

I. General Background

1. WG2 made an initial description of the subject matter, the main issues and questions in a short paper called “Mapping our Work”. This initial frame has been discussed and new ideas have been proposed that are being incorporated in a modified conceptual framework
2. More recently WG2 prepared a Work Plan that includes main objectives, questions and a detailed calendar of meetings, Teleconferences and assigned works including the dates in which they are due.

II. Main Issues and Questions: Thinking out of the box and within the box

- 1. The objective of Partnerships.** Partnerships can be seen as a means to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of CGIAR activities. In this perception it is a means to an end. Partnerships should seek synergies, complementarities and multipliers effects to maximize the CGIAR impact. On the other hand, the CGIAR has been always considered an important member of a Global Agricultural Research System (GARS). The question that has been raised is if that membership should be taken to be a passive belonging to a conglomerate of organizations or if the CGIAR has a responsibility in the construction and development of well articulated GARS.
The analysis of this question needs to incorporate four main considerations.

First, the CGIAR is a small player in size, in the overall GARS representing only between 2 and 4 % of total expenditures. Around 90% of total expenditures are distributed almost equally between: a) Public research expenditures in the developed countries, b) Public research expenditures in the developing countries, where a handful of countries represent the lions share, and c) research expenditures made by the private sector in the developed world. Its potential influence is not automatic and would require, given its small relative size, a deliberate effort

However, the CGIAR is a very significant partner in the specific context of agricultural research for development, i.e. in specifically addressing the needs of *the poorest* within national and regional contexts. This focus represents a key area of need that will not be readily reached by the private sector until markets are developed. In this particular context the funding to the CGIAR represents a very significant slice of global ARD expenditure that can have a very positive, or very distorting effect, depending on the context into which the work is applied.

Second, consideration of partnership requires a starting context of ‘where does the CGIAR add best advantage and where is it requested to do so in relation to expressed global needs and national demands and capabilities?’

Any international centre must be seen to add value beyond that which could be achieved by comparable investment in national systems. True comparative advantage lies only where there are accepted efficiencies in working internationally, compared with national (or regional) processes, where the system is bringing external learning that is accepted to add to local knowledge & innovation, or where the system is explicitly working to develop local capabilities that will come to take over its previous roles. An effective international system should thus be looking for areas where it has an accepted value and role and where national capabilities now exist, seeking to actively evolve itself out of the previous frame and move on to tackle new agendas. The alternative becomes mission creep and taking on local delivery roles for which an international research system is ill equipped, or which duplicate or compete with the very national capabilities which it seeks to strengthen.

However, the extent to which this external ‘ownership’ of the system’s agenda and programmes is felt seems to vary widely. The counterbalance to domination of the agenda by a better funded party is one of equitable and agreed partnership from the outset of programmes, rather than a sponsor-client relationship. Only by such mechanisms can the international system become truly effective in its role.

Third, the three Development Goals identified by WG1 expand the area of interest of the CGIAR way beyond agricultural research and it would seem that also way beyond research activities. If this is the case the GARS may no longer be the appropriate institutional frame of reference for the CGIAR who will have to extend beyond it. In this case the CGIAR could see itself as a player, of a global coalition focused on working with developing countries on the three Goals identified by WG1. The area of work would be much larger and thus the role of the CGIAR would be diluted. It is likely that in this new and larger universe of activities the CGIAR could not attempt to be a leader in “setting the agenda” as it has been in the past in the smaller universe of agricultural research. The question related to the role that the CGIAR should play in this new context still remains as an issue.

Fourth, the activities that go beyond research and are directly related to obtaining Outcomes (awareness and support to decision making), are the bread and butter of intergovernmental organization like FAO, UNEP etc and, in the case of local development outcomes, of national organizations, local service providers and enterprises. CGIAR activities in these areas may be seen as invasive and duplicative by those organizations that are seen by the CGIAR as main partners.

All these issues need to be analyzed with care and discussed widely within the whole team because the CST has expressed the opinion that Partnerships should be viewed in a more modest way, that is, a means to an end.

- 2. What makes a Partner to be a Partner?** It has been suggested that not every organization that has some relationship with the CGIAR should be considered a Partner. Partnerships imply a long term relation with common objectives, and a clear understanding of complementarities and potential synergies. In this view a Partnership implies that Partners seek a common objective and, at the same time, are mutually interested in the well being and success of its partner. They are long term associates that consider that its own future is associated to the future of its Partner. This characterization excludes Collaborators which implies a lighter, more circumstantial and short run relationship. Probably it should also exclude Members (which are, by definition, long term donors) and short term or circumstantial Donors which represent a different type of relationship. A Partnership strategy of this type would naturally lead to a Network Mode of working with the selected Partners and probably to the development of a conglomerate of institutions working together. In this limited conglomerate the CGIAR would have, because it's international nature and relative size, a major role. A fully developed Network mode could have implications for the optimum CGIAR physical structure
- We need to discuss these notions and agree on a characterization of Partners

- 3. Should selected Partners participate in Governance?** This is an issue that has been discussed for many years in the CGIAR and one that generates many heated arguments. The creation of the Private Sector and the NGO's Committees where a positive response to the desire to have better and more productive relationships with two constituencies considered to be of great importance. In addition, in a less formal way some Centres have appointed Board members that, although acting on their personal capacities, represent the views of specific partners.
- Most people would agree and the Bezanson report supports the notion, that these mechanisms of participation have not been effective neither in improving the governance function nor in improving the richness of partnership relations. These processes have assumed the CGIAR to be at the centre of these relationships, rather than to be playing a specific role, in international research, that connects with other actors in the system at either national or international level. Sustainability demands that the CGIAR seeks engagement with a range of delivery partners, not just one sector at a time.

