

Background

- **1993 – 1995: Major Initiative aimed at ‘CGIAR Renewal’ – Context**
- **1995 (Feb.): Decision reached at Lucerne Ministerial meeting to establish NGOC and PSC**
- **1995 (Feb. – June): Both Committees established and commenced functioning**
- **1995 – 2002: Committees active**

Background

2002:

- NGOC announces 'freeze' on relationship with CGIAR system;**
- PSC indicates wish to review activities and future plans;**
- CGIAR announces intent for independent review as part of review of entire committee structures**

Background

2003 (June):

Review team formed, comprising:

Keith Bezanson (Chair), Director
Sunita Narain, Member for NGOC
Gerhard Prante, Member for PSC

Background

2003 (June):

Advisory Group comprising:

**Hamid Narjisse, Director-General, INRA,
Morocco**

**Rugh Haug, Director of Research,
NORAGRIC**

**Elisio Ponce, Research Fellow, PIDS,
Philippines**

**H-Joachen De Haas, Head, Agricultural and
Rural Development Division, BMZ**

Terms of Reference

Two basic questions:

How successful have the Committees been in achieving their mission?

Are there alternative ways in which the CGIAR could achieve the Committees' mission more efficiently?

APPROACH

Literature Review

- CGIAR and both Committees
- Experiences elsewhere (Multilaterals, NGOs, Private Sector)
- Academic Literature

APPROACH

Structured Questionnaire and Interviews to date: 54% (70 of 129)

- Centre DGs/Board Chairs (63%)
- Co-sponsors (75%)
- PSC and NGOC Members (93%)
- CGIAR Investors (50%)
- NARS (28%)
- Selected Others (34%)

Some General Observations

Negative attitude in many quarters towards this study ('Another *pro forma* exercise. The evaluation will make no difference because no-one really listens to what we say.')

From inception, no clarity on CGIAR goals/expectations.

Roles of both Committees left to self-definition.

Some General Observations

Large % of respondents emphasise CGIAR systemic problems

- Competition rather than cooperation
- Challenge programme as ‘zero sum game’
- Turbulence in Secretariat-Centres relationship
- ‘We/they’ viewpoints

Some General Observations

General Consensus is Paradoxical:

- Partnerships essential to CGIAR effectiveness and credibility
- But high levels of scepticism re mechanism of partnership committees
- The NGOC 'broken' – needs fundamentally different approach if to be rebuilt

Private Sector Committee Some Milestones

**1995 - Quick to respond following
Lucerne – established four
working groups in 1995**

1995 - 1997

- Extensive interaction with TAC
Chair**

Private Sector Committee

Some Milestones

1996

Produced 'Mission Statement', based on questionnaires to all Centres seeking complementarities and division of labour

Proposal for global private sector Summit on Agricultural Research for Development

Paper with proposals for strengthening CGIAR Private Sector partnerships

Produced extensive study on CGIAR and biotechnology

Private Sector Committee

Some Milestones

1997

- Formally registered disappointment on non-responsiveness of CG system.
- First PSC Chairman leaves Committee.

Private Sector Committee

Some Milestones

1998

Sought division of labour by identifying 10 'assets' of CGIAR of value to private sector and as basis for partnerships. Expressed frustration at no take-up by CGIAR ('black box')

Differences emerge regarding CGIAR policy statements on aspects of biotechnology. PSC Chairman formally advises that: "...This policy statement without consultation negates the purpose of a partnership interaction with the Private Sector".

Private Sector Committee

Some Milestones

1999

PSC urges urgent attention to development of clear IPR guidelines to facilitate collaboration in advanced breeding and use of proprietary technologies.

Frequency of PSC meetings begins to slow as result of CGIAR systems review but also reflecting lessening of enthusiasm and assessment of dialogue as 'non-rewarding'.

Private Sector Committee

Some Milestones

2000 – 2002

- Infrequent meetings and frequent membership changes.
- Suggestion that membership be reduced by one-third and meetings held irregularly and 'only when convenient in response to demand'.

January 2003

- New program launched aiming at time bound 'concrete work program' in areas of:
 - Alliance Building, including exchange of scientists
 - Policy Dialogue, specifically on biotechnology
 - Communications

PSC PERSPECTIVES

Main Strengths	Main Weaknesses	Main Conclusion
<p>That mechanism exists</p> <p>Opportunity for productive division of labour</p> <p>Forum holds potential for mutual benefit, especially on IPR issues</p>	<p>Inadequate link to individual centres</p> <p>CGIAR system functions as 'black box' (a one-way flow and non-responsiveness)</p> <p>Transaction costs high</p>	<p>Overall, PSC evaluates itself as maximum 30% effective 'because CGIAR system only 30% effective</p> <p>Little point in continuing 'unless CG decides what it wants'</p>

PSC PERSPECTIVES

Main Strengths	Main Weaknesses	Main Conclusion
<p>Has increased mutual awareness</p> <p>Some influence on CG agenda, especially IPR</p>	<p>Returns inadequate to sustain interest or effort</p> <p>The gap between potential and achievement is a 'chasm'</p> <p>Apparently little interest and even hostility from some Centres</p>	<p>Unless challenge programme works differently from CG as a whole, PSC will dissolve</p>

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

1995

- Quick to respond following Lucerne
- Extensive travel and consultations with different constituencies, including visits to Centres

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

1996

- Initial conclusions communicated to Secretariat:

NGOs not mainstreamed in CGIAR, but large reservoir of NGO goodwill (general support for mainstreaming)

But resistance in some Centres to working with NGOs

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

1997

- Position paper on biotechnology presented, warning that a CGIAR commitment to biotech could alienate much of NGO community.

