

**Report of the
FAO Expert Consultation on Agricultural Innovation Systems and Family Farming
19-21 March 2012, Rome, Italy**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In December 2011, the UN General Assembly declared 2014 to be the International Year of Family Farming and invited the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to facilitate implementation of the International Year, in collaboration with its partners. To mark this important initiative, FAO plans to publish in 2014 a major study on agricultural innovation systems (AIS), focusing on family farming, in its State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) series, which is FAO's major annual flagship publication. As part of the initial preparations for this study, an Expert Consultation was organized at FAO Headquarters on 19-21 March 2012 with about 40 participants, from 14 different countries. Roughly 40% of participants were invited experts while the remainder came from different FAO divisions and its regional offices. A highly participatory approach was used throughout the meeting to encourage full engagement of participants in discussions.

Objectives

The general objective of the Consultation was to provide FAO with guidance and inputs on developing the major study, specifically covering areas such as the state of agriculture innovation and key issues and gaps in knowledge on agriculture innovation.

Major Conclusions Drawn by FAO from the Meeting

The Expert Consultation:

1. Supported the proposal to prepare a major study on AIS that will focus on family farming. It will be important to define and clarify the precise meaning of key terms, such as innovation, AIS, smallholders and family farming. The family farmers should not be considered in isolation but within the context of rural households.
2. Emphasized that the study should focus on the policy level and policy-making, considering also the entry points in AIS where policy-makers can make a difference.
3. Emphasized that the study should also focus on the enabling environment, as this and the policy arena are key areas where FAO can make a unique contribution to the strengthening of AIS to benefit family farmers and build on recent related work by its partners, such as the World Bank.
4. Provided important insights into the current state of thinking and practice regarding key issues that can influence whether family farmers benefit from the AIS approach, i.e.
 - a) Level of organization of farmers – the importance of family farmers organizing themselves and the crucial role of these organizations in AIS was emphasized throughout the meeting
 - b) Characterization of actors in AIS – identifying the important players in AIS as well as their incentives
 - c) Research systems – ensuring that they focus on the needs and demands of family farmers
 - d) Extension and advisory services – ensuring that they are accountable to family farmers and provide access to appropriate and useful knowledge, and that communication is two-way
 - e) Linkage of family farmers to markets
 - f) Engagement of the private sector and partnerships between the public and private sectors
 - g) Degree of empowerment and participation of family farmers in AIS
 - h) Funding and investment strategies – new funding mechanisms may be critical for enhancing AIS

i) Measuring and monitoring impact – although potentially difficult in practice, there was agreement that it was important to attempt to measure the impact of interventions aiming to strengthen AIS to benefit family farmers

5. Suggested that the study pays considerable attention to best practices and lessons learned – using case studies from practical experiences to illustrate both what has worked and what has not.

6. Provided information on a wide range of resources, including case studies, ongoing projects and publications, that will be useful in preparing the study.

Report of the FAO Expert Consultation on Agricultural Innovation Systems and Family Farming
19-21 March 2012, Rome, Italy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Acknowledgements

Background to the Meeting

Objectives of the Meeting

Day 1: Monday 19 March

Welcome remarks - Keith Wiebe

Introduction - John Preissing

Keynote presentation 1: The status of agricultural innovation systems (Riikka Rajalahti)

Keynote presentation 2: Role and responsibility of private sector in sustaining smallholder's family farming (Seemantinee Khot)

Discussion of keynote presentations

Day 2: Tuesday 20 March

Role play about Day 1 – Kristin Davis and Tom Anyonge

Feedback on four pre-conference questions – John Preissing

Presentation of seven key issues for group discussions – John Preissing

The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) - Jakob Skoet

Group Work:

Working Group 1: Strengths/weaknesses of the AIS concept

Working Group 2: Approaches for promoting AIS

Working Group 3: Governance and funding

Working Group 4: The roles of different actors

Working Group 5: Ensuring research and knowledge are relevant and are applied

Working Group 6: Measuring impact

Working Groups 7A and 7B: Making a difference

Day 3: Wednesday 21 March

Role play about Day 2 – Nevena Alexandrova and Stephen Franzel

Reflections from the meeting – John Preissing

Discussion on two remaining key issues

Overview of FAO activities planned to support development of the publication – John Preissing

Marketplace

Way forward

Evaluation and feedback

Closing

Annexes:

1. Programme of the Expert Consultation

2. List of Participants

3. Composition of the Working Groups on Day 2

Acknowledgements

The FAO planning committee would like to express its gratitude to the invited experts who, attending the meeting in their individual capacity, whole-heartedly shared their knowledge and experiences over the three days in order to assist FAO with planning this major study for 2014. The planning committee would also like to thank the many FAO colleagues who assisted with the preparatory, organizational and technical aspects of the Consultation, in particular Günter Hemrich and Karin Nichterlein, for their work as facilitators during the meeting, and Cecilia Agyeman-Anane, Catherine Letocart, Charlotte Lietaer, Eleonora Paratore, Sandra Tardioli and Guendalina Troiani, for their assistance with logistical issues.

Background to the Meeting

In December 2011, the United Nations General Assembly in New York declared¹ 2014 to be the International Year of Family Farming and invited the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)² to facilitate implementation of the International Year, in collaboration with its partners. To mark this important initiative, FAO plans to launch in 2014 a major report on agricultural³ innovation systems (AIS), with a strong focus on family farming. It is planned to publish it in the State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) series, which is FAO's premier, award-winning, flagship publication. As part of the preparations, an Expert Consultation was organized at FAO Headquarters on 19-21 March 2012 to receive guidance and inputs on developing this major study, particularly regarding the current status, key issues and gaps in knowledge concerning AIS, with the focus on family farmers and smallholders. Programme of the meeting is in Annex 1.

Objectives of the Meeting

The general objective of the Consultation was to provide FAO with guidance and inputs on developing the major study, specifically covering areas such as the state of agriculture innovation and key issues and gaps in knowledge on agriculture innovation.

MONDAY 19 MARCH, Red Room, 14.00 – 17.00

Welcome remarks - Keith Wiebe

Keith Wiebe, Deputy Director of the FAO Agricultural Development Economics Division, welcomed the participants⁴ stating that, as Deputy Director of the FAO division which oversees preparation of SOFA as well as many of FAO's other policy and knowledge products, it was a great pleasure to be present at the beginning of this collaborative process that would lead eventually to a major FAO study on AIS for smallholders.

He first gave some background to FAO's interest in this topic. Latest FAO figures indicate that the number of undernourished people in the world remains unacceptably high, at over 900 million people. Looking to the future, there are major challenges ahead that make the situation even more urgent, namely the rapidly changing socio-economic environment, where it is estimated that the world's population will increase from about 7 billion people today to more than 9 billion by 2050; that the proportion of the world's people living in urban areas will increase from about 50 to 70 percent by 2050; and that people's diets are changing to increased proportions of vegetables, fruits and livestock products. With this larger, more urban and, on average, richer population it is estimated that the global demand for food may be 60 percent higher in 2050 than it is today. Increasing food production to meet this demand (and to eradicate hunger) will be made more difficult due to climate change, growing environmental concerns, closer links with the energy sector, and a host of other emerging challenges.

He underlined that smallholders and innovation are central to meeting these challenges. Most of the world's poor and hungry people live in rural areas in developing countries, and most of them depend on agriculture for at least part of their livelihoods, so improving agriculture must be at the heart of any strategy to alleviate hunger and poverty. Action is necessary on several fronts – to increase investment in agriculture; to broaden access to food; to improve governance of global food systems; and to increase agricultural productivity while conserving the natural resource base.

