

# **A few steps more: the CGIAR Annual General Meeting 2001 and beyond seen from an NGO perspective**

**by Ann Waters-Bayer, Co-Chair, NGOC**

The restructuring of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) has been moving slowly in the year 2001. The Non-Governmental Organisations Committee (NGOC) is accompanying the process with both hopes and fears, having decided to use this time of “disturbance” within the CGIAR system to push in a direction that allows greater influence of civil society on decision-making in international agricultural research for development (IARD).

In this past year, the NGOC focused its energies on trying to increase the awareness of NGOs and small-farmer organisations (SFOs) about current changes and opportunities in IARD. We have communicated widely, both electronically and in global and regional workshops, with members of SFOs, NGOs and universities in the South. The major demands coming out of these workshops are for:

- ❖ focus of research on low-external-input and ecologically-sound agriculture and natural resource management (NRM), including social, cultural, political and institutional dimensions and building on indigenous knowledge
- ❖ stronger regional organisation of IARD activities
- ❖ inclusion of SFOs and NGOs in research priority-setting, planning, implementation, evaluation and impact assessment, foremost at sub-national and national levels but also at regional and global levels, including the CGIAR
- ❖ representation of SFOs and NGOs in the decision-making and policy-setting bodies of research organisations and programmes, including the CGIAR.

The paper entitled “Getting There” reported on the last Mid-Term Meeting of the CGIAR, held in Durban, South Africa, in May 2001 (see the NGOC website [www.ngoc-cgiar.org](http://www.ngoc-cgiar.org)). In October 2001 the first Annual General Meeting (AGM) of the CGIAR was held, according to the new format of only one meeting per year, to be located alternately in Washington DC and in one of the over 40 member countries of the CGIAR. Despite the terrorist attacks in the previous month, about 450 people from around the world attended the meeting in Washington. Participants from civil society included several belonging to the NGOC – AS-PTA Brazil, Environmental Alert Uganda, ETC Ecoculture Netherlands (also with Agrecol Germany), Food First / Institute for Food and Development Policy, GRET France, Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG), Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) Association Eastern and Southern Africa – and from civil-society organisations such as the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP), CARE USA, Etc Group (formerly RAFI) based in Canada and the German NGO Forum for Environment and Development. The travel of the NGOC members was financed through the CGIAR, the other members of civil society attended on their own account or, in the case of IFAP, with funding via the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR).

During AGM2001, the NGOC and other members of civil-society organisations (CSOs) who came to Washington gave particular attention to issues around the proposed Challenge Programmes, the composition of the future Science Council, representation of civil society – above all, farmer organisations – in the Executive Committee of the CGIAR, and seeking a clear and firm stand of the CGIAR with respect to governance of genetic resources. The statement given by the NGOC in the plenary of AGM2001 can be found in Annex 1.

## Challenge Programs

The Challenge Programs (CPs) are supposed to be mechanisms for addressing major and complex agriculture-related challenges of global relevance through partnership among a wide range of institutions. The team that designed the change process in the CGIAR in 2000 visualised the CPs also as an indirect way to restructure the system: a programmatic approach to research planning and funding would lead to downsizing and merging of the 16 international agricultural research centres (now called “Future Harvest Centres”) and would be more effective in delivering products to meet the CGIAR’s goals of increasing food security, reducing poverty and protecting the environment.

On paper, the access to funds for research under the CPs is open to all stakeholders, i.e. not only the international centres but also national agricultural research institutes (NARIs), the private sector, NGOs and farmer organisations. The process of creating CPs consists of five phases:

- ❖ Generation of ideas: a concept note of 2–4 pages can be submitted by anyone to propose research in agriculture and NRM to address an issue of overwhelming significance at global, regional or sub-regional level but with a global impact;
- ❖ Development of pre-proposals: on ideas approved by the CGIAR, pre-proposals of 10–15 pages will be developed, defining research partners in an interdisciplinary collaborative programme with clearly defined research outputs and mechanisms for their dissemination;
- ❖ Development of full proposals: the parties whose pre-proposals win approval from the Science Council and Executive Council will be invited to develop a full research program proposal, including a business plan. Some funds are available for the process of developing these proposals, which will involve considerable negotiation between potential partners. These are to include at least two CGIAR Centres and at least two national agricultural research systems (NARS) from the South;
- ❖ Program implementation by a consortium selected by the CGIAR: no fixed management model is given. Although the original proposal had been that all CPs would be overseen by a Steering Group composed of stakeholders and although remnants of this idea (referring to “most CPs”) were still included in a recommendation approved by the CGIAR during AGM2001, the recently issued Call for Ideas for CPs no longer makes any mention of this. There is only a very rubbery line that “governance and management arrangements are flexible and adaptable to the specific needs of the CP”.
- ❖ Program evaluation: in addition to internal monitoring and evaluation by the consortium, the CP will be peer reviewed by the Science Council. The repeated demands by CSOs that also other stakeholders (NGOs and SFOs) be involved in evaluation are not reflected in the process and guidelines for developing and implementing CPs attached to the “Call for Ideas”.

