to the GCARD substituting for the Triennial Conference.
• GFAR welcomed the recognition and was willing to take on the responsibility of leading its organization, supported by the CGIAR.
• GFAR is willing to rise to the challenge of helping to shape the global agricultural research framework, driven by development objectives, within which the CGIAR will identify its business objectives with its partners.
• The process must be adequately and viably resourced, both in funding and institutional commitments.
• The new Science and Partnerships Council provided a further voice for change within the system and for the active engagement of partners by the CGIAR and so is welcomed.
• GFAR looks forward to an open process for selection of the Consortium Board.
• GFAR brings together all the parties working to make agricultural research for development a reality and provides the multistakeholder platform for the CGIAR’s expertise to provide a greater contribution in international agriculture and development policy.
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GFAR welcomes the strengthening engagement and collaboration with the CGIAR the Alliance and the Science Council and will work to build upon the positive momentum for change.

9. Programme Committee Chair’s Report

Dr Paroda presented the outcome of the Programme Committee’s deliberations prior to the Steering Committee (Appendix). Prof El-Beltagy emphasized that the Steering Committee would need to prioritize among these before taking a 2009 plan to funding bodies. Individual elements of the proposed areas of work were discussed as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comments/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global advocacy for action on agricultural research and innovation priorities</td>
<td>Preferred as a unified activity, rather than by technical theme. Needs high level focus on support to and value of all ARD. High level meeting (GCARD) in 2009 to address emerging challenges of food security, climate change, and increased investment in agricultural research and extension and build link with GPAF as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote global and inter-regional partnerships for innovation and N-S and S-S learning</td>
<td>Flag request to GFAR DSG for further support to innovation systems &amp; innovative partnerships that involve other stakeholders in achieving institutional change Support wider involvement of civil society stakeholders in regional and inter-regional/global activities, including building on from the value of DURAS in more effectively involving civil society stakeholders, women and the poor in research. <strong>Action: Secretariat to incorporate into business plan and pursue possible follow-on activities from DURAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>Seen as a high priority in need of support as a global partnership programme. Associated initiatives are CGIAR Climate Change Challenge Programme and an FAO-GFAR joint study on needs &amp; gaps in national research &amp; extension systems in regard to climate change. Awareness raising on agriculture &amp; climate change was requested for 2009. <strong>Action: GFAR Secretariat to build cross-linkage with related areas and pursue an integrated approach.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Farmers to Markets</td>
<td>A high priority, with an existing proposal developed through the Task Force. <strong>Action: Secretariat to circulate proposal to GFAR stakeholders for final confirmation/changes and with them pursue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Agriculture</td>
<td>This theme, considered a high priority, had been revived in 2008 through a successful GFAR-FAO-TAA workshop in Rome. <em>Action: Dr Paroda to convene a meeting of partners at the Delhi WCCA meeting in February, to develop an overall programme in this area.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to strengthening inclusive stakeholder networks</td>
<td>CACAARI, YPARD, SSA-NGOC and NAARAP were all recognized as requiring support and engagement from both regional and global levels to become truly effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inter-regional networks</td>
<td>Actions relating to previous initiatives, to be supported, subject to proposers meeting GPP requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PROLINNOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GFU-UUP (Crops for the Future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commodity networks (cotton-INCANA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Biotechnology and genetic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High value crops (Global Horticulture Initiative) GFAR networks to harness opportunity created by work done for previous Global Challenge Programme development. <em>GFAR Secretariat and PC Chair to collate potential links with Regional Fora and establish how GHI could best take on the role of a Global Partnership Programme.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM4ARD</td>
<td>Refine existing agreed programme document to integrate new developments in learning, ARD Webring and CIARD, then develop through regions as funded proposal or component proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action:**
*Secretariat to prepare these priorities and other actions identified in the meeting into the GFAR Plan of Work, with associated budget plans and clear roles, responsibilities and accountabilities among GFAR stakeholders for specific programmes.*

### 10. Linking science & society: strengthening broad stakeholder representation and engagement in GFAR (Agenda paper 22SC-08-07)

The Chair introduced this theme, recognizing that the world of agriculture and rural development was shifting very swiftly and the GFAR’s different constituencies needed to stay relevant and be able to meet these new challenges to meet the needs of the poor. It was timely to revisit GFAR’s role and the representation of all sectors in the Global Forum.
Civil Society organizations

Ms Monica Kapiriri reported on the consultancy she was undertaking on behalf of GFAR to examine specific needs to enhance CSO involvement in research planning and implementation. She has found no systematic documentation of CSO involvement in the Regional Fora and problems in establishing coordinated mechanisms owned by the stakeholders concerned. As a result, the current structure of CSO involvement in research planning and implementation was complex, messy and failing to deliver.

