Reframing Governance

Discussion Paper #3

GFAR Strategic Governance Working Group
July 2015

_____

Summary:*In August 2015, stakeholders of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) will come together as a Constituent Assembly to consider a number issues relating to the strategic direction and future governance of the Forum.To help guide and inform discussion, background papers have been prepared on each of the four topics to be addressed at the meeting.*

The purpose of this paper is to present options for improving GFAR governancefor the consideration of the Assembly.The paper outlinesthe broad design principles underpinning the reform, and presents two options as to how it could be configured. Key decision-points at the end of the document will form the basis for further discussion.

_____

Introduction

The Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) plays a critical role in transforming agricultural research and innovation systems. Its focus and its priorities are clear – as set out in the GCARD Roadmap and agreed by the sector. But to effectively fulfil its role as a catalyst for change the Forum needs stronger and more robust governance.

In 2013 the GFAR Steering Committee commissioned the MANNETConsultancyto look at the issues and challenges facing GFAR governance and to make recommendations to strengthen it in the immediate and medium-term.Four dimensions were examined:

- **Global governance:**setting the strategic global agenda foragricultural research and innovation in development, influencing policy on approaches and investments, and ensuring that institutions engaged in agricultural innovation engage with other stakeholders.
- **Network governance:** how GFAR functions as a forum, platform and network, mobilizing stakeholders and catalyzing collective actions.
- **Institutional governance:**secretariat strategy, work plan and budget
- **Stewardship,** catalytic funding of collective actions/initiatives and entities and the strengthening of multi-stakeholder regional fora.

The review examined the effectiveness, accountability and credibility of the governance processes and issues related to inclusion and representation.MANNETconcluded that the governance of the Forum was not sufficiently robust and needed to be overhauled.GFAR alsoneeded to resolve some major strategic challenges relating to its identity as a multi-stakeholder forum, the roles and constituencies of the Regional Fora, the relationship between GFAR and CGIAR, and the strategic priorities of the Forum and of its Secretariat.In the transition to better governance, this process of reflection would lead to a wider process of renewal of the Forum in which all stakeholders could engage.

The GFAR Steering Committee (SC) began a change process, setting up theStrategic Governance Working Group (SGWG) to lead a process of strategic reflection and renewal, looking at the issues raised by the Review as they impacted on governance.As a result of this process, the SGWG, supported by the Secretariat, have prepared and agreed four discussion papers for the consideration of those attending the Constituent Assembly; each dealing with an agenda item at the forthcoming meeting in Bangkok in August:

1. Renewing GFAR'sRole and Purpose;
2. Re-defining Collective Action;
3. **Reframing Governance**; and
4. Resourcing the Global Forum**.**

The purpose of this discussion paper is to present options for improving the governance of GFAR. The Constituent Assembly is asked to consider a series of key decision points on the preferred governance model, and associated changes and consolidation of statutory bodies and processes; membership criteria and selection of the Partners' Assembly; and approval for the Strategic Governance Working Group to prepare a revised Charter, based on the Assembly's decisions.

The Need fora New Approach

GFAR was established in 1996 to:
> *"To mobilize all the stakeholders involved in agricultural research for development and support their efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and promote a more sustainable use of natural resources"[1].*

The Forum grew out of a need to strengthen national public agricultural research and extension systems so that they could play a more effective role in national agricultural development. GFAR's initial governance brought together (and in some cases helped establish) Regional Fora of national agricultural research-for-development institutions, with representatives from other sectors including the UN agencies, CGIAR, farmers, NGOs and the private sector.

Today,GFAR has evolved significantly in both scale and scope, and in the way it operates.It is fundamentally a unique global platform for agricultural innovation encompassing all sectors, bringing together public, private, producer and civil societypartnershipsthat consider entire food value chains and their multiple stakeholders. GFAR's constituentsnow include farmer organizations, consumer associations, researchers, extensionists, educators, private-sector enterprises (inputs and markets) and international organizations; all working together to deliver agricultural development worldwide.

GFAR has a vital role to play in the future of agriculture, as a collective movement for change, articulating the needs of the poor, promoting basic human rights to food and nutrition security, enabling viable rural livelihoods and generating resilient and sustainable productive systems.

But for these ambitions to be fully realised,the Forumneedsa system of governance that is truly representative of all itsstakeholder groups and that brings them together on an equal basis, to engage in policy dialogue, to determine how to implement AR4D globally and within their own regions and/or sectors, and to lead and support each other in transforming agricultural research for development.

