



GFAR

The Global Forum on Agricultural Research

*Together we're shaping the future: Transforming agricultural research,
education, extension and enterprise for development*

Draft Minutes of the 29th GFAR Steering Committee

7th - 9th April 2014

CGIAR Consortium Office at Agropolis International

Montpellier, France

Participants in attendance

Vice-Chair: Honourable Professor Ruth Oniang'o (acting Chair for the 29th Steering Committee)

SC Members:

Mohammed Ajlouni (Executive Secretary, AARINENA)
Oseyemi Akinbamijo (Executive Director, FARA, from 8-4)
Guram Aleksidze (for Chair, CACAARI) and Alisher Tashmatov (Executive Secretary, CACAARI)
Pedro Arcuri (for FORAGRO)
Codrin Paveliuc-Olariu (YPARD Chair)
Sonali Bisht (NGOs - Inhere)
Kristin Davis (Executive Secretary, GFRAS)
Judith Francis (Executive Secretary, EFARD)
Simon Hearn (Chair, APAARI) and Raghunath Ghodake (for Executive Secretary, APAARI)
John Kennelly (Chair, GCHERA) and Simon Heath (Executive Secretary, GCHERA)
Lucy Muchoki (Private Sector - CEO PanAAC)
Esther Penunia (Farmers – AFA) and Luisa Volpe (for Farmers - WFO),
David Radcliffe (Donor Support Group)
Frank Rijsberman (CEO, CGIAR Consortium)
Mark Holderness (Executive Secretary, GFAR)

GFAR Secretariat:

Robin Bourgeois, Harry Palmier, Thomas Price (Senior Officers)
Pierluigi Masciotta (Financial Officer)
Charles Plummer (Administrative Officer)
Erna Klupacs (Communications Consultant)

CGIAR Consortium Office Senior staff:

Wayne Powell
Luis Solorzano
Anita Regmi

Apologies:

Juan Lucas Restrepo, GFAR Chair
Xiangjun Yao, FAO
Ernesto Brovelli, SAI Platform (for private sector)

Agreed Summary Statement: 29th Session of the Steering Committee of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research

At the kind invitation of the CGIAR Consortium Chief Executive Officer Dr Frank Rijsberman, the Multi-stakeholder Steering Committee of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) met at Agropolis International, Montpellier, France, April 7-9, 2014.

Key Outcomes – Members of the GFAR Steering Committee decided that:

- GFAR and CGIAR renewed their commitment to working in close partnership across programmes and to ensuring a shared vision and implementation for a successful GCARD3 process. To this end, the GFAR Steering Committee and CGIAR Consortium, in consultation with their constituencies, will prepare and submit a revised GCARD3 concept note for consideration by the CGIAR Fund Council meeting in May.
- The Committee agreed to practical, time-bound steps for improving the transparency, accountability and efficiency of the governance of the Global Forum, and in turn, that of the regional fora and other stakeholder groups represented in GFAR Steering Committee.
- The Committee fully endorsed the establishment, through GFAR, of an Integrated Agricultural Innovation Investment Facility to promote and increase investment and capacities in national agricultural research and innovation systems. The Facility will integrate national demands and innovation platforms, IFAD and funding partners, and international supporting mechanisms.
- Members reported on the actions they had taken to implement the GFAR Medium Term Plan and their plans for future work in their particular areas of responsibility.
- The Committee determined financial and technical support to catalyze partners' actions and agreed to new working principles for implementing the GFAR Medium Term Plan (2014-2017).
- The Committee adopted the Budget and Action Plan for 2014, aligned to the GFAR Medium Term Plan (2014-2017).
- The Committee reviewed the Terms of Reference for the upcoming External Evaluation of GFAR and agreed to build on previous external evaluations of GFAR Governance and GCARD2. The External Evaluation will take place after the Constituent Assembly scheduled in November 2014, and be completed before mid-2015.
- The Committee adopted a gender strategy based on that of FAO.
- The Committee noted progress in developing a robust and layered Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Forum and agreed that it must be fully operational by the end of 2014. Members agreed to fully document and share progress in their work, including through contributions to the GFAR website and communications.

GFAR Vice- Chair, Hon. Prof. Ruth Oniang'o, who Chaired the meeting, welcomed the strong unity of purpose shown and positive outcomes of the meeting "GFAR is renewed and re-energized; we have shown that together we can realize our joint purpose and meet the expectations of those we work to serve. It has been a great meeting and I thank us all for the enthusiasm and renewal of purpose".

Day One, 7 April 2014 – Workshop on partnership for impact with CGIAR

Opening

The GFAR Steering Committee opened with designation of the GFAR Vice-Chair, Honourable Professor Ruth Oniang'o, as Chair for this meeting in the absence of the Chair, Mr Juan Lucas Restrepo, who was unable to attend due to his duties to present and secure the budget of Corpoica, the national agricultural research institution he leads, with the Colombian national legislature during the same period.

After brief self-introductions of all participants, Dr Frank Rijsberman, CEO CGIAR Consortium, welcomed all as the host of the meeting in Montpellier. He noted the ongoing changes in the CGIAR including the renewal of its overarching strategy and a desire to improve and make use of partnerships, particularly now in shaping the next round of CRPs. He noted a very useful workshop of the CGIAR Consortium Partnership Committee in Wageningen, where they had met with the Fund Council, including GFAR representatives. Face to face discussion was clearly more effective than written dialogues.

The Chair invited and welcomed free and frank interaction among all participants, counting on contributions from all, with new participants coming in as equal partners and in a general spirit of mutual respect to move the GFAR agenda forwards. She also highlighted the experience and learning of the people around the table in wider agricultural themes such as nutrition, gender, enterprise development and how the GFAR agenda was built on agricultural innovation in its development context. She thanked the Secretariat for facilitating and arranging the meeting.

The agenda was adopted by consensus, but remained open to amendments as required in the course of the sessions.

The GFAR Executive Secretary, Dr Mark Holderness, noted that fully two-thirds of the attendees were new participants to the Steering Committee and that the meeting evidenced the increasing inclusiveness of the Global Forum to representation of new constituencies, including education, rural advisory services and youth.

1. CGIAR Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and the CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)

Dr Rijsberman presented the plans for the continuing development and implementation of the CGIAR's SRF as well as the ongoing evolution of the CRPs leading into their next phase. He stressed the complex history of preparation of the SRF and its evolution, and the need to establish clear priorities and balance qualitative and quantitative analyses of what was required of CGIAR performance. The principal themes had been settled upon as Food security, Rural poverty, Sustainable natural resource management and Nutrition and health, but these were not as yet associated with regional priorities in the existing SRF and these strategic priorities were mixed in with existing Center programmes and with a diversity of rules on how the CRPs are managed.

The CGIAR was hence looking for a more practical SRF document, a guidance document with a more explicit operational basis. It was necessary to develop clear reference to results and practical direction, and rules and guidance for setting the program. The role of the CGIAR Partners is also deemed central, with a need for clearer roles for partners and meaningful contributions from all.

The future SRF and CRPs should also address three cross-cutting subjects: gender (new strategies are now being put in place), capacity development (an area both under-developed and under-invested in the current portfolio and the CGIAR is now establishing a capacity development strategy) and partnerships themselves, in which GFAR is seen as having an important role in creating strategic links with partners including, for example, EMBRAPA.

He noted the CGIAR overall remained recognised as a leader in global agricultural research, but had been dispersed via many projects (more than 3000). Despite some resistance to change, this had involved a strategic push towards collective CRPs, reducing duplication in the system and intended to produce less cumbersome governance in achieving larger scale development impacts. With now 16 CRPs, concentration around key areas confronted the earlier challenge of resource dimensions having been too small for impacts at scale.

Nonetheless, partnerships remain the weakest area of the reform in all dimensions, in particular at national level and with the private sector. Financial resources in the CGIAR have increased through the CGIAR reform and reawakening of interest in agriculture through the food price crisis. However, there was still need for greater coordination of resources with those of different sectors to deliver impacts at scale. He also recalled the progressive changes in overall CGIAR governance with the establishment of the Fund Council, ISPC, IEA and Partners and Stakeholders engagement through GFAR, the GCARD process, and the Consortium itself. The new approach was based on a Theory of Change, with the CGIAR being accountable for its research outputs and with shared responsibility with partners for impact pathways towards large scale outcomes.

