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The attached paper, "Broadening Support for International Agricultural Research", is for discussion at the Ottawa meeting of the Group under Agenda Item 9. This covering note gives its background, summarizes the main points, and outlines issues the Group may wish to consider during the discussion.

Background

A November 1984 paper entitled, "Improving Communications About the CGIAR", reported to the Group on a program of work to broaden the understanding and support considered important to the continued growth of the CGIAR system. In June 1985, the Group requested that the Secretariat report on new initiatives in fundraising. In response, the Secretariat provided a preliminary paper, "Fundraising for the CGIAR", at the 1985 International Centers' Week. That paper focused on activities designed to attract new government members, and promised a more detailed paper on broadening non-governmental sources of support.

During the past several months, a draft paper on broadening support was widely circulated and elicited comments from centers, Group members and other interested individuals. The present paper reflects many of their observations and concerns.

Main points of the paper

1. Non-governmental support for the centers is as old as the CGIAR system, but it currently represents a small percentage of core budgets.

2. Support can take various forms; in cash or in kind or influence exerted on behalf of the CGIAR system. The term non-government encompasses many entities, including foundations, businesses, religious organizations, environmental groups, individuals and the general public.
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3. The accomplishments and impact of the CGIAR system and its potential for further development should be more widely appreciated throughout the world. At present only a relatively few people outside a small circle of donor representatives and scientists have a proper awareness of the accomplishments and present activities of CGIAR centers and related institutes involved in international agricultural research.

4. The present time is propitious to design and begin implementing a strategy to broaden awareness of the CGIAR, which should in time translate into increased support for centers and related institutes from a wide range of sources.

5. Private foundations, businesses and other groups can provide support in the form of money, expertise and in kind. As important, they can serve as constituencies encouraging continued government funding of the CGIAR.

6. Strategies for increasing awareness and support must be culturally sensitive and will probably vary from country to country. Therefore, the paper recommends establishing national support groups - lean and flexible organizations - ready to approach whatever constituencies are appropriate in their own countries, with objectives and methods that fit individual circumstances. In some countries they are needed, but in others they may not be necessary.

7. Support organizations would be independent entities, each governed by its own Directors or Trustees, on which would be represented individuals well connected to and representative of non-government institutions in their countries.

8. A number of concerns about broadening private support for international agricultural research are presented, along with suggested strategies to allay such concerns.

9. The paper concludes that broadening non-governmental sources of support is timely, necessary and possible, and that with appropriate safeguards this can be accomplished without distorting the present CGIAR system.

Issues for the Group to Consider

1. Does the Group recognize the principal conclusion of the paper that broadening support is necessary, should be undertaken along the lines suggested, and that national support groups be initiated in donor countries where circumstances are appropriate?

2. Are the concerns which some members of the Group have about potential dangers stemming from involvement of centers with non-government agencies adequately covered in the analysis?

3. Does the Group wish to give any guidance to its members, the centers, and the secretariat concerning the types of relationships that would be appropriate with non-government entities? Or about the balance support groups should adopt between public education on the one hand and mobilizing resources for the system on the other?

4. What arrangements should be made to give support groups and those who provide resources to them an opportunity to interact with centers, and with the CGIAR itself?
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BROADENING SUPPORT FOR
INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

I. Background

The CGIAR centers originated through the pioneering efforts in the 1960s of the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in creating the first four centers in the Philippines, Mexico, Nigeria and Colombia. During the first decade, the centers were funded almost entirely by these non-government institutions.

In 1970, when it became apparent that additional centers working on a range of problems were needed and that the foundations could not provide the required resources, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and the Food and Agricultural Organization jointly convened a series of meetings of other prospective members. The CGIAR developed from this beginning.

Since its creation, the CGIAR has grown from four centers funded by 16 donors at about $20 million to 13 centers with core contributions from about 40 donors of approximately $175 million in 1985. CGIAR centers currently receive 98 percent of their core funding from governments or international organizations, with 66 percent from government aid programs and 32 percent from international organizations. The original private foundation donors continue to provide support to the centers; at the present time their contributions account for 2 percent of the core budgets. Though relatively small, corporate contributions to centers have also been made periodically throughout the years.