¹ Resolution 66/222 adopted 22 December 2011, <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/RES/66/222>

² Frequent abbreviations used in this document: AIS = Agricultural innovation systems; CSR = Corporate social responsibility; FAO = UN Food and Agriculture Organization; ICTs = Information and communication technologies; OEKR = FAO Research and Extension Branch; PPPs = Public-private partnerships; R&D = Research and development; SOFA = State of Food and Agriculture.

³ The term agriculture includes the crop, livestock, forestry, fishery and aquaculture sectors

⁴ The list of participants is in Annex 2.

To increase productivity while conserving natural resources, and to eradicate hunger while making food systems more sustainable, it will be necessary to substantially increase support for AIS. Today, there are a multitude of ongoing agricultural innovation initiatives. FAO has supported thinking and action in this area using partnerships, policy analysis, capacity development, knowledge sharing platforms/tools and technical assistance through field-based projects in conjunction with international financial institutions and FAO member countries. Strengthened agricultural research, extension, education, capacity development and investments in value chains and agriculture marketing can help to increase food security, economic development and sustainable natural resource management. However, the most appropriate policies and strategies to ensure that these investments and initiatives are effective still need to be better understood and shared. While much has been learned in recent years about strengthening AIS, there is still much that is not clear.

Given the increased attention that has been given to agriculture and food security in recent years, and noting that 2014 has been declared the International Year of Family Farming, he concluded that this was a critical time for sound, evidence-based discussion and action on these topics and that the collective experience and expertise of the participants, both during the Expert Consultation and after it, would be invaluable in assisting FAO to prepare and develop this major study.

Introduction - John Preissing

In his presentation, John Preissing, Senior Officer (Extension) in the FAO Research and Extension Branch (OEKR), first dedicated a few words to the work of OEKR, the FAO unit that had organized the Consultation. OEKR's mission is to contribute to the strengthening of inclusive AIS that respond to the needs of small producers by providing policy advice to member countries and donors; promoting partnerships at all levels; and supporting capacity development for rural knowledge institutions and decision makers. It uses an integrated approach to meet the countries' needs and assists them in capacity development (where it operates 40 projects across 25 countries); policy development; assessment of, and advocacy for, investments; sharing knowledge on technology adoption; institutional strengthening and reform; and works in partnerships with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services (GFRAS) and other fora.

He stated that the general objective of the Consultation was to provide FAO with guidance and input on developing a major study on agriculture innovation, with a focus on family farming. Specifically, it would cover areas such as the state of agriculture innovation; key issues and gaps in knowledge; and resources, case studies and partnering. The objective of the first day was to jointly identify major trends, issues and recent thinking on building innovation capacity for smallholders.

As they would be used frequently throughout the three days, he also provided the FAO working definitions of two key terms. An agricultural innovation system is “a system of individuals, organizations, and enterprises focused on bringing new products, processes and forms of organization into social and economic use to achieve food and nutrition security, economic development, and sustainable natural resource management”. The term family farming⁵ is “understood to include crop, livestock, forestry, fishery and aquaculture production by producers who, despite their great heterogeneity among countries and within countries, have the following key characteristics:

- Limited access to land and capital resources;
- Predominantly family labour is used, with the head of the household participating directly in the production process;
- Agricultural/forestry/aquaculture/fishery activity is the main source of income for the family”

⁵ From FAO. 2012. FAO medium-term strategic framework for cooperation in family farming in Latin America and the Caribbean 2012-2015 (Draft document) <http://www.rlc.fao.org/en/publications/strategic-framework-cooperation-family-farming-lac/>

He concluded by noting that the meeting was organized to be highly participatory and interactive during the three days, with breakout sessions and group work so, before presenting the two keynote speakers, he introduced the Lead Facilitator, Günter Hemrich from FAO's Economic and Social Development Department and the co-facilitator, Karin Nichterlein from OEKR.

Keynote presentation 1: The status of agricultural innovation systems (Riikka Rajalahti)

The first of two keynote presentations was given by Riikka Rajalahti, Senior Agricultural Specialist in the Agriculture and Rural Development Department of the World Bank. Together with another colleague (Andrea Pape-Christiansen), she had managed and coordinated the task of producing a recent major World Bank publication on AIS⁶, from which most of her presentation was derived.

She began by noting that over the past 40 years, food production had increased dramatically. However, success has not been universal. For example, Sub-Saharan Africa was still lagging behind. Also, to achieve a food-secure world by 2025, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) estimates that an annual increase in agricultural productivity of 0.5 percent across all regions until that year is required. A massive expansion of national and international investment in agricultural research and development (R&D) is required – from US\$5.1 billion per year today (in developing countries) to US\$16.4 billion per year by 2025. Productivity investments need to allocate resources to technology generation and to labour productivity - on staple crops, livestock, fish, horticulture and cash crops - but also on enabling policies and institutional approaches.

Investments in support of agricultural innovation had shifted over time, moving from investments in the physical infrastructure of research institutes in the early 1980s and beyond, to current support for AIS. Over the years, a growing spectrum of efforts had been made to engage farmers and others more fully in the R&D process, including stakeholder participation in research governing boards and advisory panels; decentralizing research, to bring scientists closer to clients and for better focus; decentralized extension services and use of matching grants; competitive funding; promoting producer organizations; and mixing public and private systems.

She described six key elements of effective AIS, namely: policy coordination and collective action (which in some countries involved limited ministerial-research-extension linkages while in others it included AIS-wide priority setting); technical and professional skills (covering the role of formal and informal agricultural education and training [tertiary, vocational, on-the-job]); extension and advisory services; research systems; private sector; and, finally, policy and enabling environment (including regulatory frameworks, funding, markets and infrastructure). The status, trends and approaches for each of the key elements varied enormously between countries.

Regarding smallholders, she argued that more inclusive AIS that focus on smallholders can be built. However, there are some prerequisites. The small producers need to be organized. Second, and often of most importance, rural advisory services are needed. Third, the smallholders should be involved in priority setting and planning – through representation, brokers, rural advisory services etc. Also, criteria (such as target group, geographic area, specific themes) are needed for approaches that are funded by competitive research and matching grants or based on other contractual arrangements.

She then described some of the approaches that can be used, providing examples of their application. First, co-design approaches for R&D, where researchers engage systematically with a heterogeneous set of actors (which might include farmers, input suppliers, traders, government officials etc.) in the flexible process of developing innovations, were used in the Papa Andina programme, a regional partnership between the International Potato Center (CIP) and national agricultural research organizations in Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru. Second, public-private partnerships (PPPs) were used in a

⁶ World Bank. 2011. Agricultural innovation systems: An investment sourcebook.
<http://elibrary.worldbank.org/content/book/9780821386842>

major programme in China for agricultural technology transfer targetting smallholders, involving public-private and public-private-producer organization partnerships. Third, productive partnerships approaches, where favorable conditions are created for large buyers and small sellers to establish mutually beneficial and sustainable relationships and which use matching grants to support smallholder access to technical assistance, services, technology etc., have been successfully used in Colombia. Fourth, the potential of “pull mechanisms”, where results-based financial incentives are designed to overcome market failures through encouraging innovation (such as prizes or advance market commitments for private sector generated/disseminated technology appropriate for smallholders), is increasingly recognized in agriculture.