To assess quality and appreciation, a partnerships survey was conducted in late 2012, with the document produced in June 2013. With GFAR support and stakeholder reach, the survey was successful in achieving a 27% response rate (1500 respondents). 75% expressed general satisfaction in partnerships with the CGIAR. However, in spite of overall satisfaction, Dr Rijsberman noted that of the 3094 partners cited by the CRPs, only 2.5% are farmers and their organizations and 7.5% from the private sector, while 25% are national research institutions and 22% from academia. Where the respondents were least satisfied was in the CGIAR's transparency – of funding and decision making - and these were key areas of partnership that needed to be improved upon.

New platforms for partnerships, such as HarvestPlus, have yielded partnership in new areas important for agricultural research such as micro-nutrients, so moving beyond conventional production alone. As a result the CGIAR is now committed to mainstreaming breeding for micronutrients into all crops.

The CRPs are comprehensive, covering four fields: Crops, Ecosystems, Policies Institutions and Markets and Farming Systems (humid, drylands, aquatic). There is a big effort now underway to synchronize and harmonize these programmes across the system. Refining the CGIAR's strategy has progressively resulted in an enhanced accountability framework with a lower number of key objectives and common development goals (now reduced to eleven). These still require development of necessary indicators and targets. There are also new,

emerging issues to take into account, such as how malnutrition also encompasses problems of obesity and addressing urban, as well as rural, poor. In addition, major issues remain a source of much debate, such as the future for smallholder farmers and farming. Establishing appropriate indicators and targets for CGIAR work is a priority for 2014.

The new SRF will encompass a shift from international public goods focus to how development outcomes can be realized. The progressive refining, consolidating and updating of CGIAR priorities must address multiple issues, recognizing the linkages to the SDGs, taking into consideration high level politics and appropriate temporal and geographic scales. For example, how can targets be set at national level? For Africa, how to take into account the CAADP process with its goals and priorities? And in planning, there is need to report in the shorter term and track progress every 3-4 years, recognizing that the programs will yield their results in a longer term frame of 9-12 years. Finally, the process is framed within development of fit-for-purpose applications of Results-Based Management processes, with Capacity Development provided within the scope of the CRPs, more open participation in CRP development and M&E. Other questions to be resolved are the relationship of the System Level Outcomes (SLOs) to the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

Dr Rijsberman also noted the ongoing choices and changes necessary in CRP management and governance for more integrated delivery of outcomes, whether to move away from main/secondary contractor models towards a joint venture model such as that for CCAFS and building on the models and experiences established in the Challenge Programs. There is also scope for the CRPO Steering Committee and Director to have more authority to manage for results, so becoming more akin to the Challenge Programs.

In spite of calls for enhanced partnership and although the volume of funding has doubled, the proportionate funding for the CGIAR's partners has remained at 17% for the last 5-7 years. Dr Rijsberman suggested that the goal for partners could be at least 1/3 of funding, which was the benchmark from CGIAR Challenge Programs, and consideration given that at least one work package per CRP could be led by a partner rather than their working as sub-contractors. There is no standard basis at present among the 16 CRPs.

Within this overall context of a new strategic framework, ongoing CGIAR reform and roll out of the Research Programs, the CRPs are moving to the call for a second phase. The programs are focusing on geographic linkages and planning to integrate multiple dimensions of agricultural research on site, building from flagship ideas that look particularly promising. Building on experiences from the first phase, there will be a two-stage process for proposals. To simplify and expedite the process, an initial 10-page proposal with a set of key components and strategic goals will be considered for approval, to go to subsequent development of a full proposal on approval. The proposals will demonstrate alliances across groups, rather than be Center-focused, and budget by output to demonstrate value for money. This will require consideration of outcome-based accounting as to what each element in impact pathways will cost and link payments to outputs achieved as a new form of performance management.

Target setting will need to be done in conjunction with governments, but the mechanism for this remains unresolved. The IDOs will need to be expressed as quantitative time-bound and measurable results statements for specific target countries. There is a sensitive balance to sustain between best science and development impact. The aim is program cycles beyond 3 years, to at least 4-5 years, with strong Performance Management and Incentive Payments for

"out-performing" in partnerships, with additional resources available. The current numbers – 16 CRPs and 15 Centers – may reduce, in part in response to the emergence of new areas of concentration such as improvements in livestock fodder and productivity or the range of issues around nutrition. As regards the timeline for the 2nd phase CRP call, ongoing programs such as AAS and MAIZE will be extended through 2015 to bring all existing programmes in line together. Requests for new pre-proposals will be made in 2015 and then full proposals in 2016. The aim is to harmonize approaches and align the process in the course of 2016. The GCARD3 in 2015 is thus occurring at the right stage for establishing priorities with partners.

The CGIAR Consortium Chief Scientist, Dr Wayne Powell, further emphasized that strategies in agricultural research and its applications have converged in developed and developing countries. Contemporary developments in science, such as the impacts of “big data” on systems research, can be “game-changing” for the future.

2. Partner feedback session

In the ensuing discussion, participants addressed some of the big issues identified in Dr Rijsberman’s presentation:

- 1) How fast can the second phase CRPs digest and apply the results and lessons learned from the first phase including the need for improvements in partnerships? Where is partnership seen by the CGIAR in capacity development and the involvement of others?
- 2) How to bring greater focus on sustainable development and mechanisms for engaging national agricultural research/innovation systems? How will these make use of the Regional Fora for Agricultural Research? What resources will be made available to the Regional Fora to help enable this role?
- 3) How to show how the CRPs are working with developing country partners and to measure partnership, its impact, and the link to capacity development and learning by doing through working together; noting that for some donor agencies (e.g. ACIAR, IDRC), future funding will be contingent on such measures and linkages. A target of 30% to partners was strongly preferred by the SC members.
- 4) Farmer and non-governmental organizations welcome these changes, noting the need for research to be applicable and for their participation in the entire process, from identification through implementation to monitoring. The institutional and resource limitations of such organizations, compared to government institutions was highlighted – especially in developing countries and at local level - as well as the need to consider diversity and scale of partnerships required along impact pathways. The NGO sector in particular is a very scattered group and would need support to be able to engage coherently with CGIAR discussions.
- 5) The future basis for selection of partners by CRPs needs to become more inclusive and representative – it is too arbitrary and ‘sub-contractor’ based at present. This needs to start at country level with the collective expression of all AR4D actors, notably including farmers and local organisations, of their needs and expectations. National dialogues must go beyond statements of intention, to real participation in design, implementation, monitoring and governance.
- 6) A mechanism is required to more directly engage young people, so that perhaps 25% of young graduates can gain international experience
- 7) Innovative financing mechanisms should be discussed that can also include international providers from national systems e.g. EMBRAPA.

- 8) Practical measures are required to link CGIAR, Regional Fora and national research, while also strengthening national systems. This should include measures that: strengthen national systems, strengthen regional platforms to better inform the CGIAR centers, support and fund involvement of national research or university systems as vital partners for success
- 9) Data availability, diffusion and distribution for use by partners on the ground were flagged as vital.
- 10) The GCARD1 philosophy placed farmers at the centre of processes. Has this been achieved? Farmer organizations felt they were consulted in the design phase, but dropped from the implementation phase. Farmer organizations need to be linked with at national and regional levels.
- 11) Sensitivity to regional and country specific contexts, such as the specific challenges for the Central Asia region in coming out of highly centralized decision making models and collectivized agricultural production into privatized farms. National partners need to feel the CRPs recognize their roles and how these are articulated through the Regional Fora. The CRP Directors needed to link more closely with regional and national processes via existing platforms for each.

It was noted that many of the issues of concern for partnerships have been expressed and considered in the past. Resource issues were cited as important here and the target of 30% of funds going to partners was considered an important demonstration of good faith in partnership. There was general agreement that programmes must build up from national research systems, connecting these to the value addition opportunities from international research, notably the CGIAR, and incorporate flexibility in resource mobilisation adapted to institutional constraints at country level. Measures must include education to reach young people and attract them into agriculture-related professions. The Regional Fora can play their role here to inform the CGIAR system and other international institutions.