Theoretically, the process offers opportunities for Southern NARIs, universities, NGOs or farmer organisations to propose ideas. These could then be taken up by anyone who so wishes, pulling together a consortium of actors from different organisations who would like to work together – which may or may not include those who proposed the original idea.

It will take at least two years until a CP goes through this full-fledged process and gains the funds and approval to start. In order to be able to “test” the new approach and explore ways of improving programme design and implementation, up to three CPs will go through an accelerated process so that the full program proposals can be approved already by the next AGM in October 2002.

The CGIAR Centres were quick to pour their activities and plans into the shape of CPs for this accelerated process and included all the right "buzz words" to earn a prize in Development Bingo. The ten proposals for CPs put forward at AGM2001 to be considered for the accelerated process were concerned with:

- ❖ agriculture and climate change
- ❖ agriculture and water
- ❖ biofortified crops to combat micronutrient deficiency
- ❖ animal diseases, market access, food safety and poverty reduction
- ❖ agriculture and combating desertification
- ❖ developing sustainable agricultural production systems in Central Asia and the Caucasus
- ❖ global genetic resources: conservation, management and improvement for food security, agrobiodiversity and sustainable livelihoods
- ❖ global initiative on HIV/AIDS, agriculture and food security
- ❖ global mountain program
- ❖ African challenge program.

The CGIAR Centres and some research institutes in the North, plus a small number of the larger NARIs in the South, e.g. in Brazil, China and India, were involved in developing these proposals. They have pulled together consortia, at least on paper, and many proposals were already far more advanced than concept notes. If non-traditional research partners want to be involved and to bring in their ideas regarding research topics and methods, they will have a relatively difficult time. This gives a very strong impression that the same major, conventional players are scrambling for CGIAR research funds labelled in a different way.

Although the CGIAR had decided in 2000 to take a regional approach to research planning, the proposals that have emerged as candidates for the pilot CPs have not come out of the current activities for setting regional research priorities, with the exception of the African challenge programme. The programme concept from Central Asia and the Caucasus cannot be regarded as the result of a priority-setting process involving relevant stakeholders in that region, as a process involving farmers and other CSOs has not even begun there.

Parallel to the accelerated process, the "regular" process for developing CPs will be followed. Ideas can be submitted continually. The first set of concept notes to be reviewed by the Science Council in the regular process will be those received by 15 January 2002. This will allow pre-proposal development and selection by AGM2002. However, there is no huge pot of gold waiting to be tapped by the winning pre-proposals or even full proposals that emerge from this regular process; in the end, only those programs will go ahead that manage to drum up sufficient funds (US\$8–12 million) from the individual multilateral and bilateral donors and development banks that belong to the CGIAR. For 2002, the World Bank has earmarked US\$45 million to support the accelerated process of switching to programme funding. The total CGIAR budget for 2002 is planned for US\$340 million.

CSOs will have to monitor closely the nature of the partnerships in the CPs. If these programs do not include development NGOs and small-farmer organisations (SFOs) as genuine partners in planning, implementation and evaluation, then CSOs will have to increase efforts to convince donors to change the way that public monies flow for development-oriented research. Suggestions include creating councils of SFOs and NGOs that are given control over public funds for agricultural research and development. They could then contract research organisations – whether national or international – to carry out research together with farmers.

### **Science Council**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the CGIAR will be transformed into a Science Council (SC) that is supposed to have a balanced composition of biological, physical and social scientists with experience in science policy and development. It was agreed at

AGM2001 that there should also be diversity in terms of gender, origin and perspectives on science. Emil Javier will remain Chair of the SC during the transition period. He was very supportive to the NGOC in considering ways that farmers and NGOs could be more involved in regional priority setting and in advocating for inclusion of farmers and NGOs in governance mechanisms within the CGIAR.