II. Why Broaden Support?

Understandably, as reliance on government support has increased, the need to reach other constituencies has not been compelling. Consequently, few today outside a relatively small circle of individuals in government aid agencies and collaborating scientists have adequate knowledge of the CGIAR system or its achievements. For example, a comment on a draft of this paper was:

"Given the amount of documentation put out by the international centers I am quite surprised at the limited extent to which not only the public, but also the scientific community, are aware of their activities. I gave a paper on a center at a major international conference on drought-prone Africa held in London last November and was astonished to find out how few people knew anything about (the centers)...The audience was a group of scientists, administrators and policy makers who I would have thought would have been very well aware of the centers."
Recently, many Group members have expressed a need for greater recog-
nition of the centers outside of government in order to help assure continuing 
support. In some settings, serious concerns have also been raised concerning 
such heavy dependence on government funding to the exclusion of other sources 
of support. For example, one commentator on a draft of this paper stated:

"The experience of the last four years seems to show that unless new 
public donors can be brought in, the CGIAR has bumped into something 
like a ceiling on government/international organization support.

...Thus the system is faced with the urgent necessity to more widely 
publicize the CGIAR in the [U.S. and other] governments and simul-
taneously to start energetically to broaden the base of support."

Moreover, exporters of agricultural products from a number of industri-
alized countries, notably the United States, are opposing public funding of 
research to help developing countries increase production of these products. 
These developments indicate the necessity of starting now to reach out to new 
constituencies.

For the foreseeable future, it is likely that the CGIAR and the centers 
will continue to receive the great preponderance of their resources from 
governments and international organizations. To sustain and extend this 
support, it will be important for the system's accomplishments to become more 
widely appreciated. Therefore, to broaden the constituencies that understand 
and support its work, centers and members of the Group have in recent years 
encouraged the expansion of the CGIAR's public awareness and resource devel-
lopment activities.

III. How Can Support Be Broadened?

Whatever it is termed - public information, outreach or public relations 
- the effort to increase understanding of and sympathy for a cause depends on 
bringing the message to a range of audiences. It is necessary to identify 
the audiences to be addressed, and to produce materials designed specifically 
for each audience in each of the countries reached. Increased public aware-
ness can be an end in itself. Those results can range from encouraging 
governments to support the cause to raising broad-based financial resources 
from a variety of governmental and non-governmental sources.

Though increased public awareness can be an end in itself, resource 
development, or fundraising, is always ancillary to an information dissemina-
tion function. Some countries - notably the United States, Canada, and the 
United Kingdom - have had more experience than others in raising private 
support for ventures that will benefit the public at large. By contrast, in 
continental Europe and most developing countries, a tradition of reliance on 
the state for welfare, education, scientific research and other services has 
meant that large-scale, private fundraising has not developed. Nevertheless 
in most settings, it is understood that the term "resources" encompasses 
in-kind contributions of goods and/or services as well as money. Further, 
in all settings, the rule of effective fundraising is to request specific 
amount of support for specific purposes compatible with donor objectives and
readily comprehensible to non-specialists. Finally, rarely will private fundraising bring in amounts on the scale of government contributions to centers. In considering the initiation of a resource development effort, this means:

1. the development of well-informed public constituencies that can influence governments to continue or increase support should be a primary goal;
2. expectations for fundraising from non-governmental sources should be modest;
3. modest targeted funding for specific projects (e.g., fellowships or other training) will be easier to raise than core support, and
4. resources other than money (e.g., in-kind contributions) can sometimes be easier to raise than cash.

This paper presents a strategy to undertake public information and resource development efforts designed to create constituencies in CGIAR donor countries to support international agricultural research. These efforts would be focused in appropriate donor countries on international agricultural research as performed by private, self-governing entities such as the centers supported by the CGIAR and in some cases other similar institutions not supported by the CGIAR. They might also choose to contribute to organizations engaged in activities within their own countries which support such institutions, e.g., university-based research. All such non-CGIAR-related organizations engaged in international agricultural research are referred to in this paper as "related institutes".