In summary, Dr Rijsberman supported the importance of partnership, and of national responsibilities. It was clearly recognized that the CFGAR have to work more effectively with Regional Fora, in particular as partners in design of the next phase CRPs, though the linkage is less direct in implementation, where CGIAR partners directly with national partners.

The Consortium is working to engender change in the system and a culture of being outward-facing. For example, the IT revolution and communications needs identified were deemed a critical point. It is essential that national governments prioritize development of national capabilities. Finally, the future for smallholders and meeting their needs over the next 20-25 years is considered a critical question to consider through foresight and the impact pathways.

Decision 1: The CGIAR will report back to the SC in future on progress in partnerships, notably as regards the proportions of funding allocation and participation in programme implementation.

Identifying and establishing national priorities

The Executive Secretary introduced the subject, emphasizing GFAR as a collective multi-stakeholder forum, driven by its constituencies. GFAR has evolved to be truly inclusive and has an innovation systems approach with outcome-based thinking. Building from the morning discussions and given the changes in the CGIAR, we need to shape together a more effective

way of linking national demands, mandates and capabilities with international support actions, such that the latter add clear value. This needs to happen at regional and national levels, improving the effectiveness and efficiency of countries own research and innovation systems.

Resourcing is vital, through both governments and external partners. There is still much need for greater funding to national systems. This requires articulation of demand through Finance Ministries in the countries concerned. The CGIAR has a role to play in advocacy for this, but much advocacy and action is required among the partners and countries. This required mobilizing the partners already associated with GFAR and that national systems themselves own the agenda of changing and strengthening national systems. The CAADP experience has much to offer other regions, building on NEPAD and then engaging donors. But each region has specific political issues and resource needs: Asia, Central Asia, Near East, Latin American and Caribbean each has different challenges. Governments also needed to become more accountable for the investments made on behalf of farmers and in ensuring long term capabilities to research and address key issues. Practical examples include the MOST scheme of China, which invests matching funds to those provided by BMGF.

In discussion it was recognized that this also requires more advocacy using returns to an investing country itself, as has been the case for Australia with CGIAR wheat research. It was also suggested to link global trade in commodities with a levy for improving national agricultural research systems. Partnerships do tend to favour strongest partners and more effort is required to strengthen weaker partners, better balancing capacity development with the need for research outcomes and changing the dynamics of systems. There is also need here to consider who benefits from research and how to address the needs of those with system constraints and poorer uptake capacities.

Yet, there is real strength in such processes and donors are now taking on the CAADP as an obligatory frame for all countries in Africa. At national level, partnerships can be extended with all – particularly farmers, trade unions, small and medium size agro-enterprises. Grassroots farmers determine the sustainability of the system. However, connecting farmers directly with research is not always easy. This is generally weak at local level, and project based at national level. For governments, agrarian reform with Agriculture Ministries may require representation in different bodies e.g. Organic Board and Land Bank.

Donors can assist in the human development goals, without ‘driving’ the agenda. CGIAR must work in partnership with others, but national systems are often poorly resourced at all levels, including FOs and NGOs and Private Sector.

Resource Mobilization Actions

Participants agreed that much has been achieved in transforming international research. The case for the CGIAR’s role was well supported, but the CGIAR cannot deliver results by the Centers and CRPs alone:

- 1) there is need to improve communications and share good examples in order to move faster and scale out with demand driven from national actors and also demonstrating value of international agricultural research to developed countries;
- 2) resources for partnerships in the CRPs should move to the level proposed of 30% of available funding as part of a drive to increase investment in and by national systems and

- ‘balance the equation’ of investment needed at international and national levels to realize desired impacts;
- 3) advocacy and pressure must be applied to allocate resources in national budget – for example, in line with the commitments of African countries in the Maputo Declaration and CAADP – with matching funding coming from international partners;
 - 4) establish collective arrangements among the entire spectrum of AR4D actors at country level, using mechanisms such as the African Agricultural Science Agenda in line with the commitments of the Maputo Declaration and resource allocation in CAADP;
 - 5) National systems in some regions are very weak and require regional strategies, built on national needs and enhancing capacity of national partners while championing and protecting their concerns, within which the voices of farmers are **essential** to create real change;
 - 6) Alongside CGIAR investments, donors should be focused in parallel on funding national actors of all kinds, to achieve development outcomes – this needs another initiative supporting national level actions beyond that of the CGIAR and requires commitment from national partners and adoption of agriculture and rural development as national priorities;
 - 7) GFAR partners can also do more to ensure that national plans developed through multi-stakeholder consultations are acted upon and not overridden by new external investments. International priorities need to be aligned with and driven by national priorities. The CAADP/FARA processes give a good example as CAADP is politically endorsed through the AU and this could provide a model elsewhere;
 - 8) Smallholder agriculture still comprises most of the world’s production and are often the majority of a country’s citizens. While centrally important, and recognizing the value of local innovation, smallholders lack access to external information so both local and external innovation are needed.

Participants considered that GFAR, as the multi-stakeholder global mechanism, is particularly well placed to advocate and bring these issues to the forefront at global level. This calls for mobilizing political support at high level and corresponding commitments. The Forum has the global reach to support regional processes of prioritization, mobilize support through international mechanisms such as the G8 and G20, and connect to heads of government and other decision makers through initiatives such as the African Agricultural Science Agenda and the European agenda on agriculture. It was noted that these processes play through the long term, but reap substantial benefit in public awareness, resource allocation and establishing policy.

Decision 2: GFAR should promote and catalyse a coherent initiative in support of country-led processes to enhance investment and capacities for agricultural research and innovation for development, in particular directed to the needs of smallholder farmers.

3. The GCARD3 process

The Executive Secretary introduced the process to date. GCARD1 had produced a groundbreaking analysis of region-by-region research need analysis and of systematic transformations and investments needed for agricultural research and innovation to become more effective in development. Generated through bottom-up processes, these had led to the

bold agenda of the GCARD Roadmap, agreed by representatives of all sectors and now shaping the GFAR MTP. GCARD2 had focused more on the foresight, partnerships and capacities needed for success and had inspired discussion and development of many new partnerships and network opportunities. However, a number of CRPs felt the process was too early in their cycles to be able to contribute effectively, that the CGIAR was not as visible in the process as it should have been as an equal partner in the Conference and that in such a big event it was not clear who could legitimately speak for whom in terms of providing public reflection on the work of the CGIAR. As a result, Rodney Cooke had been commissioned as a consultant to provide an external review of the GCARD2 and make recommendations for a GCARD3 process, focused on a region-by-region consultation process over a year, leading to a smaller conference event.

This review was accepted in its entirety by the GFAR SC 28th Meeting in Istanbul and an accordingly revised proposal was prepared jointly between the GFAR Secretariat and CGIAR Consortium Office and submitted to the Fund Council by the Consortium Board in mid-2013. The Fund Council meeting in Nairobi received and discussed the document but while the developing country members were supportive, those asked to directly fund system costs were less so and referred it to the Governance Committee of the Fund Council to determine what they actually sought from the GCARD process in relation to the CGIAR Fund's needs for public accountability etc. Feedback from the FC Governance Committee was received only a few days before this 29th GFAR Steering Committee and was circulated to the Committee.

Frank Rijsberman reaffirmed these comments, the differences of perspective among funders on GCARD2 and the concern that GCARD2 had been felt to have too much discussion without clear outcomes for the CGIAR. The CGIAR is looking particularly for a truly grounded consultation process at national levels, linked to national targets and feeding back up regionally to the global picture. This is to understand real demand and ensure that CGIAR research is aligned with development priorities.

The process should be particularly relevant for farmers' organization and national governments. He proposed that as the revised SRF could be ready by November, this could be discussed publicly in a GCARD3 kick-off meeting alongside the CGIAR Fund Council meeting then. The Year 2015 provides real opportunity for collaboration with GFAR stakeholders as the Consortium would be formulating the next round of CRPs through 2015 and this process would require extensive consultation in country.

The process to GCARD3 could end in a smaller global meeting, involving key participants from the regionalised processes over 2014-15.