Strategic Issues - Implications for Governance

Supporting Collective Action

GFAR provides its constituencies the mechanism to engage in collective actions where they can bring their capabilities together for development success (see Discussion Paper 2 for a definition of Collective Action).A GFAR Partners Assembly with a new or renewed committee structure, as proposed, would provide the strategic direction needed to ensure better integration.

The GCARD consultation process, operating at multi-geographic level and with multi-constituencies, will capture demand and coordinate collective actions. Those actions that are endorsed, whether in national innovation systems or at trans-national systems level, could be referred to the proposed Agricultural Innovation and Enterprise Facility for support (see Discussion Paper 4)

The coordination of GFAR collective actions needs to be facilitated, catalyzed and tracked by the GFAR Secretariat. The coordination process will ensure that the collective action, as it is defined here, is truly guiding the work of the partner organizations. It will also prevent problems of differing degrees of commitment that are often encountered in collective actions elsewhere.

---

[1]1996 GFAR Charter

Resourcing

Collective actions require appropriate levels of resourcing, as outlined in Discussion Paper 3.

In response to requests from the G8 and G20, GFAR Secretariat and stakeholders have been exploring the feasibility of better linking national agricultural research and development systems and financing of international networked actions.The aim has been to create a coherent and well-resourced mechanism to ensure that the essential changes in institutional focus, function and capability identified through the GCARD Process are delivered in practice.The management of this mechanism or any other process for resourcing collective action may be undertaken by one of the subsidiary governance bodies as outlined in Section 2 of this paper.

Dialogue and Governance

The GFAR Charter indicates that the function of dialogue is "*to facilitate discussion on critical strategic issues and to contribute to the emergence of a global research agenda*". It establishes GFAR as a neutral space for dialogue.Establishing a GFAR Partners Assembly would open up a major strategic dialogue mechanism for the Global Forum, which can usefully be associated with GCARD (see below).Current and future dialogue mechanisms will depend on where the Partners Assembly wants to put emphasis within the renewed GFAR.

GFAR has a powerful role to play as an objective and non-institutional space for stimulating dialogue and partnership to address key issues in agricultural research and development. Both the GFAR Charter and the MANNET Review highlight the important role of GFAR's global governance in engaging stakeholder groups in policy dialogue, to define how to implement agricultural innovation platforms and systems globally and locally, and to lead and trigger the desired change. The GFAR dialogue mechanisms seek to build awareness and increase understanding and are expected to lead to partnership and collective action.

Accountability – Roles and Responsibilities

GFAR works to transform agricultural innovation systems through the actions of its partners, as set out in the GCARD Roadmap, to outcomes specified in the Medium Term Plan.The GFAR Secretariat is the catalyst and supporting mechanism for partners. The outcome matrix in the Medium Term Plan clarifies these roles and actions, which should be reflected in future amendments of the GFAR Charter.

At present, the GFAR Steering Committee is responsible for monitoring the development of the GFAR program as defined in the Medium Term Plan. Partners are accountable to each other through the GFAR Steering Committee. The Steering Committee commissions a periodic external evaluation, to assess programmatic progress against the goals and objectives. Formal reporting mechanisms to external audiences are through the GFAR Annual Report and through separate reports to donor agencies as required (e.g. European Union). These are prepared by the GFAR Secretariat and approved by the GFAR Steering Committee Chair.

Measuring the impact of networked actions is not straightforward. The Steering Committee has adopted a Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation (MLE) approach for the key outcomes GFAR is pursuing and is rolling this out to all active GFAR network partners and their constituencies. The MLE approach is designed to document institutional and individual achievements as well as capacities and is essential for reporting to donors.

The GFAR Secretariat reports directly to the Executive Committee on program delivery and progress in work plan and budget. Sub-committees and working groups created to support the Executive Committee or Steering Committee also report to it periodically.

The new governance model should continue to ensure these channels of accountability and reporting, respect principles of subsidiarity, distinguish roles and responsibilities, and avoid conflicts of interest.

GovernanceOptions

Organizational Model

The basic organizational model selected by the Strategic Governance Working Group (SGWG) is based on GFAR's remaining a virtual organizationwith no independent legal identity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)will continue to host the Secretariat on behalf of an informal grouping/forum of organizational members. The SGWG recognizes that, in the future, GFAR may choose to become a legally-established organization but has decided not to pursue this optionat present, pending decision by the Constituent Assembly on what form of organization is required for GFAR.

