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**Background:**
The objective of the foresight session at GCARD is to define clear lines of action to improve foresight and the impact of foresight in research/implementation prioritization. The foresight session is organized in three half-days with specific sub-themes intended to trigger “momentum” in this direction. The focus is on impact through both content (what do foresight works tell us about agriculture in the future?) and process (how to achieve more impact?).

This momentum is built on existing evidence related to content and process; i.e. what the foresight tells us about agriculture in the future and what can be learned by the way foresight studies are carried out and influence research prioritization. We will jointly build on the lessons that can be learned from this evidence and from constructive interactions among the participants to transform lessons into actions.

**Building evidence:**

A worldwide inventory of forward looking, anticipatory works conducted over the recent years, including the works of the CGIAR, yielded more than 50 relevant and documented “cases” directly related to agriculture and rural development. These cases constitute the basis for reporting on the current state of foresight, content and process, to the GCARD and for learning what still needs to be done to make foresight more effective for ensuring that, today, agricultural research at all levels also includes in its priorities the future societal needs.

These cases will be put in perspective with existing research priorities and development needs as these were identified for GCARD 1 in 2010 at regional level through the regional fora. This will enhance identifying new challenges, revisiting priorities and needs, adjusting actions and possibly needs for deepening and developing forward looking, anticipatory works.

Existing regional reports produced for GCARD 1 will be re-visited and synthesized into cases with the support of the regional fora during the write workshops and be used there as “benchmarks” to stimulate also collective reflections on changes. In order to achieve this objective, it is necessary to make sure that the benchmark provides the relevant information needed to feed the foresight session and its various sub-themes, so that lessons can be learned from the perspective they bring.

The write workshops are designed to provide the appropriate environment for this purpose. The outline used for providing case-based evidence is designed to ensure that the outputs of these workshops can directly be used for reporting on the cross-case analysis in the GCARD and for highlighting key issues and lessons with relevant examples. Not all cases can be discussed in the write workshops due to the availability of participants.

**Case outline structure:**

The outline has three sections, respectively on content, process and impact. Each section entails specific issues directly related to specific sub-theme of the foresight session at GCARD.

Content-wise, the outline will help gathering and analyzing information on topics, visions, emerging challenges and methods. It will focus on the three areas of work of the Forward Thinking Platform of the “Global Foresight Hub” facilitated by GFAR: Farming patterns of the future; the futures of Land-use; the futures of Production – consumption linkages.
Outline items:

**Content**
- What was the purpose: for inquiry (new ideas, systemic understanding, etc), for decision support/change (developing new and actionable options, testing existing policy options, etc), for norming (building social capital)?
- What type of method was used to guide/identify research priorities (such as projections, visioning, scenario building, mixed) and why?
- What were the visions in particular, regarding farming patterns, land use changes or links between production and consumption of agricultural products?
- What (new/other) challenges/issues have emerged or being identified?

**Process**
- Who led the work (the operator)?
- Who was involved (the participants/partners), why and for what task (type of participation/partnership)?

**Impact**
- What has been the impact of the work on prioritization of research?
- Was there a formal process of impact evaluation? Who did it, when and how?
- What is the impact of the work on smallholder livelihoods?
- Were there any other (even unexpected) impacts/benefits/value-in-use?
- What kind of follow up has been done?

**Lessons learned**
- Partnership (what was the added value of working in partnership if done? what were the difficulties faced? etc)
- Existing and needed capacity from all stakeholders for effectively contributing to research priority and exploration of future development needs