She then pointed out some major challenges. In agriculture-based countries, public spending on agriculture and agricultural R&D is extremely low (four percent and less than one percent respectively of the agricultural GDP) and should be increased. Innovation capacity was a huge issue in most agriculture-based countries, but was also pressing in many more advanced developing countries. For example, Chile needs to revamp its technician training and invest in primary-secondary education to make the most of its AIS and agricultural sector in the long run. Finally, the extension and advisory services are in a bad condition in many countries.

She concluded her presentation reminding participants why this subject is so important, referring to one of the key conclusions from the World Bank’s World Development Report dedicated to agriculture for development⁷, i.e. that 75% of the world’s poor are rural and most are involved in farming and that, in the 21st century, agriculture remains fundamental for poverty reduction, economic growth and environmental sustainability.

Keynote presentation 2: Role and responsibility of private sector in sustaining smallholder's family farming (Seemantinee Khot)

The second keynote presentation was given by Seemantinee Khot, Head of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for the Suzlon Group, a leading manufacturer of wind power equipment headquartered in India. She began her talk by arguing why we should be concerned about smallholders, i.e. they make up the majority of the population in India and other countries (estimating that 20-40% of the population have less than 0.3 acres and 40-90% have 1-3 acres), they are more efficient and sustainable and, finally, if neglected further, they will be a burden on the economy, as the most vulnerable social group. She highlighted that ‘smallholders’ are often very ‘small’, using minimal amounts of resources and inputs and adopting a wide range of innovative strategies to survive. Access to land and natural resources is the big issue for them. She argued that agriculture is increasingly becoming unviable for smallholders and their conditions are deteriorating progressively. Responsible factors include the increasing expansion of the private sector, taking over the smallholders’ lands, as well as weak R&D and extension services; poor access to mass media and markets; illiteracy; climate change and environmental issues; and lack of political will. The smallholders enter into a vicious cycle where they are in debt, their input costs are high and their financial returns are poor.

Talking about her company, she argued that it takes CSR seriously, seeing it both as a responsibility and a sustainable business strategy. She described its numerous initiatives in this domain, such as those promoting multiple land use with multiple stakeholders. In partnership with Government and NGOs, it was also supporting the strengthening of women farmers (through self-help groups and micro-credit); developing a cadre of 'jankars' (wise women); promoting an integrated agro-based livelihoods program (IABLP) approach; and biomass recycling for soil improvement. It was also encouraging innovation through village awards to reward collective efforts; multimedia documentation of outcomes for extension; transfer of technology, such as the system of rice intensification (SRI) or effective microorganisms (EM), through farmer field schools; cross

⁷ World Bank. 2007. World development report 2008: Agriculture for development. <http://go.worldbank.org/2DNNMCBG10>

subsidizing innovation through 'in kind ' support of machinery; promoting organic food among the growing middle class; and supporting agriculture in public schools to promote farming.

Considering the company's motivations, she maintained that CSR made business sense for a number of reasons, including developing the community as a business partner, investing in tomorrow's business, brand image, customer satisfaction and risk reduction. She concluded by emphasizing that it is essential to engage with the private sector ("if we don't co-opt businesses they will co-opt us") and to demand "responsible business". The UN, governments and research institutes should explore win-win situations and the civil society should be empowered to demand accountability and transparency.

Discussion of keynote presentations

Before the keynote presentations, the Lead Facilitator informed the participants that after the presentations they would be asked to discuss with their neighbour two questions:

Question 1: "What major points did you hear in relation to building AIS for smallholders?" and

Question 2: "What additional aspects, that were not covered in the presentations, are important for developing AIS for smallholders?"

Each pair of participants was then asked to write down the most important point or aspect for each of the questions on a small card using 5-7 words. During the coffee break, the cards for each question were clustered into main themes by a core team made up of two of the invited experts and two members of the FAO Secretariat. The invited experts then presented the results to the plenary after the break.

For Question 1, Ian Mashingaidze, from the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN), reported that the main messages that participants had heard were:

- a) The need for collective action – involving different stakeholders in the AIS
- b) The importance of incentives for the smallholders - such as access to land or financing of farmer groups
- c) The importance of capacity, which was multifaceted and worked at different levels (such as farmer or organizational level)
- d) That there are different entry points, so value chains are needed
- e) The importance of deciding to target smallholders.

For Question 2, Virginia Cardenas, from the University of the Philippines Los Banos, reported that participants emphasized the importance of the following additional aspects:

- a) The need to have support systems that work, such as advisory services, and that will assist smallholders manage the risks from adoption of innovation
- b) The need to focus on the incentives for smallholders – such as incentives that can establish the behaviour of small farmers demanding and using innovation
- c) Models for small farmers – issues such as the competitiveness of small scale farming versus large scale commercial farming or perfecting a model for smallholders to pay for services
- d) The dynamics of innovation processes – the need to understand their consequences (e.g. impacts on asset ownership)
- e) Ways of funding – e.g. new ways of channeling investments, through farmers organizations/ demand side
- f) Farmers rights to protect germplasm and traditional knowledge
- g) The need to ensure links to the market

The floor was then opened for a general discussion, where a number of key points were raised, including:

- It was argued that there is no need to open discussions on how to define innovation or AIS, as there are internationally accepted definitions developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and

Development (OECD), published in the Oslo Manual⁸, that are already being used to collect innovation-related data.

- The definition of family farming needs to be clarified, as for different parts of the world (e.g. Latin America versus Africa) it can mean very different things
- Farming and environmental conditions are changing quickly (due to climate change etc.), so farmers need to be able to respond to change quickly, meaning that innovation systems should allow adaptability and flexibility. It may be necessary to integrate new aspects into these systems that were not originally planned.
- Need to also consider that many of the forces driving innovation in agriculture today (such as advances in information and communication technologies (ICTs) or basic biology) are actually coming from outside the agricultural sphere.
- We need to consider how a major FAO publication such as the one that is planned can actually make things happen on the ground – how can it make a difference to peoples' lives?
- Even though family farmers are the major focus use of the study, it was suggested that the terminology “to develop family farmer innovation capacity” was not entirely appropriate because the family farmers are just one component in the large and complex innovation system. It might thus be more appropriate to write: “to develop the capacity of the agricultural innovation system to benefit family farmers”. It was also highlighted that capacity development is multi-faceted and that the Corporate Strategy on Capacity Development⁹, recently approved by FAO member countries, focuses on three dimensions, i.e. developing capacities at the individual and organizational levels and, thirdly, in the enabling environment (which includes political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks; budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms).

TUESDAY 20 MARCH, David Lubin Library, 8.30 – 17.00

John Preissing welcomed the group to the second day of the meeting and to the more informal settings of the Facilitation Room within the FAO library. He reminded the Consultation that the objective of both the 2nd and 3rd day was to receive guidance and inputs on developing the major study on agricultural innovation, with a focus on family farming.

Role play about Day 1 – Kristin Davis and Tom Anyonge

To recap on the first day, two participants enacted a short role play. Kristin Davis (Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services, GFRAS) played a reporter interviewing Tom Anyonge (International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD) as a small-scale farmer leader. She asked him about the major issues of importance for family farmers that he had observed on Day 1. He replied that he noticed, firstly, that few farmers were actually present at the Consultation. He argued that, in the past, farmers had received too much training. Instead, he emphasized the importance of collective action for small farmers, as once they are organized into a group this facilitates them gaining access to farm inputs, credit, technologies and markets as well as enables them to interact with, and learn from, other groups.

Feedback on four pre-conference questions – John Preissing

In their invitation to the Consultation, participants were sent four questions about AIS and asked to briefly reply to each, with a maximum of 3-4 bullets per question. A total of 12 responses were received and John summarized them as follows:

Question 1: Why should we promote the strengthening of inclusive AIS (i.e. with a focus on smallholders/family farmers)?