Mark Holderness emphasized that GFAR Secretariat was not wedded to a particular solution rather the perspective of the SC was sought as to what was necessary for the GCARD3 process, how it could work most effectively and how to be resourced and assessed. The kick-off could usefully be linked to the Constituent Assembly. Rather than referring to a 'global system', it was better to refer to agricultural research and innovation systems globally, for which GCARD provides a unique global gathering to take stock and share experiences and discuss and advocate their global value in transforming and strengthening AR4D.

The Chair also referred the SC to Juan Lucas Restrepo's separate note on the GCARD3 process.

SC members emphasised the need for effective communication and a common voice for the value of agricultural research and innovation, recognizing that this requires clear simple and robust messages that are well grounded in farming realities. GCARD3 must show that the objectives identified fit directly to the priorities of the farmers and provide guidelines to lead us to these objectives. National dialogues should begin as soon as possible among national research & extension institutes, farmers, NGOs, universities, companies, governments etc. GFAR should establish a timeline for 2015 starting ASAP at national level and outcome-planning for that process. Feedback from SC members was:

- There is a need to avoid repeating the same ground as the 2009-2010 process and to ensure that farmers are central here. However, the agenda may well have changed in key aspects (e.g. nutrition, gender, climate change) since 2010.
- This also requires finding ways to reach the poorest farmers, which is challenging. The GCARD2 - foresight exercise gave strong emphasis on farmer voices and local level actions and this can be built upon through the planned grassroots foresight exercises and focus on multistakeholder actions with provisions of funding for further farmer involvement in such dialogues.
- We should not lose the momentum from GCARD2 and need to agree on what we want from GCARD3. There is need to pursue dialogue at national and sub-national level and focus must include the policy environment.
- Farmers are very active in all countries, as are private sector actors, and both need the chance to be involved in policy processes and know what is expected of them, what they expect themselves, the objectives of the process and the terms by which they are asked to prioritize.
- Experiences from GCARD1 were positive; for Georgia the pre-GCARD discussions led to a decision to increase research funding up to 3% of agricultural GDP based on regional priorities, though it is difficult to then push governments into subsequent policy changes.
- GCARD1 was ground breaking in taking innovation systems on board, a real shift from the previous CGIAR AGM, at which there was felt to be little attention paid to partners. GCARD1 empowered partnerships beyond research, then GCARD2 brought many parallel discussions, but less profile for the newly-formed CRPs. GCARD3 should discuss the outcomes of the CRPs in plenary and bring perspectives from all stakeholders.
- It is encouraging to see the CGIAR moving towards the GCARD as a regularized strategic process of consultation with partners. For GCARD3, it is important that we optimize engagement of all stakeholders and attune researchers to wider development issues and strengthen the processes required, using GCARD as a permanent ongoing process to articulate the global voice.
- Deep, effective engagement of partners is required at regional and national levels with particular emphasis on country priorities, with roles and responsibilities defined and a timeline.

- There is need for “soft accountability” on research being carried out in the name of farmers. The direct farmer voice is basic and CGIAR needs to show impact on smallholders. If not, the legitimacy of the CGIAR is in question.
- The next GCARD must be action oriented – for farmers, for the private sector, for all actors
- It will be a global event, but very streamlined, building on regionalised or national processes of consultation in conjunction with the CRPs and other Partners in GFAR. These can usefully be back-to-back with other national and regional consultations.
- Considerations should build on accomplishments from GCARD1 and GCARD2 regarding areas such as productivity, but also include new areas such as investment, post harvest issues, innovative financing, eliminating drudgery through labour saving for women in agriculture.
- The CGIAR Consortium and CRP processes and GFAR MTP processes are both linked and independent, running in parallel in 2014 and 2015. Nevertheless, there should be a joint response of GFAR and the CGIAR Consortium to the CGIAR Fund Council.

Action 1: A joint proposal of GFAR and CGIAR Consortium will be submitted to the CGIAR Fund Council for the GCARD3 process, including a global meeting in late 2015.

Day Two, 8 April 2014 - GFAR Steering Committee Meeting

Opening

The Chair welcomed Yemi Akinbamijo, who had not been able to be present on Day One.

She introduced the meeting, describing times of major change for GFAR, with a new Chair and Vice Chair, new members of the Steering Committee and GFAR and with the CGIAR Consortium sitting together very constructively, working together and building mutually accountable processes. She welcomed the spirit of togetherness now being shown among GFAR constituencies and how different networks and institutions were now working together for positive change and holding each other to account in the processes.

1. Draft Agenda

The draft agenda was moved but with the sequence revision of addressing the investment facility in advance of the action plan discussion.

Agenda approved. Moved: Simon Hearn, Seconded: Lucy Muchoki

2. Minutes of 28th Steering Committee

The Minutes were accepted with one minor correction:

Page 5: Secretariat Progress Report first paragraph should read: “The delay was due to suspension of EU funding to the CGIAR in 2012, a knock-on effect of financial *irregularities* that came to light at one CGIAR Center.”

Minutes approved. Moved: Sonali Bisht, Seconded: Mohammed Ajlouni

3. Secretariat Report on Actions undertaken

Dr Holderness presented an overview of the work undertaken by GFAR Secretariat and stakeholders in response to the actions requested by the 28th SC (Istanbul) in 2013. The report was very well received and stimulated a range of specific discussion points:

Costing of the entire exercise and overall picture of the funding of GCARD3 is required, perhaps linked to minimum and optimal costing scenarios. For the CGIAR, Frank Rijsberman considered that the national and regional consultations required would be part and parcel of shaping the next round of CRPs. Funding available from the CRPs can cover the costs of these events as part of their planning for a next phase. Members sought a revised concept note for GCARD3 to put to the Fund Council and address the issues raised in the Fund Council Governance Committee review. This should include a time-bound plan, operational principles and how the GCARD 3 process will be structured in relation to other events. The Chair highlighted GFAR stakeholder’s collective responsibility to deliver on this plan and

proposed that a small SC working group revisited the GCARD proposal on 9 April 2014, to review the proposal and ensure they met the needs set out by the Fund Council and that different sectors had strong awareness and buy-in to the process.

SC members considered that the GFAR MTP was a very positive development that recognized their own work, that of GFAR Secretariat and that of the wider stakeholders reached through the SC member organizations – “one voice, one GFAR, one family” as described by AARINENA. The challenge of demonstrating the impact of GFAR’s work was well recognized and the focus on demonstrable contributions to change, rather than attribution of field outcomes, was welcomed as better reflecting the role of GFAR. GCHERA highlighted the need for better collective communication, to demonstrate the value-add of GFAR in together addressing societal issues requiring action and help – and moving that agenda forward through our collective actions. The CGIAR proposed that, rather than seeking attribution for change as a result of GFAR’s work, it would be better for GFAR SC operation and Secretariat to focus on organizational effectiveness and a scorecard for change, setting out annual measures of influence on outcomes and what the Secretariat and Steering Committee members aim to achieve in as quantitative a frame as possible.

The initiative of a new facility for increasing investment and capacity development was strongly welcomed by Shantanu Mathur of IFAD and others as taking GFAR’s operation to a new level and bringing multi-stakeholder innovation partnerships closer to development practicalities, via links with development loan programmes.

Yemi Akinbamijo, for FARA, complimented the Secretariat on the level of activity shown. He questioned whether the Climate Smart Alliance for Agriculture, led by a number of governments and multilateral agencies, was sufficiently linked to coherent actions on the ground. While valuing that GFAR has been asked to join this global partnership, he also felt strongly that GFAR stakeholders must together foster solid partnerships for delivery of results on the ground. He expressed FARA’s support and willingness to work with GFAR Secretariat and stakeholders in developing a coherent, impact-oriented CSA action plan for Africa. Simon Hearn, for APAARI, felt that while much scientific work has been done and farmers want to address climate change needs, the lack of coherent policy work in many governments also needs to be addressed. Sonali Bisht, for civil society, also flagged the rich link with grassroots farmers and NGOs, who already used many forms of climate-smart local innovations; these should be scaled-out more widely. WFO are also devoting considerable action and advocacy to influence policies in regard to climate change.

