

GFAR REFORM & RENEWAL

Reframing Governance

Professor John Hailey

Cass Business School, University of London

Mannet, Geneva



GFAR Governance Review

- The GFAR Governance Review examined the effectiveness, accountability and credibility of the governance processes and issues related to inclusion and representation.
- Conclusions
 - that the governance of GFAR needed to be overhauled.
 - GFAR also needed to address strategic issues relating to
 - its identity as a multi-stakeholder forum,
 - the roles and constituencies of the Regional Fora
 - the relationship between GFAR and CGIAR
 - the strategic priorities of the Forum and of its Secretariat.
 - revising Governance would lead to a wider process of renewal of the Forum in which all stakeholders could engage.

GFAR Governance: The Challenge

- The review concluded that GFAR needed a system of governance that:
 - That incorporated aspects of global governance, network governance, institutional governance, & stewardship
 - is representative of its key stakeholder groups
 - 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.
 - To provide oversight for, and support to, GFAR's strategic priorities

Why have Governance ?

The Five M's

1. MISSION:

Determine vision, mission, long term strategy, major policies

2. MONITOR

Programmes and services that deliver the mission

3. MONEY AND RISK

Ensure there is sound management of money and risks;
support fundraising

1. MANAGE and motivate the Chief Executive

2. MUST have one in most cases

Current Thinking & Trends Around Governance

- Assessing governance structures in terms of how they help the organisation deliver its mission
 - not just a “must have” or that they appear inclusive or representational
- Shift from governance from being focused on “compliance & accountability” to being more “future-facing & strategic”
 - Governance seen as having a key leadership role
- Growing concern that governance bodies are cost-effective
 - Assessment of whether investment in governance (direct costs, time & transaction costs) adds real value
- Move to ensure that the design of governance structures appropriate to ensure full engagement & levels of attendance
 - Issues around continuity of attendance, use of alternates, virtual meetings, use of sub-committees & membership of committees.

GFAR Reform & Renewal

Strategic Priorities

- Supporting Collective Action
 - The new Partners Assembly would support & facilitate collective action, and provide the strategic direction needed to ensure better integration.
- Dialogue & Interaction
 - Supporting GFAR's role as a neutral space for dialogue, and partners Assembly would open up a major strategic dialogue mechanism
- Resourcing
 - Consideration of new GFAR fund to support AR & collective action
- Accountability & Transparency
 - Continuing to ensure channels of accountability and reporting work effectively and are based on principles of subsidiarity, clarity of roles and responsibilities, and avoiding conflicts of interest.

Elements of GFAR Governance

Executive Committee

- 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.
- ExecCo would have 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 would be supported by specialist sub-committees such as the Resource Allocation, Collective Action and Donor Support Committees

Elements of GFAR Governance

Partners Assembly

- The SGWG proposed that a **Partners Assembly** be established that is plays an overall governance role and is responsible for setting strategy based on consensus decision-making.
- 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.

Membership of the PA

Some Issues to Consider ???

- That partner members are representatives of a “constituency” ?
 - normally organisational nominees (i.e. not self-nominating)?
- That some partner members have “guaranteed places”
 - Key Donors, Regional Forum (See Membership Framework 1)
- That there should be an appropriate mix of other constituencies, with a “cycle of rotation” of such constituency members to ensure appropriate mix and engagement ?
 - Should any partner members be co-opted to ensure appropriate mix?
 - See Membership Framework 2
- That there should there be a clear and transparent criteria to determine appropriate “constituencies”?
 - Any thoughts on these criteria?

	Sub-Saharan Africa	West Asia and North Africa	South and South-East Asia and the Pacific	East Asia	Central Asia and Caucasus	Europe	Latin America (including Central America and the Caribbean)	North America	TOTAL
Regional Fora	FARA	AARINENA	APAARI	???????	CACAARI	EFARD	FORAGRO	?????	9
Nars/NARIs??									
Agricultural workers									
Consumers									
Farmer Organizations and Cooperatives									
Advanced/G20 Research Institutions									
Higher Education Institutions									
NGOs/CSOs: agriculture/rural development, advocacy, INGOs									
Private Sector: Agri-food industries, Agricultural input sector, Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SME)									
Rural Advisory Services									
Women (women's representative bodies)									
Youth									
Regional Intergovernmental Bodies									
TOTAL									

Membership Framework 1

International Support

Development Banks,
Foundations, Donors
FAO,
IFAD

International Networks/Fora/Consortia CGIAR, etc.

CGIAR IUAFW Consumers International

GFRAS GCHERA YPARD

UN BODIES?? AIRCA

PRIVATE SECTOR G20 MACS

- Please discuss at your tables what you have heard, the challenges involved, and the specific issues around membership.
- This will be followed by brief Q&A and feedback from you

GFAR Governance: Option 1

(see page 8)

Partners Assembly	triennially	150	Strategic	Wider number of constituencies represented
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resource Allocation Committee (5 members)• Donor Support Group (4 members)• GCARD Organizing Committee

** The 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.

Option 1: Pros & Cons

(see p.9&10)

- Higher cost
- Some transaction/set-up costs
- Could be seen as top-heavy, over-engineered
- More inclusive & variety of membership
- Greater access to an array of expertise, experience, diversity
- Need continuity of membership to ensure legitimacy
- Diversity of stakeholders may cause a loss of focus
- Enhances GFAR credibility, would limit concerns about accountability to different sectors
- Potential overlap & conflict of interest between Partners Assembly and Steering Committee

GFAR Governance: Option 2

(see page 8)

Governance bodies	Meets	Number	Governance focus	Representation
Partners Assembly	Biennial	60	Strategic and some programmatic	Narrower number of constituencies represented
Executive Committee	6 monthly	Six (6) Members: Chair, Vice Chair, FAO, IFAD, donor rep, Executive Secretary	Executive/Management and some programmatic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Allocation Committee (5 members) • Donor Support Group (4 members) • Collective Action Group • GCARD Organizing Committee

Option 2: Pros & Cons

(see p.9&10)

- Lower cost (low transaction & step up costs)
- Business-efficient in ease of decision-making
- 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
- Less access to an array of expertise, experience, diversity
- Relies on institutions' own commitments to collective action
- Partners may feel excluded from decision-making process

GFAR Governance: New Option 3

Governance bodies	Meets	Number	Governance focus	Representation
Partners Assembly	<u>Annual</u>	<u>45</u>	Strategic and some programmatic	Narrower number of constituencies represented
Executive Committee	6 monthly	Six (6) Members: Chair, Vice Chair, FAO, IFAD, donor rep, Executive Secretary	Executive/Management and some programmatic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Allocation Committee (5 members) • Donor Support Group (4 members) • Collective Action Group • GCARD Organizing Committee