⁸ <http://www.oecd.org/sti/oslomanual>

⁹ <http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/capacity-development-home/en/>

- Because smallholders are at the bottom of the value chain, have little access to market information and advisory services and are the most vulnerable
- To improve sustainable food security, food diversity, rural employment and the rural economy
- To better target female producers

Question 2: Based on your experiences, what are the key ways to support agricultural innovation for smallholders/family farmers?

- Encourage participatory, demand-driven technology transfer and knowledge sharing
- Empower and encourage grassroots level innovation
- Strengthen institutional capacities and national institutions
- Improve policies and frameworks
- Increase investments and incentives for pro-poor innovation
- Focus on agricultural innovation brokerage roles

Question 3: What are the major constraints to the development of AIS for smallholders/family farmers?

- Lack of policies and national capacities
- Top-down structures that ignore smallholders
- Weak or missing linkages
- Lack of financing and affordable inputs
- Need to strengthen private sector roles, PPPs
- Low smallholder capacities to uptake innovations

Question 4: What are the key knowledge gaps in promoting sustainable and inclusive AIS?

- Knowledge, research, findings on sustainable AIS
- Financial mechanisms for AIS and sustaining AIS
- Lack of knowledge about actors, policies and institutions that can best support AIS
- Definitions of smallholder, family farmer, etc
- Due consideration for gender and AIS
- Access to value chains by smallholders
- Unclear role of players
- Role of most vulnerable players (non-players) landless/women others

Presentation of seven key issues for group discussions – John Preissing

John Preissing informed the group that most of Day 2 would be dedicated to group work, where participants would be split into small groups to discuss a specific key issue for about an hour and the results would then be presented to all participants (the plenary) for discussion. He presented the seven proposed issues, noting that the original ones prepared by the FAO Secretariat had been modified to account for salient points made by participants during the previous afternoon session.

In the ensuing discussion, the participants suggested that the presentation on SOFA be given before the group work, rather than afterwards as originally planned, as this would allow them to get a better idea of the context, content and timelines for the major publication. The FAO Secretariat agreed with this suggestion and Jakob Skoet, from the FAO Agricultural Development Economics Division, gave the presentation.

The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) - Jakob Skoet

He began by noting that SOFA¹⁰ is FAO's premier, award-winning, flagship publication and that it is the oldest 'global' report in the UN system, being produced since 1947. It provides a comprehensive survey of food and agriculture - including crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry - at global and regional levels and also provides country-level statistical data in annex tables. Every year, SOFA carries a special report on a major theme in world agriculture, from the perspective of reducing food insecurity and poverty. These themes are agriculture and nutrition (2013 – under preparation); investing in agriculture for food security (2012 - being finalized); women in agriculture (2010-11); livestock (2009); bioenergy (2008); environmental services (2007); food aid (2006); agricultural trade and poverty (2005); and agricultural biotechnology (2003-04). The report is published in 6 languages, is covered extensively by the international media and has helped to shape the global debate on some of these important issues in world agriculture.

Jakob noted that the core SOFA team is very small and has limited funding, so they always partner with other technical divisions in FAO and with external experts. The SOFA thematic reports aim to provide an overview of the topic that is technically sound and politically neutral. They aim to bring all relevant technical specialists to the table and to respect a wide range of viewpoints, although the reports never reflect complete consensus. The main challenge is usually one of emphasis. Because the reports cover a lot of ground in relatively little space, every issue cannot be given the depth of coverage it deserves.

The audience for SOFA includes FAO Member Governments, the media, civil society and researchers. It is not prepared for specialists, but it has to be credible for specialists. Its main characteristics are that it is short (normally about 150 pages), focused, concise and accessible, and based on sound analysis and evidence. The publications tends to follow a standard format, whereby the subject is first described; the issues and controversies are presented; empirical evidence is provided; the special challenges for developing countries are outlined; and, finally, policy options are provided.

The process behind preparation of the report involves the following sequential steps: definition of the contents and working outline; submission of the proposal to the FAO Director-General for approval; commissioning of background papers; preparation of the draft report; internal and external review of the draft (possibly with a workshop); finalization of the report; and its clearance for publication.

To get an idea of the timelines involved, he said that if the report is to be released in six languages in March 2014, then it should be cleared by October 2013, the draft should be reviewed by June 2013, its background papers should be finalized by December 2012 and the proposal should be submitted to the FAO Director-General by April 2012.

Finally, on the topic of how to maximize the publication's impact, he noted that a number of options were available, including publication of accompanying technical outputs and/or policy briefs as well as organization of promotional events and policy workshops. It was important that these options be evaluated at an early stage of the process.

Group Work

A total of eight working groups were established - four in the morning and four in the afternoon. Each group discussed a single issue for about an hour with the assistance of a facilitator (from the FAO Secretariat) and nominated one of the invited experts to be the Rapporteur to present the group's main findings to the plenary for further discussion. Participants were free to join the group of their choice. The composition of the different groups is provided in Annex 3.

Working Group 1: Strengths/weaknesses of the AIS concept

¹⁰ <http://www.fao.org/publications/sofa/en/>

The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the group for discussion was:

Strengths/weaknesses of the AIS concept

- a) *What are the major strengths of applying the agricultural innovation system (AIS) concept for the benefit of smallholders? (include examples if possible)*
- b) *What are the major weaknesses of applying the agricultural innovation system concept for the benefit of smallholders? (include examples if possible)*
- c) *What alternative models to AIS do we have that can benefit smallholders (and what are their relative merits compared to AIS)?*

Outcomes from the working group

The Rapporteur, Isabel Alvarez, presented the results of the working group's deliberations to the plenary. The strengths underlined by the group were that the AIS concept builds on existing knowledge; brings in knowledge from other fields; and can make smallholders more competitive and thus more sustainable. The group also pointed out the positive catalytic role that FAO could play regarding AIS.

Its weaknesses included:

- For emergency projects (e.g. dealing with indigenous people on the run from rebels) or projects of short time duration, AIS approaches are not appropriate
- If farmers are not organized, it is difficult for them to benefit from AIS
- There is often lack of data or information about the smallholders (who/where are they? what do they produce?)
- Weak linkages (e.g. between researchers and farmers) make it difficult to use AIS
- Weak institutions (e.g. lack of extension services) make it difficult to use AIS

For alternatives, the group mentioned that other models that account for power differentials and that include smallholders in decision-making should be considered. The country-specific context should also be considered, as regional or sub-national models might be important. The group also pointed to the continued need to maintain a defined space for public institutions (research, extension etc.).

Discussion of the presentation

Most discussion in the plenary centred on what can be achieved in emergency situations. Because of the very short project cycles, participants argued that it was hard to support innovation in these situations and that the emphasis had to be on humanitarian actions. In post-emergency situations it was important to assess and identify which value chains continued to work - citing as an example the recent case of Sudan where only the livestock value chain was reported to be working.

Working Group 2: Approaches for promoting AIS

The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the group for discussion was:

Approaches for promoting AIS

- a) *What are the different approaches (e.g. establishing innovation funds, innovation platforms etc.) that have been used to promote agriculture innovation for smallholders and what impacts or implications (e.g. on food security, economic development, sustainable natural resource management) have they had in specific countries? (include examples if possible)*
- b) *What are the lessons learned from using different approaches?*
- c) *What new approaches are emerging?*

Outcomes from the working group

The Facilitator, Magdalena Blum (OEKR), noted that, given the large number and diversity of approaches available, the group had difficulties in prioritizing what was important. The Rapporteur, Stephen Harris (Technoserve), gave an overview of some of the different kinds of approaches used to promote AIS that were discussed by the group.