In considering the issue of whether to confine outreach to CGIAR centers or encompass related institutes as well, sentiments have been expressed on both sides. Some have reservations about including non-CGIAR organizations in these efforts, others have strongly urged the adoption of a broader definition that would permit the participation of non-CGIAR institutions and activities. While restricting the number of institutions might be presumed to translate into more support for individual centers, most commentators recognized that it would be easier to elicit sympathy for the broader concept of international agricultural research. Further, the importance of this effort should not be impeded by potential rivalries. The centers' support of this position is evidenced by their willingness to provide start-up funds for the U.S. national support organization that will work to support international agricultural research in the U.S.A.

IV. National Support Organizations - A Strategy for Broadening Support

Public awareness of center research specifically, or international agricultural research more generally, varies considerably from country to country. The nature of government/non-government collaboration also differs across country lines. Vehicles for grantmaking to support scientific research also vary and often depend on country-specific legal and fiscal incentives. Furthermore, these incentives are in a state of flux. For example, the United Kingdom is greatly increasing its tax incentives for giving by offering a deduction from income tax for contributions for
"charitable" activities, such as scientific research. In the United States, according to the January 1986 issue of "BioScience", business now provides 10 percent more funding for university biotechnological research than for other university-based research in general and this increased funding is based on new interpretations of legal incentives. A new French tax has been enacted to support education — a departure from a tradition of reliance on the state.

a) **Flexibility** Clearly, any effort to increase support in different countries and cultures for centers and related institutes will necessarily be complex and will have to accommodate national differences in political philosophy, in the nature of philanthropy, the voluntary sector, the scientific research community and business involvement with development and research issues.

Accordingly, the secretariat, with the guidance of centers and some Group members, is developing a strategy of creating national support organizations, reflecting appropriate local leadership, in countries that already contribute to the Group. Such support organizations will work with a range of local audiences (e.g., scientific, political, general public) and their methods of increasing support will depend on which audience they are addressing. The function of these support organizations will differ from country to country. In some instances, their function may be restricted to building influential constituencies that support the concept; in some countries, it may be decided that a support organization is not appropriate; in others, it may be decided to augment the public information function by raising funds. (See Annex I for a description of two possible models for national support organizations.)

While support groups themselves will be national in character, it is expected that they will be linked informally either by some overlap in boards, by network mechanisms such as communication links and meetings or by the secretariat, centers or group members acting as catalysts for communications. (National committees of UNICEF provide an interesting model of an informal network of private groups that work at country levels to support the work of that United Nations agency.)

b) **Definition of "Support"** Support is defined in the broadest possible terms, and includes:

1. Increasing understanding of the accomplishments and potential of agricultural research;

2. Increasing awareness of the international centers and, where appropriate, related institutes;

3. Promoting a climate that encourages continued government support in donor countries for agricultural research institutions;

4. Gathering information for the international centers and, as appropriate, related institutes in selected countries on private sector interest in agricultural research;
5. Providing support-raising material written in lay language on agricultural research, past achievements of centers, the work of the CGIAR system and case statements on reasons to support agricultural research;

6. Providing similar materials, as appropriate, for related institutes;

7. Promoting the exchange of ideas and information between institutes, CGIAR and public supporters (for example, support groups could hold periodic seminars for different audiences on work being done);

8. Encouraging links between domestic research organizations in a specific country and centers/related institutes in developing countries;

9. Gathering information on and acting as a catalyst for possible collaborative projects between centers/related institutes and business; and

10. Seeking funds or in-kind contributions from specific contributors, and as non-profit organizations established to further a scientific purpose, receiving contributions on behalf of centers or related institutes when a direct relationship between donor and center/institute is not practical.

e) Definition of Constituencies: The support organizations are intended to reach constituencies of potential supporters that might include, for example:

1. foundations and trusts;

2. policy-makers, i.e., ministers, parliamentarians, policy advisers, decision-makers in inter-governmental and financial institutions, leaders of agricultural research in donor countries;

3. corporations;

4. commodity organizations;

5. trade associations;

6. religious organizations;

7. press and media representatives;

8. scientists;