A Working Group is being set up to plan in detail the composition and function of a permanent SC. A new nomination procedure is being considered, possibly with the national science councils around the world nominating the SC members. As the national science bodies tend to be even more conservative than the CGIAR and its Centres, many people in civil society fear that this procedure would push the CGIAR system further away from ecological and smallholder-oriented research and into closer collaboration with industry interested in biotechnology and larger-scale commercial production systems.

The Secretariat of the SC, as was the case with the TAC, will be hosted by FAO in Rome.

### **Executive Council**

In view of the fact that the members of the CGIAR will now be meeting only once a year, an Executive Council (ExCo) was set up to act on behalf of the CGIAR members between the annual meetings. It will facilitate decision-making by the CGIAR members and oversee the implementation of the CGIAR decisions.

There was much debate about the character of the ExCo: whether it should involve only “shareholders”, i.e. the paying members in the CGIAR, or also “stakeholders”, i.e. the people who are involved in and supposed to benefit from the research carried out by the CGIAR system. It was touch-and-go right up to the last hour of deliberations, with some NARI representatives expressing views that there was no need for civil-society voices in this governance body of the CGIAR. However, reminders by more politically aware CGIAR members about “the world out there”, which some bureaucrats might like to ignore, finally led to a decision to make the ExCo a “committee of stakeholders, incorporating perspectives from all components of the CGIAR”.

The ExCo includes a total of 21 persons:

- ❖ the CGIAR Chair and three representatives from the co-sponsors
- ❖ the Chairs of the Committee of Centre Board Chairs, the Centre Directors Committee, the Science Council and the GFAR
- ❖ five representatives from OECD/DAC countries in the Americas, Asia/Pacific and Europe
- ❖ five developing country representatives from the Americas, Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia/Pacific, CWANA (Central and Western Asia and North Africa) and regional fora,
- ❖ one from the foundations
- ❖ one from the private sector
- ❖ one from civil society, including both NGOs and farmer organisations.

The sole seat for a member from civil society is presently held by a Co-Chair of the NGOC, the only official body that is currently bringing civil-society perspectives into the CGIAR. However, she made it clear at the first ExCo meeting, which was held the next morning, that she regards herself as only a temporary holder of this ExCo seat, which will be held by a farmer representative as soon as a Farmer Organisations Committee has been set up in the CGIAR or some other mechanism for farmer representation is created. Moreover, CSOs will continue to exert pressure for creation of a second civil-society seat on the ExCo to allow also NGO representation. Farmers and NGOs make up two distinct constituencies concerned with agricultural research. Farmer organisations are membership groups of primary producers, whereas NGOs are professional and often non-membership bodies that provide development support either in the field or as advocacy and lobbying groups. NGOs

should not be regarded as spokespersons for small-scale farmers, who must be given a direct voice in decision-making about IARD.

During AGM2001, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) submitted a request to the CGIAR that a Farmers Committee be set up as a third partnership group alongside the NGOC and the Private Sector Committee. The CGIAR assembly gave the ExCo the task to consider ways in which the CGIAR could “improve its dialogue” with farmer organisations. The ExCo agreed that “a farmers’ perspective should be specifically included in CGIAR discussions” and considered several options to make this possible, including the creation of a separate Farmers Committee. It asked the GFAR to examine these options in consultation with the umbrella organisations of farmers involved in the GFAR (IFAP and Via Campesina) as well as with the NGOC, the Private Sector Committee, the Committee of Centre Directors and the co-sponsors of the CGIAR. The GFAR Secretariat in Rome has already started consultations with IFAP and Via Campesina and plans to hold a consultation workshop on how to strengthen farmers’ representation in both the CGIAR and the GFAR. This will have to take place in the first quarter of 2002, so that the outcome can be discussed at the next ExCo meeting in April 2002 in Syria.

### **Genetic resources governance**

AGM2001 was held at a crucial time immediately before and partly parallel to the final negotiations at the FAO in Rome on the International Undertaking (IU) on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA). Several of the CSOs present in Washington lobbied by means of a leaflet (see Annex 2) and informal discussions to convince the CGIAR to call for strict controls on research, testing, importation and use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and for a moratorium on releases of GMOs in centres of diversity, to adopt the precautionary approach in its own research, and to defend global public goods by preventing application of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) on genetic resources. The CGIAR approved a statement read by the head of the German delegation that urged for an expeditious and successful conclusion of the IU “to create an international policy environment that is fully supportive of local, national and international efforts to conserve and use PGRFA for ensuring food security, helping to eradicate poverty and protect the environment”. This statement was a positive and welcome move by the CGIAR but was not as specific as the CSOs would have liked.