Regarding innovation funds, he noted that some were global (e.g. an upcoming USAID request for proposals) while others were national (e.g. innovation funds to support research in Senegal). They are still a relatively new phenomenon in the agricultural field, so the approach was “one to watch”.

Regarding innovation platforms, some good examples now exist such as the Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) model, where ATMAs were established in many districts of India and, *inter alia*, assist smallholders to form groups to sell their produce. It was noted that this decentralized extension approach was featured in a recent FAO publication¹¹ and it was suggested that it might be a good case study for the 2014 report.

Regarding institutional approaches, the role was mentioned for market service centres (where farmers go to sell produce, but which can also be used by the farmers for knowledge exchange) as well as establishing commodity associations at the national level (which can also aim to influence policy) or farmer organizations.

Regarding ICTs, it was highlighted that they are evolving very rapidly and are being used in a variety of ways in AIS. For example, through mobile phones, farmers wishing to buy or sell products can be linked to markets. For Indian farmers with access to computers or mobile phones, services like e-choupal or aAQUA (“almost all questions answered”) provide relevant information in several local languages. In the Philippines, the Farmers Information and Technology Service is a “one-stop-shop” for multi-media resources for advisory services, and there were about 1000 of them around the country. Kiosks are playing an important role in many countries in providing farmers with access to ICTs and information. The advantages of using ICTs for distance learning and for disseminating information through the mass media (TV, rural radio) were also mentioned, although the main limitation is often the availability of good content and its dissemination in an appropriate format and in local languages.

Discussion of the presentation

In the ensuing discussion, participants made a number of points, including that the approaches described to connect people, access knowledge etc. assumed that the basic infrastructure and policies were in place, which might not be the case; that market service centres are very useful and should be promoted by IFAD and FAO; and that approaches involving innovation brokers should also have been mentioned.

Working Group 3: Governance and funding

The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the group for discussion was:

Governance and funding

- a) *What are the key institutional¹² development and governance structures needed for a successful agriculture innovation system for smallholders (e.g. at the national or sub-national level)?*
- b) *How can the financing of agricultural innovation and the long term sustainability of institutions and processes be achieved for the benefit of smallholders?*

Outcomes from the working group

¹¹ FAO. 2008. Global review of good agricultural extension and advisory services practices http://www.fao.org/nr/gen/gen_081001_en.htm

¹² The term institutional refers to organizations, rules, policies etc.

The Rapporteur, Catherine Moreddu (OECD), presented the results of the working group's deliberations to the plenary. For the first question, she said the group's response was that the key institutional development and governance structures needed were:

- Strategic planning and priority setting (that would be inclusive and evidence-based)
- Greater accountability, transparency and representation at all levels
- Demand-driven innovation
- Benchmark evaluation – to have indicators of achievement
- Public expenditure reviews, audits and procurements should be open, transparent and participatory

For the second question, she said the group thought that funding and long-term sustainability could be achieved by:

- Having both dedicated funds for long-term public-good issues and more flexible funds for short-term issues
- Ensuring private sector and farmers investment. For this, the enabling environment must be conducive to investments by farmers and the private sector. To achieve this, there should be an improved regulatory framework; rural infrastructure and property rights; and incentives (such as PPPs, matching funds).
- Helping farmers to organize themselves
- Providing access to rural credit
- Ensuring that implementation of projects and the funds match – smoothing the implementation (i.e. funding should be available in a flow that matches requirements of the project – to avoid interruptions in project implementation)

Discussion of the presentation

In the subsequent discussion, participants made a number of key points, including

- The need to diversify the sources of funding – “not put all your eggs in one basket”
- The importance of having “tolerance for failure” – not all projects will succeed
- Newer funding mechanisms should also be considered, including “push-pull” mechanisms and competitive grant schemes.
- That flexibility is important – both for governance and for funding
- That “government funding” may include several sources – funding by central, regional and local government (and each may have different interests)

Working Group 4: The roles of different actors

The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the group for discussion was:

The roles of different actors

- a) Who are the key actors in a successful AIS for smallholders, and what should be their roles?*
- b) How can we ensure rural organizations and communities are fully engaged in the process of innovation?*
- c) If communication is a means of intermediation between different players, how can the capacities of key actors (such as smallholder or research organizations, extension services etc.) to act as innovation brokers be strengthened?*

Outcomes from the working group

The Rapporteur, Franklin Moore (US Mission to the UN Agencies in Rome), presented the results of the working group's deliberations to the plenary, noting that the group had dealt only with the first two of the questions. He reported that the group's main points were that:

- For any agricultural innovation system, there is a multitude of potential actors (including the media, church/religious organizations, telecommunication companies, schools, politicians, the private sector [traders, transportation, processing, banks and finance, pension funds, microfinance, supermarkets],

- producer organizations, research organizations, extension and advisory services, universities and tertiary education, policy think tanks, individuals [farmers, women, youth, farm labourers], co-ordinating bodies, foundations, NGOs, governments and civil society organizations)
- Some of the potential actors are often forgotten, e.g. media, faith-based organizations
 - For a particular agricultural innovation system, actors who come together are those who see their incentives
 - For AIS to be successful, actors need to understand the incentives of others
 - Negotiation power is balanced when small farming families come together in rural organizations (youth, women, others)
 - Need to create opportunities for information flow across and between the different actors

There were no comments from the plenary on the presentation.

Working Group 5: Ensuring research and knowledge are relevant and are applied

The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the group for discussion was:

Ensuring research and knowledge are relevant and are applied

In order to better support agricultural innovation processes to benefit smallholders, how can we increase the:

- a) use of research?*
- b) uptake of new knowledge?*
- c) knowledge sharing?*

Outcomes from the working group

The Rapporteur, Philip Pardey, presented the results of the working group's deliberations to the plenary. The group made five major points:

- It is important to restate and recast the requirement for adequate and sustainable funding for R&D
- There was key consensus on the need for evidence-based, forward-looking strategic priority setting for R&D, with the participation of rural households and considering the full value chain
- Implementation should have flexible attributes
- Research is sitting between multiple actors, so it is important to strengthen linkages/participation between the multiple actors
- In conducting R&D, there is a need to improve public access to the data and knowledge generated

Discussion of the presentation

In the ensuing discussion, the Rapporteur clarified that the group's thinking was not just about technological development, but it also included organizational/economical research. Points made by the participants also included the following:

- To encourage improved collaboration between multiple actors, incentives are needed.
- Research in AIS takes place in a highly interlinked space and research systems need to be reformed to adapt to this reality (even though reforming research systems is a very complex and difficult job).
- The role of the public and private sectors in research is changing. PPPs are complex and many different models exist. Government policies can have a big impact on the public-private sector relationships (as witnessed by the introduction of end point royalties in plant breeding in Australia).

Working Group 6: Measuring impact

The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the group for discussion was:

Measuring impact

If efforts/investments are made to develop the capacities in agricultural innovation to benefit smallholders, how can we measure eventual

a) process and institutional change?

b) social, economical and environmental progress and impacts?

Outcomes from the working group

The Rapporteur, Ian Mashingaidze (FANRPAN), presented the results of the group's deliberations to the plenary. The group had six major points:

- The process is complex and dynamic, so there is need for a well-rounded robust mixture of tools.
- It is important to combine the need for learning with the need for accountability (for the investments).
- There is a need for clarity on what we need to measure, and why, as well as how.
- A lot of tools are already available for measuring impact. Consideration needs to be given to whether to select or adapt existing tools/approaches or whether to develop new ones.
- It is important to consider who the clients are for measurement (e.g. is it the smallholders, the government etc.).
- Make the process of measurement as participatory as possible - involve the stakeholders from the design throughout.