9. farmers and farmer organizations;

10. representatives of non-profit organizations, such as Live Aid and Band Aid, that provide funds for development projects;

11. representatives of private voluntary organizations or non-governmental organizations that work in developing countries; and

12. the public (particularly, the interested lay public).
These constituencies in differing proportions comprise the influential public of each CGIAR donor country, but the definition and importance of each group for agricultural research will differ considerably from country to country. It is unlikely that any support organization will choose to address every constituency.

d. Responsibilities The creation of national support organizations is not intended to supplant the public information or fund-raising efforts of individual centers, related institutes or the CGIAR itself. Rather, national support organizations are intended to augment and assist these efforts. Centers must continue to maintain direct relationship with donors, an important operational principle of the CGIAR system.

Group members' guidance and active involvement will be important in the creation of effective national support organizations. The CGIAR secretariat, in cooperation with centers and, as appropriate, related institutes, will help plan and establish national support organizations. Once launched, they will function as independent entities, with full responsibility for their own activities. They are intended to be small, flexible, low-budget operations, with responsibility for raising their own administrative budgets as well as seeking support for centers and related institutes. They will, however, coordinate their activities with centers and related institutes.

V. Allaying Concerns About Reaching Out to New Constituencies

Broadening constituencies may bring added complexities to an already complex CGIAR system. The system already accommodates the viewpoints of 24 governments, ten international organizations, several private foundation members and the very many institutions with whom the centers interact in networking and cooperative research. Aware of these complexities and various concerns expressed by Group members, the secretariat has moved slowly and deliberately in implementing a strategy to develop broader support for the system.

Some members of the Group have expressed concern that substantial infusions of non-government support would adversely affect donor governments' decisions to continue funding the system at the same or higher levels. The assumption underlying the question is that government support can be expected to continue indefinitely at the same or increased levels. As mentioned earlier, in some countries there is evidence to the contrary. One individual familiar with the situation has commented that the system needs:

"...well organized support groups outside the government knowledgeable as to how to bring pressure to resist cuts and to press their position successfully...The urgency is clear, and the efforts of national support organizations should be focused sharply on maintaining and if possible expanding the level of public support and striving to identify and exploit private sources of support."

Other concerns have been raised about the implications of seeking support from non-profit institutions and businesses.
Non-profit foundations, trusts and non-governmental organizations working for third-world development are dedicated to advancing public welfare. Possible problems associated with outreach to these kinds of organizations are minimal, with a conspicuous exception. That is, to most private agencies, the CGIAR system and many centers appear large and well-funded.

Smaller trusts and foundations will have to be convinced that relatively modest contributions are important to the system or to a center. To convince them, national support groups must provide clear options for the use of relatively small infusions of funding, such as fellowships or training. Other options include: collection and preservation of endangered germplasm; research on a specific crop; research on an animal disease prevalent in the CGIAR donor country with an analogue in developing countries; and TAC's 1985 priority paper list of specific unmet research needs.

Support organizations will have to be sensitive to a possible perception that the system is a "rich" organization, competing for scarce resources and putting development organizations like Oxfam, Medicins Sans Frontiers and Save the Children in some jeopardy with their fund-raising public. In fact, such potential problems can be overcome, if recognized and handled with sensitivity to local structures. For example, cooperative programs between national support organizations and other development groups may help.

Possible issues arising out of working with businesses are more complex. Center/business collaboration is not new. For example:

1. IRRI has received local currency contributions toward a building for training purposes, as well as gifts of equipment from a U.S.-based multi-national corporation; IITA has also recently received appreciable sums of local currencies from several local companies;

2. A Swiss-based pharmaceutical company is engaged in a cooperative project with ICRISAT in Africa;

3. A British corporation has a scientist working at IITA;

4. A US-based corporation has a longstanding cooperative research project with CIMMYT;

5. CIP has a contract with a US-based biotechnology firm to do innovative research in biological pest control.

In spite of this history, questions persist concerning business support for CGIAR centers and related institutes. In response, several points should be emphasized.