In governance, there had been commendable progress at global level and in most regions, but these individuals often had no sound constituency to back them up or to engage with. Regional NGO consortia were a new concept, co-financed through GFAR that had yet to become truly established in the regions. IFAP represented income earning farmers but less so the landless and pastoralists and fisherfolk. The private sector representation had often been based on particular individuals rather than networks.

For research planning, the involvement of CSOs is recognized by the Fora as important in both capturing perspectives from the poor and finding specific niches that will particularly meet their needs. At the Global level NGOs were involved in the setting of business plans, but this was less clear across all the Regional Fora.

In programme implementation, there was little information readily available and a questionnaire was to be circulated to establish this. In the documented sub-regional case of ASARECA, programmatic involvement of CSOs was very low (around 2%), while farmers, despite being the intended focus, took part in only 0.3% of actions. It was concluded that CSO participation was generally weak.

In the GFAR Global Partnership Programmes, the 2006 external evaluation had shown that CSO participation had generally been quite weak (except for ProLinnova which is centred on CSOs). In the Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Programme (operated through FARA), the Director of the programme had noted that a paradigm shift was needed as civil society organizations were not yet full members of this platform.

Representation clearly needs to be more than at the level of an individual or individual organization. Current mechanisms for bringing together civil society organizations include networks, federations, cooperatives, community based and commodity based associations. It is important to make best use of existing CSO networks and structures; these include IFAP, ANGOC and PELUM, as springboards to wider networks.

International NGOs also have strengths and weaknesses, often having: their “heads in the north but their legs in the south”. They do however have an inter-regional reach and role and require specific consideration.

**Key recommendation:**

To increase the relevance of representation for GFAR functions, the consultant recommends that CSOs are mobilized through working groups around each of GFAR’s strategic objectives. This avoids the problem of trying to cross link groups with widely different aims. This
requires real dialogue and mutual accountability; result-based demands should also be placed on participation of civil society organizations in programmes.

**Strengthening of Southern fora**

- For AARINENA, it was recognized that their governance had not been so inclusive of CSOs. CSOs were involved in practical programmes, but not in formal structures. However this was now being addressed.
- APAARI considered this representation to be a crucial issue and a basic principle for GFAR. Change was occurring through an evolutionary approach, which needed to include establishing legitimacy for CSO representatives and it was requested that GFAR should catalyse this process. APAARI had moved to create seats for all stakeholders in its Executive Committee and had established an NGO group in 2008. However, it was less clear who would provide support for such groups, what they would do and how they would be nurtured. It was requested that the GFAR Secretariat played an active facilitation role in fostering these groups as APAARI had no resources to commit for this.
- CACAARI had invited participation from NGOs and the farmer sector, but did not yet have strong links with stakeholders. Nonetheless, it was recognized that there was a need to address this and also foster S-S links through these stakeholders.
- FORAGRO involves all stakeholders in committees and has strong farmer participation, with matching funds from farmers, who play strong roles in the fora. Private sector is represented through a regional member. NGO representation was harder to establish due to a lack of network structure.
  - (FARA representatives had to attend another meeting during this session)

The Chair summarized that all were seeking to broaden true and effective representation from civil society and these processes must be moved forward quickly, checking all the time what each body could do better.

**Strengthening of Northern fora**

- NAFAR had not been sustained by its constituents and was agreed to be no longer considered operative. An alternative is now sought.
- The Chair had discussed with the Society’s President the prospect of the North American Society of Universities and Land Grant Colleges (www.nasulgc.org) providing a base for a regional forum. This had been followed up by a letter from the Executive Secretary, from which a reply was awaited. This should also be cross-linked to other multi-stakeholder groupings in North America such as the Keystone Alliance (http://keystone.org/spp/env-sustain_ag.html), to ensure inclusiveness.
- FORAGRO saw good cross-links between NASULGC and their northern Sub-Regional Forum.
- The Committee supported the invitation to NASULGC to establish a new forum as a central hub for wider stakeholder involvement.
- EFARD has been in a period of reflection as to its role and function and lacked an operating Secretariat at present, but had a likely future role as a forum for coordination of European actions such as through the successful PAEPARD programme. It would
address both N-S research issues and European regional actions, as well as N-S collaboration on global issues.