The experience on Boards is more complex and does not appear to have been specifically analyzed. In many ways this issue has to do with two issues: First, the question of the ownership of the CGIAR and who has the legitimacy to make the final decisions on strategy, priorities and resource allocation, Second, who are the real Partners that may be considered to be a part of governance, an issue discussed in the following section, and Third how do you insure that independent representatives in Governing bodies fully assume the responsibilities that the position demands

This is a difficult issue and needs to be discussed jointly with WG3

Key areas of governance before any programme commences lie in the identification of needs and demands, the development of innovative working partnerships and the involvement of other stakeholders in the joint

conceptualization of work. These are the essential founding steps for successful and sustainable research processes.

Changes to these processes have evolved greatly over the last decade, through the development and operation of regional and global fora (e.g. FARA and GFAR). Multistakeholder consideration of priorities and key research themes is the essential first step to recognizing their development complexities and potential impacts. The processes and governance relationships of these fora are themselves evolving and several have yet to reach anything like their full potential, but they represent a valuable mechanism for truly embedding the role of the international system within regional and local contexts, involving all stakeholders and conversely for identifying issues that should best be addressed internationally from the outset.

4. Partnerships and their contributions to the CGIAR Functions The main functions of the CGIAR can and should be derived from the D.Goals that are finally selected. WG1 has defined, for the time being, the following five functions: Research, Catalyzing, Anticipation, Awareness Raising and Support to decision making. On the basis of this proposal and of contributions made by WG2 members it would seem that relevant Partnerships should contribute to the following CGIAR functions:

- 1) To define the strategic tasks and the priorities of the work carried out by the CGIAR and its Centres.
- 2) To Develop work related to the anticipation function
- 3) To develop activities related to awareness raising
- 4) To produce research outputs,
- 5) For technology dissemination activities including activities related to knowledge management and the promotion of innovations
- 6) To develop activities related to support to decision making on policy and institutional matters
- 7) To develop activities related to capacity building including training

5. Who are the main potential Partners? There are many potential types of organizations with whom the CGIAR can relate and has had, or could have, some collaboration. There are probably fewer with which it is convenient and possible to establish true partnerships of the type described in section II.2. The following list includes the relevant universe of types of institutions with which the CGIAR could establish collaborative activities.

- 1) NARI's of developing countries
- 2) Other research institutions of developing countries that can provide research capacities and facilities, including the NARI's in large and emerging countries(China, India Brazil etc)
- 3) ARI's in the developed world
- 4) Private sector firms leaders in technological innovations (Julio has suggested we need to differentiate between the large Transactional and the local firms as two different categories) Private sector is here relevant to input supply, production partnerships and markets

- 5) International NGO's
- 6) Local NGO's
- 7) Public institutions involved in policy decision making related to the CGIAR Goals
- 8) Regional Organizations
- 9) International organizations
- 10) Farmers and professional organizations

It should be noted that if the strict definition of a CGIAR Partner, proposed in section II.2, holds then some of these types of organizations probably would not qualify as potential partners. This implies that we need to analyse this issue and decide if we want to narrow down our list of potential Partners.

6. A Matrix that relates types of Organizations with the seven CGIAR functions

Organizations	Functions						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							

The Matrix helps to visualize the universe of potential simple partnerships and of more complex multi-institutional partnerships or what Julio called (citing Guijt) “Messy Partnerships”

The Group is discussing possible ways for characterizing partnerships in a way that could help the definition of operational proposals and recommendations. Three options, not necessarily antagonistic, have been suggested: a) on a project basis case by case, b) on the basis of the overall Outcomes desired which could be derived from the Development Goals selected by WG1 and c) on the basis of the main CGIAR Functions defined by WG1

In each case, there is a need to also consider the form of partnership entailed, whether as i. partners in needs identification, ii. research partners in programme implementation, iii. direct users of research outputs, or iv. intended beneficiaries of research outcomes in development.

III. The Working Strategy

1. The working strategy has four main parts. The first part is directed to the review of existing information, identification and mapping of potential

Partners and their evolution and reviewing past experiences and lessons learned from collaborative arrangements and Partnerships (Target date May 20 except for Kim' paper). This will be complemented by consultations with existing regional and national bodies and will draw on the experiences of the current CGIAR review.

2. The second part is to analyze each of the major issues identified (discussions out of the Box) and make the appropriate conceptual and operational decisions (Target date, June 20)
3. The third part (within the box) concentrates in the analysis of the selected CGIAR function in order to identify and make specific proposals on: a) criteria for the identification of the needs and specific objectives for the development of Partnerships and the identifications of the appropriate Partners, b) operational criteria including incentives, organization, governance and exit and evaluation strategies that should be included in Partnership agreements. This part will include a special effort, through a subcommittee, on the relationships with the private sector which presents important opportunities that have not been seized in the past. The recent agreement between CIMMYT, with Monsanto and Gates Foundation illustrates these possibilities (Target date, July 20)
4. The fourth part concentrates in preparing proposals and recommendations for the development of an overall policy on Partnerships (Target date for first draft, August 20, Final Report for Ex Com September 15)