Discussion of the presentation

A lively discussion followed, where the following main issues were raised:

- There was agreement that, even though it might be difficult, impacts need to be measured. It is not just of academic interest. Support of AIS may come from taxpayers' money, so for reasons of transparency and accountability, it is important to be able to say whether the money has been well spent.
- The difficulties in measuring the impact stem from the fact that supporting (e.g. through capacity development) an AIS means supporting a process/system, so simply measuring the outcomes/outputs might not be the best assessment of its impact (e.g. one may wish to measure the impact that the support had on linkages/interactions between different components of the AIS). Similarly, if support is provided to a specific component of an AIS (e.g. financial support to establish an innovation platform), it can be difficult to ascertain whether increased outcomes are due to support for that component (and do not derive from changes in other components in the system).
- Difficulties also stem from the fact that
 - a) given the long time intervals required for R&D etc., it might only be possible to measure the real impact after a certain period (e.g. 10 years) when the results may be of little use or relevance, so indicators to monitor impact underway are needed
 - b) given the flexible and dynamic nature of AIS, the system may change direction underway (e.g. to achieve outcomes that were not envisaged at the beginning), so the indicators/measures of impact would also need to adapt to this possibility.
- It is important also to be realistic and to identify key specific outcomes and indicators – it will not be possible to monitor all of the organizations in the AIS and all outcomes.
- Initiatives on measuring impact can benefit from tools proposed for “innovation benchmarking”.
- Impacts need to be measured against an “evidence-based baseline”, so it is important to consider what this should be if envisaging measuring impacts or monitoring indicators in the future.

Working Groups 7A and 7B: Making a difference

This issue was raised during plenary discussions on Day 1 and so was included as a topic for group discussions in Day 2. Two working groups discussed the issue simultaneously. The text that the FAO Secretariat provided to the groups for discussion was:

Making a difference

What does a new study on AIS need to do to make a difference?

The groups first presented their results and a plenary discussion followed.

Outcomes from working group 7A

The Rapporteur, Sergio Ardila (Inter-American Development Bank), presented the results of the working group's deliberations to the plenary, noting that their discussions had been very productive and with little disagreement. Their conclusions were that the new study should have three main parts.

The first part (the 'selling' part of the study), would link to previous work (i.e. building on knowledge); state why there is a need to change (to increase profitability of small farmers); would discuss the reasons for resistance to change; and consider why the focus of the report should be on smallholders.

The second part (the "what's in the report" part) should be strategic and provide best practices for practitioners. It should also mention what not to do and the reasons for failure. It should also consider and clarify the role of the public sector (international, government/regional and local), private sector and farmers organizations.

The third part (the "way forward" part) should stress that no solution exists that fits all situations (i.e. differentiated strategies are needed). It needs to address sustainability, replicability, scaling-up and adaptation. Finally it should also address priorities of investment (how to do it, covering also the area of subsidies).

Outcomes from working group 7B

The Rapporteur, Kristin Davis (GFRAS), presented the results of her working group's deliberations to the plenary. Considering the comparative advantage of FAO, the group concluded that the new study needs:

- Differentiated strategies provided to reach different types of rural households (all rural actors, not just farmers)
- To give attention to the enabling environment
- Agreement on how to build the capacities of different actors (policy-makers, institutions) to operate in the new conceptual framework of AIS
- Policy recommendations for sustainability (defined as the capacity to evolve) and institutionalization
- To identify entry points where policy-makers can make a difference
- To re-conceptualize the role of research in innovation systems

Joint discussion of the presentations

In the ensuing short discussion, points made by participants included that:

- It is important to ensure that the private sector and NGOs be included.
- More emphasis should be given to the importance of markets.
- The drivers of innovation need to be identified.
- A post-report strategy needs to be devised.

WEDNESDAY 21 MARCH, David Lubin Library, 8.30 – 12.00

Günter Hemrich welcomed participants to the final day of the meeting and reminded them that, as on Day 2, the objective was to receive guidance and inputs on developing the major study on agricultural innovation, with a focus on family farming.

Role play about Day 2 – Nevena Alexandrova and Stephen Franzel

To recap on the previous day, two participants enacted a short role play. Nevena Alexandrova (FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia) played a reporter interviewing Stephen Franzel (World

Agroforestry Centre, ICRAF) as a rural extension agent. In the interview, he said that there were three things to consider for the FAO report: a) as it was aiming to influence important people in policy-making positions, the report needed also to be easily understandable for a non-technical audience, b) the issue of incentives needed to be considered – many technologies are available but have never been used, so there have to be incentives for farmers to use new tools/approaches, c) the importance of partnerships was critical.

Reflections from the meeting – John Preissing

John presented what he considered to be his main points from the meeting, where common ground had been reached regarding the FAO study, i.e.

- It needs to focus on the policy level and policy-makers as well as on the enabling environment
- It should focus on where to intervene with policy
- It should present lessons learned – both what has worked and what did not
- Its focus should be on smallholders, but within the context of rural households
- It is important to define and clarify the precise meaning of key terms (such as innovation, agricultural innovation systems, smallholders)
- It should build upon previous work (e.g. the World Bank Sourcebook)
- The role of the various actors is important. There are many actors (international, national governments, regional, local governments, NGOs, farm organizations, farmers, value chain actors, financing, research, extension, other rural service providers etc.)
- The sustainability, replicability and scalability of agriculture innovation experiences need to be considered
- Priorities for investment should be defined

Discussion on two remaining key issues

Günter told the group that during the working group discussions in Day 2, the FAO Secretariat felt that two important questions emerged and should be further discussed. He therefore proposed that roughly one hour be devoted to them. Participants seated at two tables focused on one issue while those seated at the two remaining tables discussed the other issue. At each table, people were asked first to think about the issue on their own, then discuss their thoughts with a neighbour and then discuss the issue with the whole table. A Rapporteur was nominated for each table to present the results to the plenary.

Issue 1: What are the salient points for policy interventions in support of AIS?

Outcome of Table 1 (Rapporteur - Sergio Ardila):

1. To clarify what is common for other policy objectives, and what is specific to AI (agricultural innovation) and innovation for small farmers
2. Make clear the difference between cases/examples where Government was the key actor, and where it played the role of support provider
3. Make clear how Government has to manage investment so it does not crowd out the private sector.

Outcome of Table 2 (Rapporteur - David Kahan):

1. First decide on principles, and these are:
 - Flexibility
 - Inclusiveness
 - Experimentation
 - Diversity
 - Learning
2. Then do scoping/diagnosis:

- Identify gaps
- What works
- Review policy
- Identify actors

3. Then develop the policy/programme framework, which in turn leads to investment for innovation (funding).

Issue 2: What are the salient points that are essential in order to focus AIS on smallholders?

Outcome of Table 3 (Rapporteur - Virginia Cardenas):

1. Empowerment of smallholder farmers:

- Organizing smallholder farmers
- Funding mechanisms
- Gender just focus
- Expanding their access to land and natural resources

2. Governance and political will:

- Ensuring that small farmers are represented in AIS institutions (research, extension bodies etc.)