It was again emphasized that the fora were originally established to strengthen the public research sector, but now needed to expand to include other constituencies. All fora now needed to engage the private sector, farmers etc. at both regional and sub-regional levels. Ms Kapiriri emphasized that northern-based NGOs are very active but lack a network base relating to agricultural development. The EFARD NGO group had been strong but no longer seems to exist. The CG Change Management Process Partnerships Working Group had recommended that links with INGOs were best built at headquarters/policy level.

In conclusion, the Chair again emphasized the need to continue dialogue towards active change and see how things could be done better.

**Farmer representation**

IFAP commented that there was a need to build structures from the bottom upwards. IFAP comprised 180 farmer organizations, divided by region, each with a national development officer and they would like to see IFAP represented in each region. The IFAP Developmental Committee uses farmer-generated funds for development. Structural development needs to be addressed from sub-regional fora upwards. IFAP can link with cooperatives at regional level.

- IFAP is establishing links with R&D related to specific themes such as determining animal welfare standards. It was recognized that pastoralists and small farmers were not represented in many farmers unions, but IFAP were starting a programme to mobilize small farmers and encourage their linkage into national unions. Representation of fisherfolk would need to be looked at as they were not covered by IFAP at present.

- In discussion, it was recognized that it was difficult to get real representation in countries in transition from state economies. Other groupings already mobilized small farmers such as the WSSD in West Africa and these should be drawn upon. Cooperatives were also a way in, especially for non-commercial farmers.

- The status of the IFAP Research Committee was questioned as this had been established through financial support from GFAR. Mr Bosman responded that IFAP would report back on this.

**Youth**

The role of youth in GFAR was emphasized by YPARD; the voice of youth was essential for repositioning GFAR and its role in global advocacy. Young professionals could use GFAR as a springboard for being heard in policy and reshaping institutions.

The need for representation of youth in GFAR’s regional and global processes was accepted by all.
Private Sector

The Chair emphasized the need for change so that existing groupings of the private sector were effectively represented in GFAR, but also the further challenge of how to represent small enterprise.

Mr Kapur saw the role of the private sector as becoming increasingly globalized and with an increasing role in research. At regional level all scales of enterprise are present. Key issues were that regulations and policies were becoming global in their application and impact. The marketing and processing companies recognize the linkage to farmers via technologies and development of crops.

Discussion: the CGIAR private sector committee was discussed as a possible link, but recognized as having struggled and that this was largely focused on specific links with the work of the CGIAR. There was a need to have different sectors represented in GFAR. Private sector involvement was seen as essential throughout GFAR’s processes in ensuring demand driven actions. It was agreed that GFAR should invite participation of representatives from industry associations representing different dimensions of the private sector, perhaps as observers in the first instance, to develop their involvement.

Action: GFAR Secretariat to invite relevant groups with international perspectives, which were representative of input providers, small enterprise and markets, to engage with GFAR’s processes, as observers in the first instance.

Donors

A number of mechanisms could bring cross-representation of donors in GFAR’s governance. At present the donor support group links interested in direct financial support to GFAR, but there is also the need to engage with donor policy processes. These are primarily the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, the European Initiative on Agricultural Research for Development and the Change Management donor platform for the CGIAR.

Discussion:

- The regional fora now need to engage with their own donors as most funds are now regionalized. The regions each need to express the benefits of support to regional coordination and to inter-regional cooperation such as in the case of Spain and FORAGRO.
- Engagement with donors at policy level was seen as a key issue for GFAR; the donor organizations are demanding to know how to fund research and to see innovation in funding mechanisms. Nonetheless, this is not easy as funding mechanisms are themselves restricted by national policies.
- The Committee agreed that engagement with funding policy was a high priority for GFAR as GFAR is the mechanism that brings together all ARD stakeholders and there was a real need to become involved with the larger scale lending windows rather than on a project basis.
Action: Links should be established through the GFAR Secretariat with the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development.

GFAR’s Facilitating Agencies (FAO and IFAD)

Dr Alvarez summarized that FAO sees its role in relation to GFAR as providing the forum from which will come international treaties, knowledge sharing and direct technical assistance to countries. This relationship is established as an MOU between FAO, IFAD and GFAR that also encourages the participation of the Regional Fora in regional conferences of FAO. Side events in these conferences allow issues to be brought to the attention of Ministers. Opportunities for engagement included regional and sectoral task forces.