Design Principles

The design principlesunderpinning the governance reform are based on balancing the different needs and expectations of GFAR's governance, namely:

- The need for effective and equitable representation of all sectors involved in agricultural innovation.
- The need for accountability of representatives to the sectors they claim to represent.
- Minimizing cost while optimizing efficiency and credibility of governance meetings.
- Meetings at sufficiently frequent intervals to maintain a continuity of function and purpose and an ownership of GFAR by each sector/institution involved.
- Intermediate governance at an appropriate level to ensure essential oversight of processes and of Secretariat functions and approval of annual budgets.
- Avoidance of any conflict of interest over program expenditure.
- Effective reporting and monitoring and evaluation procedures that bring mutual accountability and demonstrate the value of GFAR collective actions.
- A balance between effective oversight and representation in the role of the Executive Committee, Partner Assembly and other statutory bodies as may be determined.
- Clear separation of sectoral representation from that of thematic collective programs, together with clear oversight of the latter in line with the GFAR Medium Term Plan.

Governance Requirements

There are three types of governance required of GFAR: Strategic, Programmatic and Executive Governance. These functions will determine the type of governance structure GFAR might adopt, particularly in terms of the roles and responsibilities ofsubsidiary bodies.

Strategic Governance

Roles
- Develop a medium-long term strategy for collective implementation
- Review and adjust the strategy
- Catalyze partnerships for collective action
- Oversee achievements and ensure mutual accountability
- Appointment of other governance bodies and the basis for appointing people to these bodies
- Ensure the continued legitimacy and accountability of partners, and that they fulfil their rights and responsibilities for collective action in the strategic governance mechanism (including a code of conduct)

The SGWG proposes that a**Partners Assembly** be responsible for setting strategy based on consensus decision-making.

GFAR has functioned, since its inception, as a Global Forum of stakeholders with common commitment to transforming agricultural research for development.Taking the strategic governance role, a Steering Committee has managed and directed actions of the Forum and Secretariat.This committee is composed of representatives of networks from the range of diverse stakeholders presently active in the Global Forum, but the basis used for such identification varies widely between constituencies. GFAR's current Steering Committee model has developed and evolved over the years andhas progressively become more inclusive of different constituencies. GCARD1 (2010) and GCARD2 (2012) have served for broader consultation among the GFAR constituencies with subsequent development of the overarching strategic framework, the GCARD Roadmap, and a Medium Term Plan.

It is proposed that a Partners Assembly be established to provide strategic guidance and governance to the Forum. This will ensure a more inclusive, representative, forward-looking, transparent, accountable and transformative framework for expressing stakeholder priorities, taking decisions of importance and ensuring change at all levels.

The rolesof the Partners Assembly would be to contribute to strategy development in agricultural research and innovation for development, to reflect diverse stakeholder perspectives, to relate to other sector fora and institutions, to track developments, to provide oversight of GFAR's strategic framework, plan of action, role and direction, and to bring collective advocacy and common commitment for GFAR actions.

The Assembly will be a broad representative body, the composition of which will enable GFAR to take full account of the range of stakeholder organizations for whose benefit it exists.This breadth of perspective will help the Partners Assembly to fulfil its role of upholding and taking forward the mission and ethos of GFAR, holding it to account, and appointing any subsidiary bodies.

The Partners Assembly (*ca* 150 members) is intended to reflect a range of perspectives from those stakeholders with an interest in, and connection with, agricultural knowledge and its use in innovation, research, enterprise and development.

The Partners Assembly could meet every two or three years, potentially in connection with the GCARD, convening a significant number of stakeholders representing and engaging with the wide geographic, thematic and institutional range of GFAR stakeholders.

Programmatic governance

Roles
- Oversight, legitimacy, commitment among all concerned and accountability for delivery
- Select the collective actions to be implemented in a given year, based on the medium- to long-term strategy
- Approve work plans related to the strategy
- Approve annual budget and financial report
- Report and review on program achievements, monitoring and evaluation of collective actions
- Report progress to Strategic Governance

Executive governance

Roles
- Oversee programme execution
- Approve GFAR Secretariat Annual Work Plan
- Mobilize resources for collective actions
- Oversee performance of the GFAR Secretariat
- Agree and enable dialogue mechanisms
- Report on implementation of GFAR work plan to Programmatic governance
- Share and communicate knowledge
- Nurture partnership towards collective actions
- Facilitate feedback loops from/with all partners

The **Executive Committee**would play a detailed oversight role over the Secretariat with responsibility for preparation and signing-off budgets, work plans and program delivery.It would include the GFAR Chair and Vice-Chair, FAO, IFAD, key donor representatives and the GFAR Executive Secretary as *ex-officio*member. The Committee's work wouldbe supported by specialist sub-committees: the **Resource Allocation Committee** (if required – see below) and the **Donor Support Group**. If the Constituent Assembly decides not to have a Steering Committee function, it would still be possiblefor the Executive Committee to create a sub-committeeas a C**ollective action group,** to promote interaction and learning among the collective actions and bring a mutual programmatic quality assurance oversight ormonitoring role.