Some CSO members proceeded directly from Washington to Rome to press the demands more specifically and directly. Three days after the AGM ended, the International Treaty on PGRFA was approved by the FAO conference. Although CSOs continue to draw attention to several outstanding issues related to Farmers’ Rights, the trade policy environment and benefit sharing to recognise the contribution made by farmers to plant breeding and maintaining genetic resources, they are urging FAO member countries to ratify the Treaty.

In the course of restructuring, some committees of the CGIAR have been dissolved, but – as was also called for in the above-mentioned CGIAR statement - the term of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) was extended. This is welcomed by the NGOC, as the GRPC is a well-informed and important body for developing a system-wide policy on GMOs and IPRs related to genetic resources and for keeping the CGIAR “on its toes” with regard to the rapid changes in the global policy environment related to genetic resources. A member appointed by the NGOC, Rene Salazar of SEARICE (based in the Philippines), brings concerns of CSOs into the GRPC.

### **Civil-society meeting with donors during AGM**

During AGM2001, the NGOC and the Ford Foundation hosted a lunch meeting that was attended by most of the major donors and several people from the CGIAR Centres. Because interest was much greater than expected, the prepared lunch had to be “stretched” and additional chairs brought in. Members of civil society (IFAP / Uganda National Farmers Association, RAFI – now called Etc Group, the German Forum on Environment and

Development and the NGOC) expressed their concerns about CGIAR research directions, alternatives to patenting of agricultural research products that must remain public goods, farmer representation in the CGIAR and farmer participation in research priority setting and implementation of research.

With the support of the Ford Foundation, the NGOC plans to host another donor briefing by civil society at the next AGM, which will be held in the week of 28 October 2002 in a still-to-be-named host country in the South.

### **Further civil-society fora on IARD**

As direct interaction of stakeholders with the assembly of CGIAR members has been limited, under the new schedule for meetings, to only two days per year (the “Stakeholder Meeting” during AGM), other means must be found to allow dialogue between civil society and CGIAR scientists and policymakers. To some extent, this can be achieved through sub-regional and regional meetings of the multi-stakeholder fora on agricultural research and development that are being built up with the support of the GFAR. CSOs – far more than those within the NGOC – are actively seeking new forms of influencing IARD. These include building up civil-society fora at national and higher levels to create a better information base and a stronger position of farmers and NGOs in negotiating research agendas and partnerships. Working towards this goal, the NGOC organised consultations among CSOs from Southern and Eastern Africa in Durban in May 2001, from South and Southeast Asia in Bangkok in August 2001 and from Meso-America (Central America and Mexico) in Guacimo (Costa Rica) in August 2001. Declarations from these meetings were brought into the CGIAR and GFAR discussions (and can be found on the NGOC website).

Also at global level, CSOs are planning to create an international alliance for IARD. It was during the electronic conference and the international workshop organised by the NGOC and sponsored by the Ford Foundation in January and May 2001, respectively, that the idea for this was born. A meeting to launch the international alliance is planned for April 2002. This coalition of SFOs and NGOs hopes to organise effective lobbying on international bodies related to agricultural research and development, such as the CGIAR, GFAR and the FAO. The NGOC hopes to obtain the funds needed to take this opportunity to meet face-to-face as a committee, in addition to the sole meeting (at AGM2002) supported by the CGIAR, in order to advance its plans and actions to increase civil-society impact on IARD.

### ***For more information:***

- ❖ on the CGIAR, including the summary record of proceedings and decisions at AGM2001, see [www.cgiar.org](http://www.cgiar.org)
- ❖ on the activities of the NGOC of the CGIAR, including publications, activity reports, workshop proceedings and statements, see [www.ngoc-cgiar.org](http://www.ngoc-cgiar.org) or contact the NGOC Administrative Assistant Ms Gudrun Soergel ([gudrun.soergel@gmx.de](mailto:gudrun.soergel@gmx.de))
- ❖ on the GFAR and related regional and sub-regional activities, see [www.egfar.org](http://www.egfar.org)

## Annex 1: NGOC statement at CGIAR AGM2001

During this period of change in the CGIAR, parallel to building up of regional research fora facilitated by the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), the NGOC has focused its energies on increasing the awareness of NGOs and small-farmer organisations (SFOs) about current changes and opportunities, particularly in setting research priorities at regional level. We have communicated widely, both electronically and in global and regional workshops, with members of SFOs, NGOs and universities in the South. You will doubtless have seen some of the declarations from the meetings, the most recent having been the Guacimo meeting of SFOs in Meso-America. It is encouraging to see how the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the GFAR and the regional forum are responding to the demands of these farmers to be genuinely involved in defining research priorities.

