

Update on PSC Activities and Recommendations

A Brief for ExCo

The CGIAR Private Sector Committee (PSC), along with the CGIAR Secretariat and the Center Directors Committee, organized a high level dialogue between the CEOs/Senior managers of major agribusiness companies and the leaders of the CGIAR. Held on September 30, 2005 in Washington D.C., the dialogue focussed on: *How to meet the needs of smallholder producers better in developing countries?* A number of short- medium- and long-term action items were identified during the dialogue for strengthening partnership between the CGIAR and the private sector in helping meet the needs of smallholder producers in developing countries. These are listed in Attachment 1.

This note summarizes PSC's progress in implementing the agreed actions and the Committee's recommendations to the CGIAR.

1. Staff and Knowledge Exchange Program (SKEP): The first SKEP exchange took place between Bayer Crop Sciences and IFPRI, where by Dr. Detlef Wollweber spent time at IFPRI looking at alternative IP mechanisms and also visited CIP and CIAT. A number of model agreements were developed (including a confidentiality/secrecy agreement), which could be used in other exchanges as well.
(Full report is available at <http://www.ifpri.org/themes/ppp/pppres.asp#skep>).

Key recommendations Dr Wollweber included the following::

- a. In the Centers, general understanding of IPR and its importance as a strategic tool is marginal, with the result that IPR is seen more as a threat than an opportunity.
- b. A need for private sector collaborations to be handled differently from the current public collaborations, which requires modification to the CGIAR policy.
- c. CGIAR centers should strongly consider developing a strategy to protect their internally generated intellectual property and know how. More details provided in the report.

A second exchange involving IRRI is in the making. The PSC has received requests for two more exchanges from IRRI and ILRI involving: (i) detailed contract management, and (ii) livestock management. Additional SKEP proposals are being developed by IFPRI and Mahyco.

The PSC is exploring with the Center Directors and the Secretariat the establishment of a stronger mechanism for promoting the programme and coordinating the activity.

2. Inventory of Existing CGIAR-Private Sector Partnerships. This study is being carried out by IFPRI with partial support from Syngenta Foundation. A preliminary report of this was reviewed by the PSC. The final report will be shared with the CGIAR

3. Organization of Workshops: The PSC is planning a *Product Stewardship Workshop* for the first half of 2006 and a *Research Management Workshop* for the Spring of 2007.

4. Improving Delivery Systems: A six person working group is being created (three from PS and three from the Centers) to look at a few models for partnerships for delivery systems for Center products.

5. CGIAR Challenge Programs. The PSC has supported the CP concept from the start, as it helps improve efficiency and provides a clear focus to partnerships. The PSC has followed closely the evolution of two pilot CPs (HarvestPlus and Generation) and is pleased to see the leadership role being played by the Centers. The partnering companies are providing in-kind as well as financial support at the project level.

The PSC *recommends* that the CGIAR re-open the CP process soon, as this would likely lead to similar strong partnerships between the Centers and the private sector.

Outcome of the Last PSC Meeting

The PSC held its last meeting on March 29th, 2006 at the Royal Museum for Central Africa in Brussels. The Committee reviewed the implementation of the actions agreed at the high-level dialogue and agreed on next steps. In addition, it discussed the new CGIAR priority on high-value agriculture and evaluation of the Committee's work.

- **High Value-Added Agriculture:** The PSC would like to see how in some of the high value agriculture areas where the CG does not have sufficient core competency (such as in fruits and vegetables) the private sector companies with strong competency in these areas could help. The PSC is prepared to organize/co-organize a one-day brainstorming between the interested centers and private companies to explore the potential for research collaboration.
- **Self Assessment of the PSC:** The external review of partnership committees (conducted in 2004) had recommended that the PSC be "road tested" for 2-4 years. The PSC is now at the 2 year mark, and it was agreed by all members that we should undertake a self-assessment to identify the Committee's progress in implementing the action program agreed in 2003 (as modified at the high-level dialogue in 2005). The results of this self-assessment will be shared with ExCo in Fall 2006.