3. Re-orientation of agricultural innovation support services to the needs of smallholders:

- Demand led by smallholder farmers
- Facilitating linkages and processes
- Supporting smallholder access to markets and natural resources

Outcome of Table 4 (Rapporteur - Javier Ekboir):

1. AIS involve new dynamics and so require new types of interventions - it is important to get the message to policy-makers that new policies are needed

2. Empowerment of farmers organizations

- Capacity development

3. Upscaling of existing innovations

- Knowledge/information sharing/use

4. Access to finance and markets for small farmers

- Need policy development

Discussion regarding the outcomes for the two issues

Some of the comments made by participants included:

- Regarding point 1 from Table 2, stating that policies should be flexible, it was suggested that the principle might be hard for policy-makers to accept in practice.
- Regarding point 1 from Table 3 about the importance of farmers being organized, it was pointed out that this had proven to be difficult in practice and that there had been many mistakes in the past. It was highlighted that farmers organizations are likely to be sustainable if the push for organization is needs-based and comes from the grassroots level rather than coming from the top.

Overview of FAO activities planned to support development of the publication – John Preissing

John introduced the topic by noting that the Expert Consultation was a key initial step in FAO's preparation for the major 2014 report. The meeting had been organized and run in a participatory manner to fully involve experts from inside and outside FAO, and it was planned to ensure a

participatory approach throughout the whole process to 2014. He informed the participants that a small FAO core planning committee, with representatives from three different Departments, had been established to oversee the entire planning process through to 2014. In addition, an expanded FAO committee had been set up, comprising additional individuals from other Departments and from FAO regional offices.

He said that FAO was initiating a number of activities related to the FAO study and gave the floor to Degi Chuulanbaatar (OEKR) to talk about some of them. She noted that over the past two days they had heard, formally and informally, about diversification of the regions, sub-regions and countries and that local context matters a lot in relation to AIS and innovation development. There are many local factors that influence adoption and diffusion of an innovation including socio-cultural, political and economic issues and institutional capacity etc. To attempt to capture the unique differences of the regions/sub-regions, she said that FAO was hoping to carry out a number of short AIS-related exercises to “piggyback” on other regional events. The objectives of the exercises are to identify a case study (what agricultural innovation is making impact?) and, secondly, capture important regional reflections/differences on key issues regarding AIS.

As examples, Karin Nichterlein said the exercise would be done during an FAO sub-regional synthesis workshop on AIS for Central Asia in Turkey (May 2012) and May Hani (OEKR) said it was similarly planned to do these exercises during FAO regional workshops on market oriented agriculture advisory services planned for the Near East (in collaboration with the Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa (AARINENA) in Jordan, June 2012), West Africa (in collaboration with the Initiative Prospective Agricole et Rurale (IPAR) in Senegal, June 2012) and Latin America (in collaboration with the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) in Bolivia, October 2012). Degi distributed a page on the subject and encouraged participants to write down information about other major regional events related to AIS that might be considered for this purpose.

The floor was then given to John Ruane (OEKR), who informed the participants that FAO is planning to host a moderated e-mail conference on AIS and family farming in June 2012. Its aim will be to enable a global discussion on specific issues relating to the topic and, in addition, to gather knowledge from a wide audience to fill information gaps (e.g. case studies) that will be useful for the upcoming FAO study. Before the e-mail conference, a Background Document will be prepared to provide easily-understandable background information on the conference theme, so that those with little knowledge of the area can understand what the conference is about. The conference will be open to anyone and moderated to ensure messages are relevant to the conference and understandable. Messages will be sent by e-mail, but will also be made available on the FAO website. He suggested that, based on OEKR’s experience of managing related e-mail conferences¹³ over the past years, it might be expected that a few hundred people will join and that about 50% of messages will come from people living in developing countries. After the conference, a short document will be prepared, providing a summary of the main issues that were discussed. He concluded by saying that an announcement about the e-mail conference would be sent to participants of the Consultation and that they were then encouraged to join and to tell other relevant stakeholders about the conference.

Marketplace

In order to share resources, six stands were prepared in two rooms with flip charts so that participants could walk around and pin information on different resources using 'post-its'. Staff from the FAO Secretariat were at each stand to facilitate the process. Topics of the six stands were:

1. Case studies (recent, proposed) - participants were asked to provide type, who was involved, and where
2. Additional stakeholders - provide organization and contact
3. Ongoing initiatives/projects - what, who, where (country/region)

¹³ <http://www.fao.org/biotech/biotech-forum/en/>

4. Publications (recent/upcoming) - provide title, and organization
5. Events (recent and upcoming) - provide title and organizer
6. Other resources (that do not fall into the above five categories)

Some participants indicated that much of the key information about the resources was back in their offices. The FAO Secretariat promised therefore to send all the information received at the marketplace in an electronic format to the participants after the Consultation so that they could add additional resources and/or edit any information they had already provided.

Way forward

John Preissing informed the participants that after the Consultation, they would receive the results of the marketplace for addition/editing of resources; the draft report of the Consultation for comments; and the announcement about the upcoming FAO e-mail conference on AIS. He said that FAO would also follow up on any offers of partnerships in regional events.

Evaluation and feedback

Participants were asked to verbally summarize their feelings about the three-day Consultation in a single word and most of the responses suggested it had been an enlightening and productive experience. They were also asked to fill out an evaluation questionnaire and its results (from 27 responses) confirmed the positive feedback. Voting from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest), participants gave the keynote presentations and the subsequent discussion on Day 1 an average score of 3.8 and 3.6 respectively. For Day 2, the initial overview of issues and subsequent group work with plenary sessions scored averages of 3.6 and 4.0 respectively. The initial part of Day 3 and the marketplace each scored an average of 3.9 points. Additional comments in the questionnaires gave particularly positive feedback regarding the skillful and supportive facilitation.

Closing

The floor was then given to the OEKR Chief, Andrea Sonnino, who said he had appreciated the diversity in the group and its different perspectives. He concluded by thanking everyone who had contributed to the success of the Consultation, including those from FAO and from outside FAO who had come together to share their experiences and wisdom during the three days; the organizers; and the facilitators.

ANNEX 1. Programme of the Expert Consultation

Monday 19 March 2012, Red Room

- 13.00 – 14.00 Registration
14.00 – 14.10 Welcome remarks – Keith Wiebe, FAO Agricultural Development Economics Division
14.10 – 14.20 Introduction - John Preissing, FAO Research and Extension Branch
14.20 – 14.40 Keynote presentation 1: The status of agricultural innovation systems - Riikka Rajalahti, World Bank
14.40 – 15.00 Keynote presentation 2: Role and responsibility of private sector in sustaining smallholder's family farming - Seemantinee Khot, Suzlon Group of Companies
15.00 – 15.45 Discussion of keynote presentations
15:45 – 16:15 Coffee
16.15 – 17.00 Discussion of keynote presentations
17.30 – 18.30 Reception with FAO Deputy Director-General, Ann Tutwiler

Tuesday 20 March 2012, David Lubin Library

- 08.30 – 09.10 Opening Session:
- Role play about Day 1
- Feedback on four pre-conference questions
- Presentation of seven key issues for group discussions
09.10 – 09.40 Discussion on the seven key issues
09.40 – 10.10 The State of Food and Agriculture - Jakob Skoet, FAO Agricultural Development Economics Division
10.10 – 10.40 Coffee
10.40 – 12.00 First round of group discussions
12.00 – 12.40 Plenary session
12.40 – 14.00 Lunch
14.00 – 15.10 Second round of group discussions
15.10 – 15.40 Coffee
15.40 – 17.00 Plenary session