The NGOs and SFOs in these various workshops are asking for:

- ❖ a research focus on low-external-input and ecologically-sound agriculture and NRM, including social, cultural, political and institutional dimensions and building on indigenous knowledge;
- ❖ a stronger regional organisation of agricultural research and development activities;
- ❖ inclusion of SFOs and NGOs in research priority setting, planning, implementation, evaluation and impact assessment, foremost at subnational and national levels but also at regional and global levels, including the CGIAR;
- ❖ representation of SFOs and NGOs in the decision-making and policy-setting bodies of research organisations and programmes.

We have been discussing the proposals for change in the CGIAR with NGOs and SFOs and it is on the main points in this discussion that I will now focus this update.

**Challenge Programmes (CPs):** Many NGOs and SFOs welcomed the concept of the CPs as a means to include the wider range of partners needed in development-oriented research and as a means to transform the CGIAR system so that it would be in a better position to fulfil its mandate. The CPs were meant to drive the restructuring process. However, the emphases in the CPs being considered thus far give no sign that these will change in essence the structure of the CGIAR system. Although Plank No. 4 laid out by TAC and adopted by the CGIAR at MTM2000 was a regional approach to research planning, the process for designing the proposals that are emerging as candidates for CPs is not based on regional priority-setting. Indeed, the process reflects exactly what we feared would happen: the organisations on the “inside”, that know what is coming and are in good contact with each other and with donors, mould their research into the newly required shape of bottle for the wine: they design the programme together and draw in a few other organisations on the edge to give the wine a multi-stakeholder flavour. These programmes do not give us the impression that they are based on equal partnerships that have grown out of bottom-up priority setting, planning and negotiation of roles. They have a strong taste of business as usual.

Especially field-based NGOs feel that, if they are included in these partnerships, it will simply be for disseminating what the Centre scientists have decided to develop. The NGOs fear that – once again – they will not be regarded as serious partners, together with farmers, in deciding what type of research is done and how it is done.

The quality of the partnership in the CPs will have to be closely monitored. If the partnerships are not real, the NGOs and SFOs will increase their demands to donors to change the way that public monies flow for development-oriented research, to the extent of giving councils of SFOs and NGOs control over funds with which they can contract research organisations – whether national or international – to carry out research together with the farmers.

**Science Council (SC):** The NGOs and SFOs with whom we discussed the proposal welcome the inclusion of biological, physical and social sciences and that members must

have experience in science policy and development. However, it needs to be made explicit that there should be a balanced representation of biological, physical and social sciences and that, in selecting the SC, attention be paid to diversity in terms of gender and origin and also in terms of perspectives as to what is considered to be science. The SC must include people who recognise indigenous knowledge and farmer's own research as legitimate science, people who recognise participatory research as a legitimate – indeed a necessary – form of research to stimulate learning processes and innovations that will truly benefit small farmers and strengthen their capacities to conduct their own site-specific research and to adapt to changing conditions. The NGOC will propose for the SC eminent and experienced scientists with this view on research. We feel that the size of the SC should be reviewed; it may be necessary to include more than eight members to allow space for the required diversity.

**Executive Council (ExCo):** It is encouraging to see that the proposal is for the ExCo to include two members from “partners” such as farmer organisations and NGOs. However, the voice of farmers in the ExCo will have strength only if a farmer member is backed by a larger number of farmers who have insight into the workings of the CGIAR at global level. Therefore, a Farmer Organisations Committee needs to be set up.