In regard to the G20 MACS, Simon Hearn (APAARI) noted that this year’s focus was on agriculture as a major engine of economic growth. This addressed productivity increases, through inclusive forms of economic growth from agriculture. Civil society noted that grassroots foresight was an important way of engaging communities in shaping their own preferred growth patterns.

Report approved. Moved: David Radcliffe, Seconded: Shantanu Mathur.

4. Update reports from GFAR constituencies on actions towards the GFAR MTP

Each GFAR sectoral/regional representative was then requested to present on their work relating to delivery of the GFAR MTP elements and to add further detail around their intended actions over the year ahead and how these could best be facilitated through GFAR catalytic actions or funding, including linkage with other sectors and partners.

AARINENA

Main areas addressed have been in developing a regional strategy for plant genetic resources, a network on medicinal plants and work on climate change and water management, leading to the AARINENA conference in Turkey, later this year. Other actions have encompassed promoting smallholder producer entrepreneurship and measuring investments and returns with ASTI. AARINENA is taking up a strategy of gender mainstreaming following the earlier report on gender. Protracted crises are of particular concern in the region and a new programme with GFAR and ICARDA aims to help rebuild Palestinian research capability. All activities have so far been dependent on AARINENA's own membership resources, with support from GFAR, IFPRI, ICARDA and IDRC, but AARINENA now plan to approach Funds in the Gulf States for support. Concern was expressed at the perceived non-competitiveness of the agricultural sector in comparison to other investments in the region – a similar trend was noted for Africa. GFAR was seen as having an important role to play in addressing this challenge, advocating on global policy orientation and cascading to Regional and National Fora to address their respective evidence bases of why agriculture needs strengthening and investment. This also requires national systems to be better funded through innovative means and able to link with international supporting capabilities – again a role for the collective action of stakeholders through the Global Forum.

APAARI

APAARI's constituencies include 25 countries as full members and the greatest concentration of the poor and malnourished in the world. Actions include the strengthening of regional networks, building research partnerships, technology transfer, policy and advocacy. There is a productivity focus, across areas including linking farmers to markets, biotechnologies and biosafety. Future challenges have much resonance with the GFAR MTP, through APAARI's programmes in policy advocacy, needs assessment, increasing investment, roles of women and youth, knowledge management and conservation agriculture. The recent APAARI meeting in Pakistan brought direct linkage between the heads of South Asian national public agricultural research and extension systems and the CGIAR, which provided useful space for a direct interaction. APAARI sees its work as fitting well with the GFAR MTP, though it is still a work in progress as to how best to link APAARI's specific work areas. It is recognized that impact evaluation is needed for APAARI's outputs and there is a challenge in bringing farmers, the private sector and others effectively into APAARI. A particular strength of APAARI is being able to reflect Asia-Pacific positions on global issues. It is recognized by APAARI that it now needs to rise to the next level of operation – while contributions are from individual members there is a need for greater synergies and core support from the region.

CACAARI

Institutions of CACAARI region are going through a generational shift following the decline in support for agriculture and research systems after the end of the Soviet era. This means considerable change in practices and a greater focus on improving delivery, inclusiveness and participation. However CACAARI's resources are very limited, with a Secretariat of one person. Main steps of late have been in moving from a Research Association to become a Forum on agricultural research and innovation and in turn develop national fora. This requires a new Charter and institutional changes, including greater representation of women and youth. There is severe under-investment in AR4D in the region. CACAARI aims to work more deeply with the development of national forums as funding agencies work through national processes. While actions will be built with national governments and policy makers, policy makers are still heavily driven by national Presidential directives. Immediate plans are for a joint conference on extension (seen as a priority area for strengthening), a governance review of CACAARI, a regional pre-GCARD face-to-face meeting and foresight studies.

EFARD

EFARD has reviewed its governance structures and now provides an umbrella, not just for research and research actors, but now expanded to include networks of universities, CSOs, farmers, donors and youth, now going beyond research to look at landscapes, nutrition and value chains and with a new management structure reflecting these shifts. As a multi-stakeholder platform EFARD is directly aligned with and supportive of the GCARD process. EFARD is seeking greater involvement of the private sector. It addresses both European specific dialogues and the European 'offer' in support of other regions. Focal areas include CSO mobilization, private sector engagement, food and nutrition security, including food safety and waste, capacity strengthening and inter-regional collaboration. Current priorities are: policy dialogue on future questions in agriculture, multistakeholder dialogues on identification of sustainable agriculture needs in Europe and Africa, user-led innovative funding platforms such as PAEPARD and coherence in innovation system capacity development. EFARD cited particularly strong links with FARA and the GFAR Secretariat. However, the Forum is short of cash resources to pursue these agendas. Involvement of the private sector was discussed and the need to address both nutrition and obesity issues, as well as the opportunity to work across Directorates-General of the EC.

FARA

Key focus areas are foresight and development of African foresight capabilities; creating the case for innovative financing of agricultural transformations through a high level advocacy panel; capacity development and integration in innovation systems via UniBrain; gender via GAP and youth via YPARD; and strengthening FARA's and the SRO's governance and accountability frameworks. GFAR contributes significantly to FARA's results and reflecting the multistakeholder philosophy, FARA has now engaged with and catalyzed regional networks of farmers (PAFO), private enterprise (PanAAC), NGOs (PanNGOC), advisory services (AFAAS) and education (ANAFE and RUFORUM). FARA is now supporting AARINENA and ICARDA in development of innovation platforms.

FARA emphasized the need for GFAR constituencies to work together in the common cause and to have a common Power Point story that can be adapted for use by all, to tell the coherent story of what we are doing together across a wide range of audiences. They see GFAR's role as being to help other fraternities grow into multistakeholder bodies and to work as a 'polypod' - many legged through its diverse constituencies - working together to seriously address the lack of investment in the agricultural research, knowledge and innovation sector around the world. FARA are also very willing to share their experiences to benefit parallel growth of fora in other regions. The need for involvement of all stakeholders into all Regional Fora was re-emphasized by Lucy Muchoki for the private sector. FARA have also been pushing for CGIAR Centres in Sub-Saharan Africa to work more directly in line with the CAADP process - science was not enough by itself and requires political buy in from the countries concerned - and to ensure that their research has viable uptake pathways in national systems.

FORAGRO

The last meeting of FORAGRO, appointed EMBRAPA, Brazil, as Chair. Plans are for a PROCISUR foresight academy, on which a slow start has been made, climate change, FONTAGRO and involvement as a leading think tank on innovation systems for wider experience sharing such as via TAP. GFAR financial support is requested for work to address women farmers needs and in particular for a governance review of FORAGRO in 2014, to engage sectors that at present are not well involved. FORAGRO sees itself needing to go well beyond its traditional role in technical dialogues.

Farmers' Organizations

AFA

Esther Penunia described AFA's role in representing 15 national Farmers Organizations and its role also in APAARI and Prolinnova. Priorities for AFA were foresight, supporting women farmers, participatory seed breeding, farmers' rights and the ITPGRFA, enterprise development and agricultural innovation, strengthening youth involvement and policies on land rights.

WFO

Luisa Volpe outlined WFO's priority areas of food security, value chains, climate change, knowledge and innovation and support to women farmers. Partnership with GFAR was fundamental to addressing these issues and greater partnership with the private sector was sought. WFO links 64 farmers' organizations and cooperatives and offers to support any processes of GFAR among these actors. WFO propose to facilitate farmers involvement at all levels in GFAR and in the CGIAR and to look for opportunities for joint meetings in the context of the International Year of Family Farming.

The farmer organizations were complimented for their work on policy and advocacy measures, recognizing also that all involved in the Global Forum need to optimize their messaging for farmers. GFAR has helped bring cross-connection for farmers with all other

actors and the role of IFAD in directly supporting the strengthening of FOs was also welcomed. Regional Fora also recognized the need for stronger farmer inclusion in workshops etc.

Civil Society Organizations

Sonali Bisht reported that CSOs have been very excited about the GCARD process and the multi-stakeholder actions generated through the Global Forum. The CSO-GARD self-established among committed NGOs through GCARD1, but was disappointed in the subsequent arbitrary partner selection processes of the CRPs.