Wednesday 21 March 2012, David Lubin Library

- 08.30 – 09.00 Opening Session:
- Role play about Day 2
- Reflections from the meeting
09.00 – 09.50 Discussion on two remaining key issues
09.50 – 10.15 Overview of FAO activities planned to support development of the publication
10.15 – 10.30 Coffee
10:30 – 11.30 Marketplace
11.30 – 11.45 Way forward
11.45 Evaluation and feedback
12.00 Closing

ANNEX 2. List of Participants¹⁴

Alberto Pantoja
Plant Production and Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Latin America and
the Caribbean
Av. Dag Hammarskjöld 3241, Vitacura
Santiago, Chile

Andrea Sonnino
Chief
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Arianna Carita
Consultant
FAO Policy Assistance Support Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Catherine Moreddu
Senior Agricultural Policy Analyst
Policies in Trade and Agriculture,
Trade and Agriculture Directorate
OECD
2 rue André Pascal
75775 Paris Cedex 16, France

David Kahan
Senior Marketing and Enterprise Development
Officer
FAO Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries
Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

Degi Chuulanbaatar
Agriculture Extension Officer
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Eleonora Paratore
Intern
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Franklin C. Moore

Senior Development Counselor
U.S. Mission to the UN Agencies in Rome
Via Boncompagni 2
00187 Rome, Italy

Franz Martin
Information and Knowledge Management
Officer
FAO Knowledge and Capacity for
Development Branch
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Gianluca Brunori
Professor
Agricultural economics and agro-food
economics,
University of Pisa
Via S. Michele degli Scalzi, 2
56124 Pisa, Italy

Guendalina Troiani
Intern
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Günter Hemrich
Programme Coordinator
FAO Economic and Social Development
Department
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Humphrey C.W. Mbugua
Technical Advisor / Secretary
Kenya Poultry Breeders A. Ltd
P.O. Box 60379-00200
City Square,
Nairobi, Kenya

Ian Mashingaidze
Programme Manager
Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources
Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN)
141 Cresswell Street,
Weavind Park 0184
Pretoria, South Africa

Isabel Alvarez
Consultor Internacional
Aptdo. Correos, 208
03580 Alfaz del Pi (Alicante), Spain

¹⁴ The Session on 19 March was also open to all FAO colleagues. People who attended only that Session are not included in the participants list.

Jakob Skoet
Economist
FAO Agricultural and Development
Economics Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

Javier Ekboir
Institutional Learning and Change Initiative
(ILCA)
c/o Bioversity International
Via dei Tre Denari 472a
00057 Maccarese, Italy

Jeroen Dijkman
Livestock Development Officer
FAO Livestock Information, Sector Analysis
and Policy Branch
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

Jervis Zimba
President
Zambia National Farmers Union
Head office
Farmers Village
Tiyende Pamodzi Road, Showgrounds
P.O. Box 30395
Lusaka 10101, Zambia

John Preissing
Senior Officer for Extension Systems
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

John Ruane
Consultant
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Karin Nichterlein
Agricultural Research Officer
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Keith Wiebe
Deputy Director
FAO Agricultural Development Economics
Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Kristin Davis
Director
Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services
(GFRAS)
Eschikon 28,
8315 Lindau, Switzerland

Magdalena Blum
Extension Systems Officer
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Magdi Latif
Knowledge and Information Management
Officer
FAO Regional Office for the Near East
11 El Eslah El Zerai Street
Dokki
Cairo, Egypt

Manuela Allara
Agricultural Officer
FAO Plant Production and Protection Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Mauro Bottaro
FAO Gender, Equity and Rural Employment
Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

May Hani
Communication Officer (Research and
Extension)
FAO Research and Extension Branch,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Nevena Alexandrova
Agricultural Research and Biotechnology
Officer
FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central
Asia
Benczur utca 34, H-1068,
Budapest, Hungary

Philip Pardey
Director,
International Science and Technology Practice
and Policy center (InSTePP)
Professor, Department of Applied Economics
1994 Buford Avenue
248B Ruttan Hall

St Paul MN 55108,
United States of America

Riikka Rajalati
Senior Agricultural Specialist
Agriculture and Rural Development
Department
World Bank
1818 H St, Washington DC, 20433,
United States of America

Seementinee Khot
Head, Corporate Social Responsibility
Suzlon Group
One Earth,
Hadaspar,
Pune 411 028, India

Sergio Ardila
Principal Project Economist
Environment, Rural Development, and
Disaster Risk Management Division
(INE/RND)
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
1300 New York avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20577
United States of America

Sophie Treinen
Information and Knowledge Management
Officer
FAO Knowledge and Capacity for
Development Branch
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Stephen Franzel

Principal Agricultural Economist and Leader,
Global Research on Marketing and Extension
World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)
P.O. Box 30677-00100
Nairobi, Kenya

Stephen Harris
Agribusiness and Horticultural Advisor
TechnoServe
Hemel Hempstead, United Kingdom

Suzanne Raswant
Chief
Latin America, the Caribbean, East Asia and
Pacific Service
FAO Investment Centre
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Tom Anyonge
Senior Technical Adviser for Rural Institutions
and Organizations
International Fund for Agricultural
Development (IFAD)
Via Paolo Di Dono 44,
00142 Rome, Italy

Virginia Cardenas
Professor
Institute of Governance and Rural
Development
College of Public Affairs and Development
University of the Philippines Los Banos
College,
Laguna 4031,
The Philippines

ANNEX 3. Composition of the Working Groups on Day 2

Working Group 1: Strengths/weaknesses of the AIS concept

Rapporteur: Isabel Alvarez
Facilitator: John Preissing
Other group members:
Manuela Allara
Degi Chuulanbaatar
Alberto Pantoja
Eleonora Paratore
John Ruane
Guendalina Troiani

Working Group 2: Approaches for promoting AIS

Rapporteur: Stephen Harris
Facilitator: Magdalena Blum
Other group members:
Virginia Cardenas
David Kahan
Seemantinee Khot
Alberto Pantoja
John Ruane
Guendalina Troiani

Working Group 3: Governance and funding

Rapporteur: Catherine Moreddu
Facilitator: John Preissing
Other group members:
Tom Anyonge
Mauro Bottaro
Riikka Rajalati
Suzanne Raswant
Jakob Skoet
Jervis Zimba

Working Group 4: The roles of different actors

Rapporteur: Franklin Moore
Facilitator: May Hani
Other group members:
Mauro Bottaro
Arianna Carita
Stephen Franzel
Günter Hemrich
Seemantinee Khot
Ian Mashingaidze
Humphrey Mbugua
Suzanne Raswant

Working Group 5: Ensuring research and knowledge are relevant and are applied

Rapporteur: Philip Pardey
Facilitator: Andrea Sonnino
Other group members:
Nevena Alexandrova
Isabel Alvarez
Arianna Carita
Javier Ekboir
Magdi Latif
Franz Martin
Humphrey Mbugua

Working Group 6: Measuring impact

Rapporteur: Ian Mashingaidze
Facilitator: May Hani
Other group members:
Sergio Ardila
Kristin Davis
Jeroen Dijkman
Stephen Franzel

Working Group 7A: Making a difference

Rapporteur: Sergio Ardila
Facilitator: Magdalena Blum
Other group members:
Tom Anyonge
Virginia Cardenas
Stephen Harris
David Kahan
Magdi Latif
Catherine Moreddu
Jervis Zimba

Working Group 7B: Making a difference

Rapporteur: Kristin Davis
Facilitator: Andrea Sonnino
Other group members:
Nevena Alexandrova
Jeroen Dijkman
Javier Ekboir
Magdi Latif
Franz Martin
Philip Pardey
Riikka Rajalati