CGIAR-Private Sector High-level Workshop

“How to meet the needs of small holder producers better in developing countries”

Sept. 30th 2005

Actionable items

The CG-PS high-level workshop identified a number of ideas on and strategies for strengthening CG-PS partnerships. These ideas could be grouped into actions that require short, medium, and long lead times.

Actions that can be taken in the short-term:

a. *Use Scientific Know-how and Exchange Program (SKEP) for capacity building and information sharing*

SKEP program is already in place and specific bilateral requests for capacity building can be accommodated within this program. The first Center to Company exchange is currently being discussed and up to 20 such exchanges are envisaged per year between the private sector and Centers. Some of the “Soft Skills” can be addressed under this umbrella.

b. *Training workshop for research management*

The PSC has received indication that some donor agencies would like to organize a workshop involving private sector managers and a small group of senior managers from Centers to address specific themes, such as IP and research capacity management. The first such workshop could be organized for spring 2006.

c. *Start PS-CG interactions for product stewardship*

Stewardship (general product stewardship and issues specific to transgenic products) is an area where a joint workshop could be held. This workshop can be organized in 2006/2007, given adequate financial support. Mr. Ian Johnson indicated that WB would consider supporting such an effort.

d. *Continue the discussion on issues relating to IP and look at mechanisms which allow access to technologies*

This is very critical for partnerships, and continued use of SKEP or other bilateral engagements to address this issue are needed to create better understanding. Experiences with other mechanisms should be documented and assessed. There is also a need to evolve hybrid IP regime which addresses corporate and CG center needs.

e. Mechanisms for segmentation of markets

Humanitarian partnerships and public goods (not for profit), are used for subsistence applications and education, require public-private partnerships and funding, and must be segmented in a way that protects for profit markets. Thus, there is interest from the Centers to develop appropriate agreements that allow for delivering technology to the subsistence farmer as public goods. The Central Advisory Service (CAS) of the CGIAR can provide examples of agreement language that will enable this type of delivery from Center partnerships, with an eye towards reducing transaction times and costs from the case by case approach. An initial example would be to draw up a draft "humanitarian use license (HUL), which companies could examine. Although, there is a certain level of apprehension as to whether a general HUL can work with all companies, working together to draft such a text, will provide an opportunity to develop agreements written in a common and clear language that would serve as a practical basis to support interactions.

f. Develop inventory of existing CG-PS partnerships

Syngenta Foundation has already agreed to support this activity and this will be completed in the short term. This should include evaluation of a few representative cases of existing partnerships.

g. Develop scenarios for strategic outlook for future agricultural partnerships.

The inventory of existing CG-PS partnerships (covered above) should be studied to identify common threads and areas of opportunity. These would help in formulation of partnership scenarios that build on the strengths of existing partnerships and that explore new avenues.

Actions that can be taken in the medium-term:

a. Develop an inventory or information system on countries, including policy environment (IP, biosafety, etc) and CG and PS activities that are ongoing. Identify areas where partnerships may be possible.

This activity would follow item (f) from the short term activities.

b. Develop a strategy for improving delivery systems through partnership with PS

A six person working group be created (three from PS and three from Centers) to look at a few models for partnerships for delivery systems for Center products. The small group will report back to the larger group on a way forward in a defined time frame.

Actions that can be taken in the long-term:

a. *Collaborative research*

1. Drought: Pursue PS interaction with the Challenge program “Generation” which has drought tolerance as one of its major themes. This would involve looking at specific activities in this broad topic for interactions.
2. Other bilateral projects: As identified by demands from PS and CG side.

b. *Biofortification*

Although the partnership would be a long term partnership, several activities in this broad program will be short and medium term such as research management and partnerships for the delivery of biofortified crops. A closer interaction between the Challenge program “Harvest Plus” and PS is anticipated.

c. *High value commodities*

Although this topic was not much discussed at the meeting, this is a new priority within the CGIAR. The private sector has been engaged in some of these activities for several decades and opportunities for value addition by partnership must be fully utilized. This also provides an opportunity to form partnerships outside of only seeds and chemicals.

For the long term activities, the PSC could continue the discussions with the two challenge programs and further define the specifics within these programs where partnerships will add value, and come back to the group. For projects/ideas which are ready to go forward, the PSC need not play a role.