First, it is important to acknowledge the changing climate of opinion in developing countries toward business activities. The success stories of the newly-industrialized countries have influenced poorer countries to be more receptive to business initiatives. Moreover, faced with economic disasters, many poorer third world countries have lately become more receptive to privatization of state-owned enterprises. The
World Bank and other development agencies have been active in their support of privatization. Alternatively, the aid community is considering the inhibiting effect of state monopolies and encouraging competition from businesses. These changing ideas are dramatic shifts from those of the 1960s and 1970s.

Second, it is important to note that some donors (e.g. the World Bank) are encouraging public sector institutions to work increasingly with the 'private sector'. This policy is consistent with the goal of broadening the base of CGIAR support to include collaboration with businesses, the scientific community and other private sector constituencies.

Third, some CGIAR members have a long-held perception that multinational businesses, particularly those operating in developing countries, have goals antithetical to those of government institutions. Furthermore, there is a perception that business support has "strings attached". In fact, center experience has been that business gifts have been given without strings and have been as altruistically given as those of other donors.

Fourth, many multinational corporations have responded to criticisms - many of them justified - raised by developing countries. Corporations have developed sophisticated corporate responsibility programs that include grants, in-kind contributions, sharing of personnel and contracting with non-profit organizations to assure their work is culturally sensitive.

Changing attitudes of developing countries policy-makers and aid administrators toward business and greater sensitivity of business in working in third-world cultures, are good reasons for considering concerted efforts to involve businesses with centers and related institutes. However, in such potentially sensitive relationships, it seems wise to try to guard against possible problems. The following list suggests approaches that might help safeguard the integrity of the system and the centers:

First, funds provided by a private entity restricted to a purpose serving that entity's direct interests probably poses the most difficult problem. Possible guidelines for center decisions to accept such support include: for large projects, a board determination (and for relatively modest projects, a Director General's determination) that (a) the project is consistent with the center's on-going research; (b) the center has excess capacity that easily accommodates the project; (c) the center gains expertise it needs in its on-going work; or (d) the center realizes another benefit for its overall activities. Collaboration is also a possibility when a private organization has important expertise not possessed by a center.

Second, private organizations, particularly businesses are just as likely to give equipment or exchange scientists as they are to give money. As these types of in-kind contributions are often as valuable as money and may not carry the same connotations of gifts of money, the system should be alert to and encourage such contributions.
Third, companies, particularly high technology companies, may have skills and know-how not possessed by centers. Centers, for their part, may have facilities that can be of use to such companies. In such situations, the companies can contribute invaluable and otherwise unattainable expertise to centers.

Fourth, when working with non-profit research institutions, businesses typically raise the question of proprietary rights to an invention because businesses do not typically invest large sums in projects for which they do not own proprietary rights. The CGIAR does not have a written policy in this area and has traditionally taken the view of favoring the free flow of ideas. Centers decide the issues on a case by case basis. Many aid agencies, including World Health Organization and Agency for International Development's malaria vaccine program, have recently recognized that business expertise is critical to the development and distribution of certain pharmaceuticals designed for third world application. Accordingly, they have shifted their patent policies to allow appropriate exclusivity to some companies. These matters do not lend themselves easily to hypothetical cases. Accordingly, the present practice of dealing at the center level seems appropriate, with a case by case determination of the question of proprietary rights. It should also be recognized that centers with some kinds of products - e.g., vaccines - are likely to have to face these issues sooner than others.

Fifth, group membership is presently confined to governments, development institutions and foundations. It is unlikely that any single private donor other than a large foundation or non-profit trust fund would wish to assume the responsibilities of membership in the Group, but the issue of Group membership may have to be faced with regard to a national support group that regularly raises more than one-half of a million dollars annually. In any event, there might have to be a new advisory structure, designed to relate to the many organizations that will become direct or indirect CGIAR supporters through a possible network of national support organizations.

Sixth, supporter assistance from private entities could be channeled to activities where there is minimal opportunity for a conflict of interest, training of developing country nationals being a case in point.