Some of you may ask: but is not the NGOC representing the interests of small-scale farmers? As you already heard from Dennis Garrity this morning, many poor people see this differently. As small-scale farmers have become better organised in recent years, they have increasingly questioned why NGOs should be considered as their spokespersons. Farmer organisations have their own interests that they should be expressing directly to the CGIAR. The NGOs concerned with agricultural R&D – either as field-based development-support organisations or as advocacy and lobbying groups – have different roles in the agricultural R&D systems than do farmers and their organisations. These two constituencies are just that: two constituencies, not one – and space must be created in the governance system of the CGIAR for both of them.

This year, farmers are requesting the setting up of a Farmer Organisations Committee within the CGIAR. We in the NGOC support this request. A Farmer Organisations Committee will give a voice to representatives of the CGIAR's most important stakeholders. The CGIAR has – at least in its rhetoric – become more open to stakeholder participation, but failure to bring in the direct voices of farmers at global level will minimise the credibility of its claims. As the CGIAR is a role model for agricultural research, the creation of a Farmer Organisations Committee would send a strong positive signal to other research organisations, not only internationally but also at regional and national level.

All in all, we see that some changes are being made within the CGIAR system, but the feeling of many NGOs is that the change is not going deep enough. We recognise that there has been some reform but we feel that the CGIAR is still far from achieving the transformation we had hoped for when the change process started.

To close, I'd like to refer you to the NGOC report in your folders for detailed information on our activities since MTM2001; it also gives our website where you can find still more information and various reports, workshop proceedings and publications written by NGOC members. But here, in person, I'd like to update you on changes in diversity in our Committee. With the terms of two members ending in this year, we will be welcoming two new members from Asia and Latin America – both of them women. Thus, by the beginning of next year, the NGOC will be a group of nine persons of whom six are from the South and four are women. Moreover, the Committee has elected another woman as Co-Chair of the NGOC – Monica Kapiriri of Environmental Alert Uganda – and I would like to introduce her to you.

*Ann Waters-Bayer, CGIAR NGOC Co-Chair*

## **Annex 2:**



# GENETIC RESOURCES GOVERNANCE

## Defending Global Public Goods

The Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA), collected from farmers' fields and stored in the Gene Banks of CG Centres, the other 90% of these resources stored in national gene banks and the multitude of resources still found on-farm are the result of millennia of creativity and development by farmers. Apart from the direct livelihood security benefits to small-scale food producers, these resources are also a major contributor to Global Public Goods - food security and environmental integrity in the sense that PGRFA are an important component of agricultural biodiversity.

PGRFA are under threat with extensive losses recorded on-farm as well as losses in *ex situ* gene banks. Apart from the threats from the globalisation of markets, cultures and tastes, industrialisation of production systems as well as disasters and conflict, new threats are emerging from genetic modification using biotechnology, intellectual property rights abuses and genetic use restriction technologies (GURTS).

The CGIAR has a major role to play not only in the practical protection of these resources, but also in policy formation at national and international levels.

For these reasons Civil Society Organisations<sup>1</sup> present at AGM 2001 call on the CGIAR to:

### GMOs

- Reaffirm its rejection of GURTs including "Terminator Technologies"
- Advocate for strict controls on research, testing, importation and use of GMOs
- Adopt the Precautionary Approach in its own research, not testing nor releasing any GMO in uncontrolled environments
- Develop a system-wide policy calling for a moratorium on releases of GMOs in Centres of Diversity
- Lobby for liability and redress penalties within the Biosafety Protocol on those that contaminate Centres of Diversity
- Develop systems and instruments to monitor GMO contamination within Centres of Diversity and CG Centre gene banks

### IPRs

- Ensure that the genetic resources including their parts and components, held in Trust within CG Centre gene banks, may not be privatised by Centres nor, through effective Material Transfer Agreements, by recipients of these resources
- Lobby strongly for effective governance of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and the CG Centre gene banks through the **International Undertaking / Convention**, currently being negotiated in FAO, and for this to:
  - Be the principal instrument to govern the use of PGRFA, and not be subordinate to WTO/TRIPs or other agreement
  - Cover all the crop genera and their wild relatives currently stored and under development in CG Centres
  - Prevent application of IPRs on PGRFA and their genetic parts and components
  - Provide international recognition and implementation of Farmers' Rights
- Communicate these points immediately to the Negotiators of the International Undertaking in Rome

---

<sup>1</sup> *Civil Society Organisations at CGIAR AGM 2001 include: AS-PTA, ETC Group (formerly RAFI), Food First/ Institute for Food and Development Policy, German NGO Forum for Environment and Development, GRET, ITDG, PELUM and the NGO Committee of the CGIAR*