As GFAR has grown, it has become difficult to uphold the CSO-GARD structure on a purely voluntary basis, without funds, secretariat or formal structure. Grassroots NGOs often provide the 'last mile' link in research delivery pathways to farmers, but there is little regularized communication between NGOs and CRPs and nominations to NGO seats in national and regional AR4D Fora tend to be arbitrary. There is a need for greater accountability in such mechanisms and strengthened governance mechanisms for this. Governance mechanisms for coherent involvement of NGOs needs to be strengthened at national, regional and global levels, including also resources for local innovation to be more widely engaged, mechanisms for information sharing and technical support and capacity building linkages. As a first step, basic resources are required for characterizing partners and collating information related to effective participation in the Global Forum.

Other sectors queried why the core coordination of NGOs should be funded by GFAR and sought more pragmatic solutions with direct commitments from the entities themselves. Ms Bisht responded that grassroots NGOs by their nature were generally not well resourced and support for engagement was required at all levels for their legitimate rather than nominal representation. The GFAR Governance review provides a practical mechanism to explore these linkages.

Advisory Services

Kristin Davis of GFRAS outlined some relevant key priorities for GFRAS in: addressing future questions; engaging producer organizations into rural advisory services, developing the GFRAS Consortium and Directory of education providers, the integration of nutrition agendas in advisory services, evaluation of Brazil's extension system and gender equality in rural advisory services. Capacity development was particularly focused on support to AFAAS and the mapping of networks in Central Asia and the Caucasus (with CACAARI). Transformation and strengthening of extension services has been supported by GFAR, through the use of EC funds, since the establishment of GFRAS. GFRAS is now well positioned to bring advisory service providers and new thinking into the agricultural innovation systems spectrum of stakeholders mobilized through GFAR.

Responses included questions on how advisory services would address the use of mobile phones, which are fast replacing many advisory functions and were being sought after by young people in particular, with large associated investments in data interoperability and ICT

systems. Africa's advisory services are increasingly moving to paid services, raising questions of who pays for the service.

Private Sector

Lucy Muchoki described the structure of PanAAC, mobilized via national platforms in each country and working with political bodies such as AUC and CAADP and with other private sector initiatives such as Grow Africa and SAI Platform, the private sector mechanism of CFS and aid investments such as the New Alliance. PanAAC acts as a platform for dissemination of research into enterprise opportunities. There is a particular focus now on women's enterprise and PanAAC are working with support from GFAR Secretariat and with GAP Partners in developing processes to directly support women in innovation, based around the principles of CAADP. PanAAC called on other Regional Fora to also start private sector platforms and share experiences between regions.

Youth

YPARD was externally reviewed in 2013 and has shown a 43% rise in members, to now number over 7,000 individuals. YPARD has also become closely involved with the GAP initiative to strengthen roles for young women in agriculture. The YPARD external review recommended that YPARD moves to a more content driven agenda and a recent Committee meeting explored what this means in practice. The CGIAR Consortium noted that they are working more and more with YPARD and that new funding to the CGIAR system has brought a rapid influx of young staff. It was discussed that YPARD can very usefully analyze what will attract young people back into agricultural production and food chains. Areas highlighted included curriculum reform, more mentoring and the use of ICTs in research and extension.

Education

GCHERA are also new to the GFAR SC but greatly liked what they see and are looking to help implement the GFAR MTP. Two years ago, the structure of GCHERA changed to an association of regional members, now involving around 600 universities around the world. GCHERA aims to influence curricula of universities, not just in a narrow definition of agriculture, but also in nutrition, health and environment, sustainability issues and the bioeconomy. They are seeking to spread best practices that create the best possible learning environment for young people. The scope of the universities covered by GCHERA is massive and it has considerable potential to influence the direction of research over time and change future career structures. While GCHERA is in relatively early stages of development, it is actively fostering innovation systems through linkages between universities, the private sector and governments and will be meeting in Mexico in November to address the role of universities in food security and climate change. GCHERA summarized that it was a wonderful opportunity to be part of the Global Forum and deliver their role in the GFAR MTP.

5. Integrated Agricultural Investment for Innovation Facility

The Facility concept note was discussed in depth.

GFAR Chair Juan Lucas Restrepo spoke to the concept via Skype. He emphasized that the timing was right for an integrated approach through the multi-stakeholder mechanism of GFAR, the need for such an approach to supporting national innovation systems having been highlighted in the G20 and in other venues such as the CGIAR-FAO discussions. He described his own experiences in transforming innovation systems in Colombia and how coherent access to the experiences and best practices of others in putting innovation systems into practice would have been a very valuable resource. He proposed that the SC discussed how the Facility should look, its partners and how they would take part. He highlighted also the need for all stakeholders to be involved and for absolute clarity on their respective roles and delivery towards the GFAR MTP.

Responses were:

It was emphasized by APAARI that innovation systems are highly context specific and that there could not be a single modus operandi as this would be influenced by factors including agro-ecology.

GCHERA strongly supported the proposal and recognized that the Facility would help make a stronger societal case for investment in national agricultural innovation systems. Presenting agriculture as a solution provider for feeding the world in a new way, with greater emphasis on nutrition, should help bring new investors to the table.

IFAD echoed this need and the need for a focus on rural transformation. They see the Facility as a gel that binds together different forms of stakeholders and provides the oil for a systemic approach to true agricultural innovation systems. They envisage grants being cross-linked to loan investments for rural infrastructure and market links, in creating truly knowledge intensive and farmer-centred value chain approaches, involving all actors the value chain. IFAD are excited by the concept and see great coherence in the approach.

The GFAR Chair, Juan Lucas Restrepo, emphasized the need to focus on the Facility's supporting national agricultural innovation system development, rather than specific thematic issues. Rather, it should be dedicated to strengthening national agricultural innovation systems, as a global Facility in support of national capabilities.

CGIAR highlighted that agriculture can deliver multiple benefits and the Facility needed to show how many benefits can be addressed in parallel.

The Donor group consider the Facility to be a very exciting development, as the funding gap it addresses has always been recognized. They recognized the need for further elaboration on funding eligibility criteria, whether the mechanism would mostly support grants, how quantitative results could be determined and the relationship of the Facility to the CGIAR Fund.

Farmer associations strongly welcomed the Facility initiative and were excited at the focus on innovation systems and what it offered in better sharing the knowledge and innovation of farmers and triggering, and putting into practice, national innovation platforms. They insisted that farmers should be significantly involved in such platforms, shaping research and creating accountability of research and extension to farmers. They highlighted the need for non-governmental mechanisms to be able to access such funding and for it to ensure central involvement of farmer organizations in any funded actions and policies and that national innovation systems should operate at levels beyond just government bodies. Civil society organizations echoed the points raised by farmers and the need for direct civil society engagement, highlighting the practical example of ProInnova and not a focus on government bodies alone.

AARINENA considered the concept well-constructed and likely to grow resources for national innovation systems. It also provided a win-win in regard to links with the CGIAR. CACAARI supported the concept and how it addressed key pillars of the GCARD Roadmap in advocacy, partnership, capacity development, investment and knowledge sharing. EFARD also fully endorsed the concept of the global Facility to support national agricultural innovation capabilities.

CGIAR welcomed the Facility and how it could readily grow the overall funds available for national agricultural innovation. The CGIAR is currently preparing its capacity development strategy. This would be highly complementary to the Facility and investments in the Facility and the CGIAR should mutually reinforce each other.

FARA considered that much greater clarity was required on TAP and its role as proposed in the concept. They expressed concern at whether TAP was proliferating platforms beyond the existing networks/fora and sought clarity as to TAP's actual role and intended direction in relation to existing mechanisms. FARA recognized the need for clear advice to the Secretariat on how the component networks and mechanisms should fit together in practice. AARINENA queried why TAP was seen as the vehicle for mobilizing international support actors and whether the TAP was needed. GCHERA also expressed concern at the potential confusion of TAP and the role of GFAR itself and the unnecessary multiplication of institutions this could entail. GCHERA proposed that TAP and many others could contribute to the coordination need, not just TAP. APAARI, GCHERA and EFARD considered that TAP can be included within the Facility, but that TAP must be constructed within the Facility and in relation to the roles of the existing GFAR stakeholders and networks. The TAP is still at a conceptual stage and the Facility should include all platforms and encompass the spread of GFAR actions, including TAP.