On the global scale, the changing role of GFAR in relation to the CGIAR may require revision of the whole hosting arrangement for GFAR and the CGIAR bodies based at FAO. This will need a signal from the FAO Director General to the FAO regional offices. The value of being based in FAO was recognized by the Committee, but it was also recognized that this potential had to be realized via a greater role for GFAR in advocacy and awareness. FAO houses around 100 people in Secretariats and more needed to be done to link their complementarities and develop synergies between them in regard to research for development.

11. Organization of the Global Conference on ARD (GCARD) (Agenda paper 22SC-08-06)

The draft agenda paper outlining the proposed GCARD elements was briefly reviewed, with concurrence that the process needed to embed research and innovation pathways into their wider development contexts in developing a global strategic framework for agricultural research for development that linked research into processes supporting rural development.

Dr Monty Jones was invited to Chair the GFAR Task Force for the GCARD.

- He thanked the Committee and was pleased to accept the role, expressing his commitment to making GFAR go from strength to strength.
- Also proposed for the Task Force were: Dr Mario Allegri (FORAGRO), Dr Ibrahim Hamdan (AARINENA), Dr Balasubramanian Ramani for YPARD, Dr Isabel Alvarez for FAO, the GFAR Secretariat and as yet unnamed representatives from the other regional fora, CGIAR and IFAP.
- Dr Paroda protested at the formation process for the Task Force, which he felt should have taken a broader perspective. It was emphasized by the GFAR Chair that these individuals were identified in the first instance to enable rapid action, but it was recognized that the Task Force composition would need to be further defined and added to, to become inclusive from all sectors and not just drawn from the Steering Committee.
- Dr Jones further commented that he would ensure that the perspectives of each Regional Forum were represented in the Task Force, as well as the CGIAR, the Private Sector and Farmers.
- It was emphasized that the 2009 Budget would need to include funds for strengthening Secretariats at both global and regional scale, to ensure the success of the GCARD.
The need for flexibility in staffing among the new staff required to facilitate the regional GCARD processes was highlighted, so that there was an interchange and common commitment to the purpose between the GFAR Secretariat, the Regional Fora and other partners and so that the process itself strengthened the constituencies of GFAR.

**Conclusions:**

The GFAR Chair emphasized that he would be aiming to make the Task Force inclusive of all sectors, but that actions had to start. He requested the Steering Committee to suggest themes for the Conference, while the Task Force defined the process. New regional forum secretariat staff, employed for the GCARD, should also interact and work between regions as a means of fostering inter-regional linkage and bringing combined global expertise to bear in specific themes.

12. **GFAR Financial Statement and discussions of resource commitments for the Programme of Work for 2009 (Agenda Paper 22SC-08-09)**

The Committee then considered the budget. The Chair introduced this Session calling upon all stakeholders to pursue an aggressive fund-raising strategy for GFAR.

- The 2008 Budget was reviewed. The Travel Expenditure line was queried and the Chair responded that the costs for travel were particularly high because the GFAR Secretariat had carried all the costs of participation in the CG Change Processes.
- Dr Jones asked for it to be recorded that the Committee very much appreciated the work of the Secretariat in its cautiousness and confidence building around the funding of GFAR and for retaining a small surplus from a very constrained income.
- FARA would be very glad to help solicit funds for GFAR. Fund Raising will require a Business Plan and Fund Raising Strategy, with an indicative budget for the activities to be pursued for the next few years. In summary he expressed that he was happy and saw much hope for GFAR.
- Resource generation was explored. The EC is supportive and is backing GFAR. Concerns were expressed that DURAS is not yet going forward into a second phase, due to problems in the French funding system.
- There was a need to put together a cost effective package for this coming year, including components for the strengthening of the Secretariat, of the Regional Fora, and the GCARD.

The financial summary was approved by Dr Monty Jones, seconded by Dr Ibrahim Hamdan.

*Action: The Chair requested the Secretariat to prepare the budget together with the 2009 GFAR Plan of Work, based on the agreements and issues raised from this meeting.*
13. Forthcoming meetings

The document summarizing key meetings in 2009 was raised for information to the members for their review and to consider who should best represent the broader GFAR community at these international events.

The meeting was closed by Prof El-Beltagy and then entered closed session.

Meeting closed