In summary, the Executive Committee's core role is to provide governance oversight of the Secretariat and to act as the steward/guardian of any financial resources entrusted to GFAR. The committee must be small and agile. The Executive Committee does not set policy—it ensures that policy is implemented and complied with, simply concentrating on ensuring that the machinery functions effectively, efficiently, transparently and fairly. It does not need to be representative of constituencies/regions. Such representation comes from—or through—the Chair, and the Steering Committee to which it reports.

The **Donor Support Group** would mobilize financial support and coordinate donor support for the Global Forum and, in particular, for investments made collectively or linked via the Agricultural Innovation and Enterprise Facility as GFAR processes become consolidated through this mechanism. A leading donor would continue to be appointed by the group to chair and convene the group, which would meet virtually, on a periodic basis, and in connection with the face-to-face meetings of the overarching statutory bodies. The GFAR Chair, Vice-Chair and Executive Secretary would attend these meetings and assist in conduct of its business.

A **Resource Allocation Committee** may be required to avoid any risk of conflicts of interest in fund use. This would have independent authority to take decisions on the funds provided directly to GFAR, within the strategic, policy and accountability framework. It would focus on decision-making regarding the funds entrusted to GFAR, in particular for strengthening of actions through the Facility and promotion of the thematic collective initiatives. Resource Allocation Committee members would not directly benefit themselves or in their institutions from the funding decisions or recommendations made. The Committee would have at least five members: the GFAR Chair, a donor representative and two independent experts from research and development sectors, with the Executive Secretary participating ex officio.

Summary of Options

These considerations can be summarised and presented as **two options**:

OPTION 1					
Governance bodies	**Meets**	**Number**	**Governance focus**	**Representation**	**Advantages and Disadvantages**
Partners Assembly	triennially	150	Strategic	Wider number of constituencies represented	• Higher cost • Could be seen as top-heavy, over-engineered • Greater access to an array of expertise, experience, diversity • Diversity of stakeholders may cause a loss of focus • Enhances GFAR credibility, would limit concerns about accountability to different sectors • Some transaction/set-up costs • Potential overlap & conflict of interest between Partners Assembly and Steering Committee • Need continuity of membership to ensure legitimacy
Steering Committee	annually	25	Programmatic	Elected by Partners Assembly and accountable to them	
Executive Committee	6 monthly	Six (6) members: Chair, Vice Chair, FAO, IFAD, donor rep, Executive Secretary	Executive/Management	• Resource Allocation Committee (5 members) • Donor Support Group (4 members) • GCARD Organizing Committee	

OPTION 2					
Governance bodies	**Meets**	**Number**	**Governance focus**	**Representation**	**Advantages and Disadvantages**
Partners Assembly	Biennial	60	Strategic and some programmatic	Narrower number of constituencies represented	• Lower cost • Business-efficient in ease of decision-making • Less access to an array of expertise, experience, diversity • Could be seen as able to mobilize expertise quicker and easier • May be seen as genuinely accountable due to the smaller size of Partner Assembly • Low transaction/set up costs • Relies on institutions' own commitments to collective action • Partners may feel excluded from decision-making process
Executive Committee	6 monthly	Six (6) Members: Chair, Vice Chair, FAO, IFAD, donor rep, Executive Secretary	Executive/Management and some programmatic	• Resource Allocation Committee (5 members) • Donor Support Group (4 members) • Collective Action Group • GCARD Organizing Committee	

The Options

Option 1: 3-tier Model

This provides for a relatively clear three-level governance model, similar to that operating at present,which builds on the established Steering Committee and Executive Committee structures and sub-committees. Good governance can ensure that overlapping responsibilities and any potential conflict of interest between the Partners Assembly and Steering Committee are avoided. Similarly, an effective Steering Committeeshould lead to an efficient Partners Assembly, Executive Committee and/or Secretariat.