IFAD stated that from their perspective the concept had been enriched by this discussion and that the Facility epitomized GFAR and what it stands for. It bridges the 'missing middle' between Research and Development. This gap needs the financing, linkages and inclusiveness required in embedding research and innovation in development contexts. It should operate as a Multi-Donor Trust Fund to support this 'missing middle' in capacity development and actions to bring the different players together. The Facility was not seen as competing with

CGIAR funding, rather it will be additional and incremental. It was important that processes were not driven by government agendas alone.

The Chair summarized that there was very strong support for the Facility concept and the need for the Facility was recognized across all GFAR Stakeholders. The proposal for multistakeholder involvement was well set out and further development of the Facility should now move quickly forward. She recognized the concerns raised by many over the need for clarification of the actual role and purpose of the TAP platform in regard to that of GFAR, its stakeholder fora and networks and delivery of the GFAR MTP and proposed that these should be raised to the subsequent TAP meeting, so that those leading TAP could respond and clarify these relationships.

Decision 3: The Facility concept was unanimously endorsed.

6. 2013 Financial Statement

The accounts were reviewed and approved as stood, noting that the additional EC income item listed was the 5% residual sum carried forward under EC rules from earlier financing and was thus shown separately from the new grant.

Accounts agreed. Moved: Raghunath Ghodake, Seconded: David Radcliffe

7. The Budget and Action Plan (including the GFAR Funding Principles)

The Executive Secretary briefly introduced the agenda item covering the Budget and Action Plan for 2014 and GFAR Funding Principles. The Funding Principles (see Annex 2) would be applied henceforth to execution of the plan and budget, including development of Letters of Agreement or other contractual or management instruments.

The SC Members unanimously agreed to the Action Plan, Budget and GFAR Funding Principles as proposed.

Decision 4: The Budget and Action Plan 2014 was adopted. New working and funding principles for implementing the GFAR Medium Term Plan (2014-2017) were endorsed as annexed.

Day Three, 9 April 2014 - Theory of Change, Monitoring and Evaluation and GFAR Policies

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

The consultancy company 'Firetail' is supporting GFAR Secretariat and stakeholders in creating the GFAR Theory of Change and associated indicators. Yvonne Pinto of Firetail joined the meeting by Skype. She reported on the stakeholder survey undertaken at the end of 2013. Although responses were not as comprehensive as would have been desired, the survey showed that >80% of stakeholders see a clear role and value for GFAR, providing a very positive reinforcement of the messages contained in the GCARD Roadmap and GFAR MTP.

The next phase is socialization of the GFAR TOC principles and development of appropriate indicators into new work programmes supported through GFAR. The measurement framework must be 'owned' by the Steering Committee, Secretariat and all organizations that are part of creating the changes set out in the MTP, as should documenting processes, outcomes and best practices around key issues. The GFAR SC and Secretariat will rely on commissioned organizations collecting the data required as part of the programme itself.

SC responses highlighted the importance of all partners recognizing the essential need for all partners to understand the GFAR Vision, communicate it to all stakeholders and practice it in programme implementation. There was strong agreement that stakeholders shared the same agenda and that it was essential that this common vision of what the Forum is and does informs subsequent actions and programmes.

The GFAR Donor Support Group considers this an essential piece of work to assure future donor support for GFAR. They also highlighted the challenge of measuring outcomes at the global vision level and the difficulty of attributing outcomes for which GFAR can only be a contributor.

Ms Pinto emphasized the need to report progress through the changes seen in the institutions with which GFAR directly engages, and in their work, recognizing that GFAR works through implementing agencies to catalyze change. This requires indicators of change for significant actions, related to the particular modes of action of different stakeholders, how they are themselves transforming and how they are in turn changing others. Donors emphasized the need for attribution for the added value here of GFAR in bringing all stakeholders round the table and forging innovative partnerships and actions, demonstrating the social capital value of such actions – and how they contributed to wider changes.

Ms Pinto emphasized that M&E processes should be developed to be as light as possible in clearly demonstrating such causal links and that demonstrable contributions were valid measures, particularly as it may not be possible to show attribution in its full dimensions.

Decision 5: Agreed that Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Forum must be fully implemented by the end of 2014.

9. GFAR Governance reform process

The SC recognized that the building blocks for constructive change are now in place. The Executive Committee (EC) is established and working well, the Steering Committee membership is now clearly recognized to cover all stakeholder sectors, though may yet be further improved upon. The changes made were felt to have established a good foundation and working governance model.

The need for an additional Resource Allocation Committee was discussed (as an independent body under the responsibility of the SC). The SC considered this was not necessary at present as the EC is now playing the role effectively and its members are not recipients of funds. It was however recommended that the role and value of the EC in fulfilling the resource allocation role be kept under review and reconsidered in case any conflicts of interest began to appear, in which case an independent committee could still be instituted.

The Constituent Assembly (CA) is the main issue now remaining. The CA has a formal *representational* role, but is not a decision making body replacing the SC, rather it will be representational in reflecting the broad perspective of the sector, rather than each individual organization and consider an appropriate basis for each sector to a) be represented into the Global Forum and b) engage widely with each constituency in actions and knowledge sharing by the Forum – and so to derive appropriate wording for stakeholder involvement in GFAR, reflecting key principles of mutuality, inclusivity and accountability in revising the GFAR Charter. The SC recommended starting from existing mechanisms in reaching out through SC members and e.g. the IFAD Farmers Forum.

Action 2: Terms of Reference for the CA participant profiles to be drafted by Secretariat and SGWG members.

The issue of the name of GFAR was addressed. With the evolution of concepts, The Global Forum on Agricultural Research, although originally intended to encompass all actors, no longer captures the perspectives and recognition of non-research actors and revisiting the name could provide a useful reinvigoration process. However, it was felt that while useful to explore a list of possible new names for future use, it would be premature to rename the Global Forum just as people are coming to recognize and value the Forum more strongly. The current name is therefore retained for the present.

Action 3: Secretariat to compile a list of possible new names for future consideration.

10. External Review

The draft Terms of Reference for the External Review of GFAR were discussed. It was recommended to include within these Terms of Reference the direct consideration of how GFAR is fulfilling its mandate as part of the CGIAR reform. It was also proposed that

supporting guidance on the Terms be sought from the Independent Evaluation Arrangement of the CGIAR.

The timing of the review was queried. It was considered premature to do an evaluation at this stage of the GFAR (and CGIAR) reform and more appropriate in capturing the dynamic changes to hold the review in early 2015, when one cycle of CGIAR CRPs would also be completed and more evidence would be available on how much the GFAR Secretariat and constituencies have been able to influence the CGIAR agenda.

The donors recognized that the broader donor base also requires an external review to ensure confidence in GFAR, but that this should build more explicitly on from the Governance Review and not duplicate that process. To fit these schedules together a review in early 2015 was considered more appropriate, with a start in December 2014 and reporting by March 2015, with terms formulated in light of the other reviews of GFAR and the CGIAR taking place this year.

Decision 6: External review to take place in early 2015 after the Constituent Assembly scheduled in November 2014, with TORs modified to include specific CGIAR linkage.

11. GFAR Annual Report 2012 (item moved from Day 2)

The Annual Report was reviewed and adopted by the Steering Committee. Input for the 2013 annual report was requested from all constituencies, in the form of 300 word illustrated summaries of their progress against the GFAR MTP objectives.

Annual report adopted. Moved: Simon Hearn; Seconded: David Radcliffe

12. Communication and GFAR Website

Ms Erna Klupacs, Communications Consultant, presented the new GFAR website. She provided a summary overview its format, content and facilities.

The SC welcomed the new website and commended the Secretariat on the visual quality, navigability and features of the site, allowing greater clarity on actions in the MTP, championing of the MTP-related work of all GFAR constituencies and greater partnership visibility and interconnectivity.

