

GRET

Professionals for
Fair Development

Date - Lieu

INSARD

***CSO involvement in
governance of the CGIAR/
GFAR***

An historical review

Christian Castellanet

PAEPARD SEMINAR - May 2d, 2012 Brussels

Devoted to Action and Innovation for Global Solidarity

The NGO Committee in CGIAR

2

- Created in 1995 on the initiative of Ismail Serrageldin
- 8 members (1 from each continent + 2 from Europe) co-opted
- Invited to two CGIAR meetings per year : high transaction costs
- Represented as an official delegation on the main table
- Problem of representativity/ position (debate with anti-CG Ngos)



Main topics

3

- Defense of agroecology vs genetic engineering (the two pillars of CG, but one is much shorter)
- Defense of small farmers vs food production at the lowest cost
- Promotion of NGO/FO partnership in research and denunciation of risks associated with private partnerships with agrobusiness
- Propose farmers representation in CGIAR (two seats and not only one for IFAP)



Results

4

- A certain level of influence at global level (support from some donors countries, give more weight to « little Centers » with ecosystemic approaches vs big mono crop centers)
- No success in getting NGOs and FO more involved in the centers strategy
- Most Centers see NGOs as « research assistance » « extension arm »
- No involvement of NGOc in evaluations



The creation of GFAR

5

- Feeling that National and regional research organisations were sidelined in CGIAR meeting
- Vision : Need to organize multistakeholders platforms (fora) at national, regional, global level to design research priorities
- NGOc involved in GFAR launching (since 1999)
- Need to organize « constituencies », especially NGOs, FOs.
- Decision of NGOc to « leave » CG in 2002



GFAR

6

- Launching : Dresden 2000
- Large and open participation of civil society (including anti CG Ngos and FOs)
- Creation of a small executive board with Regional AR Fora + 1 Ngo rep.
- Limited resources to organize regional / national constituencies
- Continuity of the problem of NGO constituency



And today ?

7

- GCARD 2010 new combined meeting every two years
- Open participation, but little debate/ decisions
- NGO representation « organised » by regional fora or invited by CG secretariate – No transparency
- Reaction : create an informal group (CSO GARD) on voluntary basis, naming a representative



And today ?

8

- CG promoting « consortium research programs », associating several CG centers , but also Ngos; FO and private sector since « multistakeholders » ARD became a requirement by funding agencies.

Partners often only « accessories » to top- down programs

- In EU itself, research planning (for domestic purposes) is all but « inclusive » , done by experts from research institutions.