A larger Partners Assembly would enable wider representation and mobilization of stakeholders through their respective constituencies and would assignclear, though less frequent, direction to the subsidiary bodies. The Assembly would be closely aligned to the transformations in international agricultural research, notably of the CGIAR, through the GCARD. The assembly would designate or elect members of an expanded Steering Committee to be accountable tostakeholders and to monitor progress of the Investment Facility and collective action programs.As at present, the Steering Committee would meet annually to provide programmatic governance, and would be accountable to the Partners Assembly.

This is a relatively higher-cost option, due to the size of the Partners Assembly (expense could be reduced if run in conjunction with GCARD meeting). There would also be the annual cost of a 20-30 member Steering Committee plus Executive Committee expenses.There would be some transaction and set-up costs,and additional demands placed onthe Secretariat (particularly in servicing theSteering Committee as well as Executive Committee).

The size of the Partners Assembly suggests greater access to an array of expertise and experience, greater diversity and more opportunity to invite or attract a range of Partners Assembly members from different organisations and sectors.The Steering Committee would also provide an annual event where a diverse group of key stakeholders could interact and build relationships, owning the GFAR agenda.

Option 1 will enhance GFAR's credibility and reputation and limit concerns about its accountability. The cost of this option may have reputational consequence if it is seen as an expensive, top-heavy and over-engineered option, if the diversity of stakeholders causes a loss of focus in discussions and actions, or if a small number of attendees try to push their own agendarather than addressing the strategic issues facing GFAR.

Option 2: 2-tier model

This alternative provides for the lightest governance oversight, making this a lower-cost option, and leaves actions largely to the constituencies to deliver collectively.

A smaller Partners Assembly (*circa* 60 members) would meet every two years. Governance would mostly be concerned with advocacy and ensuring common purpose and reporting of actions undertaken by partners. This option relies on institutions' own commitments to collective action as there will be little physical meeting of the partners. While business-efficient in terms of ease of decisions etc, this option may result in partners feeling excluded from processes.

Option 2 has relatively low transaction and set-up costs, with limited pressure on Secretariat time.There are some potential reputational costs due to criticism that this option is not sufficiently inclusive, accountable and representative. Some stakeholders may feel excluded and there will be little to hold the constituencies together between the biennial meetings. Choices will have to be made as to the type of organization which can nominate a member of the Partners Assembly and how they a) represent and b) mobilize their wider constituency.

The smaller Partners Assembly,will mean less access to a wide array of expertise and experience than in Option 1,but could also lead to greater knowledge-sharing and connectivity among the Assembly membership. GFAR may be able to mobilize individuals' expertise and experience more quickly and easily.

The establishment of a cost-effective, yet still sufficiently representational, governance structure complemented by a focused and effective Executive Committee (plus sub-committees) would enhance GFAR's credibility and reputation and limit concern about its accountability. The simplicity and cost-effectiveness of this option may appeal to donors.

Discussion on the Partners Assembly

The Partners Assembly provides strategic guidance and governance to the Forum. It will ensure more inclusive, representative, forward looking, transparent, accountable and transformative frame for expressing stakeholder priorities, taking decisions of importance and ensuring change at all levels.

The Assembly will be a broad representative body, whose composition will enable GFAR to take full account of the range of stakeholder organizations for whose benefit it exists.This breadth of perspective will help the Partners Assembly to fulfil its role of upholding and taking forward the mission and ethos of GFAR, holding it to account, and appointing any subsidiary bodies.

One of the key tasks of the Constituent Assembly will be to confirm how the Partners Assembly will be constituted (the criteria for partners, the election, nomination, co-option or invitation process, etc.) to ensure that all major constituencies and geographies are involved as effectively as possible. If the Partners Assembly is to be an elected body, a decision has to be made whether partners are voted for as individuals or organizational nominees, and whether their nomination is based on certain criteria or from an approved "list". Thought will also have to be given to the efficacy and cost of the election process (for instance, via the web or regional fora). Alternatively, if a proportion of the Partners Assembly membership is co-opted, appointed or invited; decisions will have to be made as to what criteria would be used to ensure a suitable mix and diversity of appointees/invitees (presumably based on some agreed ratio of nominees).

The legitimacy of the Partners Assembly will be rapidly undermined if members do not play an appropriate role, take responsibility and exert sufficient authority or oversight.Similarly, legitimacy could be jeopardized if there is no continuity of membership due to high levels of drop-out or use of alternate delegates (something larger assemblies can suffer from). However, this is very much a function of the commitment of each network involved. Each seat should bring the voices of many to the table and be themselves accountable to those constituencies.