13. Adoption of FAO Gender Policy into GFAR's operations

The SC agreed to adopt the FAO Policy on Gender Equality <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf> into the Forum's operations. Elements entailed in this policy, now to be adopted into GFAR's operating principles include:

- generating and communicating the evidence base through the use of sex-disaggregated data to substantiate the importance of closing the gender gap for achieving GFAR's overall mandate
- developing and sharing gender equality norms and standards for agricultural policies and programmes
- building and disseminating knowledge on rural women's needs and priorities in all of GFAR's areas of work
- ensuring that gender analysis is incorporated in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of all field programmes and projects
- sharing comparative data on how effectively countries are closing the gender gap in different technical areas of agriculture and rural development
- ensuring that rural women's needs and priorities are documented, heard and addressed in all the processes that GFAR leads and supports
- ensuring that none of GFAR's efforts perpetuate gender inequality or worsen discrimination against women
- working with partners to learn how GFAR's support for gender equality in agriculture can be made more effective
- developing internal structures and systems that promote gender equality, and ensuring equal participation of men and women in decision-making in GFAR

It is noted also that the minimum performance standard for FAO is that by 2017 (completion of GFAR current MTP phase) 30 percent of FAO's operational work and budget at the country and regional levels is allocated to women-specific targeted interventions. Priority will be given to supporting organizations and activities that advance women's access to nutritious food and women's access to and control over land and other productive resources; strengthening rural women's organizations and networks; increasing women's participation and leadership in rural institutions; incorporating women's knowledge of agriculture into programmes and projects; and ensuring the development of technologies and services that reduce women's work burden.

Decision 7: Policy endorsed for GFAR operations. Moved: Shantanu Mathur, Seconded: Sonali Bisht

Concluding remarks

The Chair requested perspectives from stakeholders on the outcomes of the meeting.

EFARD summarized the meeting in overview and:

- Welcomed the willingness on Day 1 for CGIAR and GFAR constituencies to meet and work closely together in ensuring a shared vision and mission and joint concept towards a successful GCARD3.
- Also welcomed working together with GFAR partners on issues of key investments and strongly welcomed GFAR Secretariat's pursuit of the agricultural innovation investment Facility.
- GFAR Steering Committee stakeholders are obviously committed to improving governance in the Global Forum and in turn in improving governance of Regional Fora, with a visibly renewed commitment to GFAR through its stakeholders.
- The stakeholders had also agreed key principles in guiding the implementation of the GFAR MTP.
- Agreed to review ToRs of the GFAR evaluation, building on the Governance review and GCARD and M&E processes and this should be initiated after the GFAR Constituent Assembly
- In summary EFARD were delighted to record that the GFAR family is now truly one group, with one workplan to implement.

AARINENA thanked all for the very positive spirit of the meeting and the Secretariat for its support to meetings and for pushing the changes that were needed for developing the GFAR community.

GFRAS considered this a very good meeting and thanked the Secretariat and Chair. Asked also that the objective of each session be included in future annotated agendas.

CACAARI thanked the Secretariat and Chair for a very impressive meeting, welcoming the concrete actions identified that can clearly see results. They see scope for organization of multi-stakeholder innovation workshops at national level, but that these consultations should be funded by the governments concerned, rather than by GFAR. CACAARI are delighted to now have a budget for their transformative actions.

Private sector congratulated CGIAR as host, Chair and Secretariat and finds these meetings very relevant in bringing the diverse fora together, exchanging activities, successes and challenges is a very critical role. The GFAR SC is one of the best meetings in the world, which brings all stakeholders together to learn from each other.

APAARI fully endorsed the vote of thanks to the Chair and Secretariat. Considered the SC meetings now to be much better than in earlier years, with positive changes and exciting actions.

Donors welcomed the stronger financial position of GFAR and the now complete cross-section of stakeholders being fully involved.

GCHERA thanked all and particularly the Secretariat for their efforts to engage with and bring in GCHERA.

CGIAR Consortium were very happy that GFAR had accepted the Consortium's invitation to meet in Montpellier and that CGIAR and partners had "renewed our vows" through the meeting. Struck by how many constituencies are new to the SC, reflecting GFAR's renewal and a new engagement, which also brings a new commitment from the CGIAR to work with GFAR as an important partnership mechanism for the CGIAR, especially in expressing and formulating demand for international research.

Chair's summary

The Chair reflected that this meeting had been a very powerful discussion, it had been very important to listen to all stakeholders and what they each bring, especially those who were here for the first time. She thanks the CGOAR Consortium again for having been excellent hosts and welcomed the "renewal of vows" between GFAR and the CGIAR and the many positive references made by the SC to this relationship as a valuable partnership, while still holding the CGIAR to account from the perspectives of its partners and intended users.

She welcomed the free discussion of the meeting and how all constituents had been able to express their views, reflecting that GFAR was now truly a family and moving forward together. This reflected that great importance of the work of the Global Forum. GFAR is now in a very exciting time, where all sectors are now finally aligned to address the same issues and GFAR was tying together different regions and constituencies. This coming together and combining the power of all sectors in agricultural innovation brought tremendous collective power and will enable participants in the Global Forum to achieve a great deal together.

Annex 1: Summary of decisions and action points

	Decision/Action	Responsibility
1	Decision: The CGIAR will report back to the SC in future on progress in partnerships, notably as regards the proportions of funding allocation and participation in programme implementation.	CGIAR Consortium Office
2	Decision: GFAR should promote and catalyze a coherent initiative in support of country-led processes to enhance investment and capacities for agricultural innovation and research for development, in particular directed to the needs of smallholder farmers.	Global Forum stakeholders collectively
3	Action: A joint proposal of GFAR and CGIAR Consortium will be submitted to the CGIAR Fund Council for the GCARD3 process, including a global meeting in late 2015.	GFAR Secretariat, SC Working Group and CGIAR Consortium
4	Decision: The Facility concept was unanimously endorsed.	GFAR Secretariat and Global Forum stakeholders collectively
5	Decision: The Budget and Action Plan 2014 were adopted. New working and funding principles for implementing the GFAR Medium Term Plan (2014-2017) were endorsed.	GFAR Secretariat and GFAR stakeholders in Letters of Agreement
6	Decision: Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Forum must be fully implemented by the end of 2014.	GFAR Secretariat and all stakeholders
7	Action: Draft Terms of Reference for the CA participant profiles.	GFAR Secretariat and SGWG
8	Action: Compile a list of possible new names for the Global Forum for future consideration.	GFAR Secretariat
9	Decision: External review to take place in early 2015 after the Constituent Assembly scheduled in November 2014, with TORs modified to include specific CGIAR linkage.	Executive and GFAR Secretariat
10	Decision: FAO Policy on Gender Equality endorsed and to be adopted into the Forum's operations.	All stakeholders

Annex 2. Agreed Programme expenditure principles

GFAR funding is provided in support of strengthening and transforming national agricultural innovation systems.

- Agreed actions are supported with catalytic funds in line with their potential contribution to achieving the outcomes foreseen and areas of action agreed by all within the GFAR MTP.
- All actions should reflect the farmer-centered and multi-stakeholder principles of the Global Forum.
- In the thematic areas concerned, grants are provided through GFAR as catalytic ‘seed’ funding to initiate actions and leveraging of further resources by the organizations concerned.
- Funds are provided with the expectation of matched and documented contributions in cash or in kind (including dedicated staff resources) from the bodies concerned.
- A process towards outcomes should be defined and agreed upon in a transparent way and with accompanying outline logical framework and measurable indicators of achievement. Actions may take more than one year.
- GFAR mobilizes collective actions with the expectation that the partners will continue delivery of these plans with resources generated through their own further actions.
- Support (financial and technical) is intended to lead to programmes with clear measured outcomes and subsequent impacts, and help enable the generation of additional resources from elsewhere to deliver and scale out outcomes.
- Those sponsored through the Forum must provide a public feedback report on the event and on subsequent follow-up
- Programmes should reflect and publicly recognize that they contribute to delivery of the GFAR Medium Term Plan
- Progress and achievements, and the extent of leveraged resources and actions, will be reported back to the GFAR Steering Committee and through the M&E systems introduced for GFAR. This will also determine whether continued funding is merited
- The GFAR Management Team (or Resource Allocation Committee) will make recommendations on the basis of these reports