1998

- Position paper submitted on IPR, emphasising farmers' rights and protection of indigenous and traditional knowledge.

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

**1999 – Proposed triple mandate and role
of NGOC as:**

Advocacy of priorities/concerns/interests of
small farmers

Communication of civil society perspectives
to CGIAR

Operational partnerships/links in activities
involving NGOs and farmer organisations

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

2000

- Formal expressions of disappointment that recommendations and suggestions not acted upon at Secretariat and system levels.

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

**2001 – Shift in major modalities
proposed with emphasis on:**

New regional consultative mechanisms
(‘clusters’) for priority setting and
policy/strategy/programme choices
(subsidiarity?)

Outlined participatory approaches,
instruments and processes to facilitate
building of ‘functional partnerships’.

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

2001

Advised CGIAR that the change plan (adopted in May) involved 'serious errors' that would encourage 'symbolic or token consultations ...unlikely to affect research in the way needed'.

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

End of 2001 – New membership of NGOC initiated review of its strategy and revision of objectives in response to its assessment of ‘difficulty in persuading the CGIAR to recognise the strength of opinion from civil society about changes required in research . . .’ Priorities as restated included:

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

- ‘Building a strong and organised constituency within and outside the CG’
- ‘Influencing the CG to carry out ecologically-oriented research’
- ‘Achieving genuine participation of civil society in governance of CG . . . (and) . . . in setting priorities . . . monitoring and evaluations of (CGIAR)’. Call for increased representation on Council.

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

October 2002 - NGOC 'freezes' relationship with CG system, indicating that CGIAR:

Deviating from its mandate ... adopting corporate agenda for agricultural R&D. Membership of Syngenta Foundation 'last straw'.

Failed to support an immediate moratorium on the release of GM crops in their centre of origin.

Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) - Some Milestones

Promoting genetic engineering technologies and products, which are incompatible with farmer-led agroecological research.

Public calls for NGOC members to resign: 'They should resign and lead a walk-out in solidarity of billions of farmers struggling against imperialist control and for a farmer-centred agricultural system'.

NGOC Perspectives

Positive Views	Negative Views	Main Conclusion
<p>A place at the table</p> <p>Some gains in increasing CGIAR emphasis on pro-poor programmes</p>	<p>CGIAR unwilling/ unable to make the fundamental changes required to address needs of poor CGIAR system functions as a 'black box'</p>	<p>CGIAR unclear on what it wants/ expects of NGOC</p> <p>Expectations so divergent that common ground will be hard to find</p>

NGOC Perspectives

Positive Views	Negative Views	Main Conclusion
<p>Some positive influence on mainstreaming of NRM and agroecology in CG systems</p>	<p>Dialogue proved meaningless – no response and no action</p>	<p>Structure was arguably 'fatally flawed' from outset</p>

NGOC Perspectives

Positive Views	Negative Views	Main Conclusion
<p>Improved communications between NGO members in the various CGIAR and GFAR Committees – the ‘NGOC Plus’ gathering yearly</p>	<p>Process is a betrayal aiming only at co-opting NGOs</p>	<p>NGO community deeply divided – some now advocate closure of CGIAR system; others privately deplore breakdown and unilateral freeze</p>

Other Views

(Centre DGs/Board Chairs, donors, co-sponsors, NARS)

Very widely divergent views, but some points of strong convergence, including:

Few doubts about importance/imperative of partnerships with civil society and private sector.

Problematic experience of both Committees symptomatic of larger, systemic problems.

New mechanisms and new spaces needed but not clear what these are.

Other Views

(Centre DGs/Board Chairs, donors, co-sponsors, NARS)

With a couple of notable exceptions, conviction that governance distinction necessary between shareholders and stakeholders.

Highly divergent views on whether Jan 2003 proposals of PSC will produce concrete, functional base for collaboration.

Unreasonable/impossible to assume representativeness.

Re NGOC

Very serious problems in this engagement

- All parties are victims (self definition)
- CGIAR failed to understand and communicate its own expectations, hopes and constraints
- atmosphere with NGOC terminally vitiating and cannot be rectified by a few adjustments - need for reinvention, new spaces and innovation
- Significant cultural gaps that may be resolved only if focus is on concrete, functional areas for cooperation and collaboration

OTHER EXPERIENCES – POSSIBLE LESSONS

Partnerships come in many forms; know what you want!

Partnerships can be cost-ineffective – too many approaches as ends in themselves

Agreements time bound with sunset clauses

Ex ante negotiation and agreement on detailed expectations and rules of engagement pay dividends. Agree on milestones, evaluation criteria and formal exit strategies.

Issues of asymmetry and cultural differences should be addressed and resolved beforehand