If the Partners Assembly is to have legitimacy and credibility, the Constituent Assembly will also need to resolve whether members will have the authority and legitimacy to represent their organizations, or attend as participant members, bringing in perspectives of,and reporting to, a cross-section of member organizations or stakeholders.

Conclusion

The SGWG has put forward two governance options for the consideration of the Constituent Assembly.Both are based on GFAR remaining a virtual organization with no independent legal identity. Both provide for GFAR's needs for strategic, programmatic and executive governance, but vary in how these needs are addressed by different statutory governance bodies. The final form of these bodies will depend on the size and meeting frequency of the Partners Assembly and may involve management of the Agricultural Innovation and Enterprise Facility as it develops.

The first option presents a three-tier model, similar to the present system, featuring a larger, less frequent Partners Assembly.The benefits of this option include wider representation and participation of all GFAR stakeholders through the Partners Assembly and expanded Steering Committee, although the diversity of stakeholders may cause a loss of focus. There is also potential for overlap and a conflict of interest between Partners Assembly and Steering Committee. Set-up and transaction costs could be high.

The second optionproposes a two-tier model withlighter governance oversight, making this a lower-cost option, and leaves actions largely to the constituencies to deliver collectivelyThis option relies on institutions' own commitments to **collective action** as there will be little physical meeting of the partners.

Decision Pointson Governance Structures

Two options are offered below and the CA is asked to decide between the two:

Option One

Identity
GFAR will be a virtual organization with no legal identity.

Governance structures
The governance structures of GFAR will comprise the following:

- Partners' Assembly
- Steering Committee
- Executive Committee

Partners' Assembly
The Partners' Assembly will provide strategic oversight and governance to the Forum. It will comprise 150 organizations (membership criteria and selection process will be considered in the following discussionand voted on in a subsequent decision text). It will meet once every three years. It will elect its own Chair and Vice-Chair.

Steering Committee
The Steering Committee will provide programmatic oversight for the Forum. It will comprise 25 organizations, which will be elected by the Partners' Assembly. It will meet once a year. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Partners' Assembly will also be the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee respectively.

Executive Committee
The Executive Committee will oversee the Secretariat and it will manage the allocation of financial resources raised by GFAR. It will meet twice a year.

Membership
The Executive Committee will comprise: the Chair and Vice-Chair of GFAR, representatives from FAO and IFAD, representatives of donors and the Executive Secretary as ex-officio. The Executive Committee members will be confirmed by the Partners' Assembly.

Resource Allocation Committee
The Executive Committee may set up a Resource Allocation Committee, comprising five members: the Chair, a donor representative, two independent experts and the Executive Secretary ex-officio.

GCARD Organizing Committee
The Executive Committee will set up the GCARD Organizing Committee.

Donor Support Committee
The Executive Committee will establish a Donor Support Committee comprising approximately four members. Its meetings will be attended by the GFAR Chair and Vice-Chair as well as the Executive Secretary. It will meet virtually.

Collective Action Group
If necessary, the Executive Committee may set up a Collective Action Group to provide programmatic quality assurance oversight and monitoring.

Option Two

Identity
GFAR will be a virtual organization with no legal identity.

Governance structures
The governance structures of GFAR will comprise the following:

- Partners' Assembly
- Executive Committee

Partners' Assembly
The Partners' Assembly will provide strategic oversight and governance to the Forum.

It will comprise 60 organizations (membership criteria and selection process will be considered in the following discussionand voted on in a subsequent decision text). It will meet once every two years. It will elect its own Chair and Vice-Chair.

Executive Committee
The Executive Committee will oversee the Secretariat and it will manage the allocation of financial resources raised by GFAR. It will meet twice a year.

Membership
The Executive Committee will comprise: the Chair and Vice-Chair of GFAR, representatives from FAO and IFAD, representatives of donors and the Executive Secretary as ex-officio. The Executive Committee members will be confirmed by the Partners' Assembly.

Resource Allocation Committee
The Executive Committee may set up a Resource Allocation Committee, comprising five members: the Chair, a donor representative, two independent experts and the Executive Secretary ex-officio.

GCARD Organizing Committee
The Executive Committee will set up the GCARD Organizing Committee.

Donor Support Committee
The Executive Committee will establish a Donor Support Committee comprising approximately four members. Its meetings will be attended by the GFAR Chair and Vice-Chair as well as the Executive Secretary. It will meet virtually.

Collective Action Group
If necessary, the Executive Committee may set up a Collective Action Group to provide programmatic quality assurance oversight and monitoring.