On balance, in some countries, the advantages of seeking broader support from foundations, businesses and other appear to outweigh the risks. Where the integrity of the system or a center is in question, the issues can probably be foreseen and avoided or, as they arise, can be resolved without distorting the system.
VI. Start-up Steps

As something of an experiment, and to take advantage of an opportunity to utilize blocked currencies in some countries to help fund some center activities, the first national public support organization was recently established in the United States - the International Fund for Agricultural Research ("IFAR"). IFAR is non-profit in character, has an initial board of trustees, and has received a determination from the Internal Revenue Service that contributions to it are deductible from income tax. The secretariat has obtained informal funding commitments to start IFAR.

Preliminary enquiries have been made toward establishing similar organizations in several other donor countries. As is to be expected, the views of those with whom it has been discussed so far have varied. Some have indicated that resource raising per se would be an acceptable immediate function for a support organization, others have said it would not be needed or be appropriate in their circumstances at this juncture. Almost all have indicated that there is a need, in some cases a pressing need, to more actively promote the CGIAR and that this should be the principal and most immediate function of a support organization in their countries. One or two have said that an active support organization, with good linkages to non-governmental entities, could be a most effective way to sustain government support for the CGIAR.

The secretariat believes that, on the basis of views received so far: (a) there is scope for initiating support organizations in a number of countries, (b) that the objectives and priorities of each support organization will differ depending upon local circumstances, (c) in a number of countries support organizations are unlikely to be appropriate for some time to come, and (d) it would be worth promoting the concept where circumstances justify it.

VII. Conclusion

The strategy of reaching wider constituencies is appropriate for the CGIAR at this point in its development. Privately supported at the start, the system has moved to primary dependence on a large and still growing number of governments and international organizations. In some donor countries it is a natural evolution for the centers and the Group to seek additional sources of support that will not only contribute resources but will also reinforce those already contributing. Support means more than cash; it embraces gifts of equipment, exchanges of personnel, public information activities, and influence with policy makers and local leaders. The Group and the centers will wish to monitor with care the expansion of the support base to assure there is no distortion of the system. In many donor countries, widening the sources and types of support through the proposed national support organizations will strengthen the system and help create a sounder future for the CGIAR and international agricultural research generally.
ANNEX I

A DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS

1. Organization

There are at least two possible organizational models for National Support Organizations ("NSOs"). Under the first model, an NSO would be a free-standing organization incorporated under the laws of the host country and with its own board of trustees responsible for setting policies and programs. Under the second, an NSO organization might be affiliated with an existing non-profit institution in a host country and have a board of advisors serving the function of overseeing the NSO's policies and programs.

The first type of NSO would be a nonprofit organization, with charters or articles of incorporation specifying the objective of enhancing international agricultural research. In appropriate jurisdictions, these organizations will be exempt from taxation. Where local law permits, contributions to them will be deductible from corporate and/or individual income tax. The United States support organization, the International Fund for Agricultural Research ("IFAR"), has been established along these lines.

The second type of NSO would be established in concert with an existing body. Both the United Kingdom and France offer illustrations of host countries that suggest this possibility. Charities Aid in the United Kingdom and the Fondation de France in France are special institutions that serve the charitable community by providing the administrative back-up to associated charitable trusts. It might be possible for an NSO to link up with this type of organization. In other countries, there might be an existing non-profit organization with compatible goals and a board that wishes to take on the issues of concern to the NSO.

There will be pros and cons in every jurisdiction as to whether to establish a new organization or affiliate with an existing one. For example, a separate body potentially has more visibility and the prospects of attracting more entrepreneurial leadership. Affiliating with an ongoing institution offers the NSO the advantage of favorable tax treatment at no or little extra legal costs, expertise of an existing administrative staff and colleagues who know generally the community in which the NSO will function. The route to be followed will depend on legal, financial and other circumstances at the time the NSO is begun.

2. Objectives

An NSO can have a multiplicity of objectives. They will range from making the concept of international agricultural research better known to a wider public, to increasing support from influential members of the public for international agricultural research, to raising additional resources for research or centers. Each NSO will have the freedom to establish its own set of objectives, based on first-hand knowledge of its country and culture.

The CGIAR and centers are not well known outside a small circle of aid administrators and interested scientists. The concept and benefits of international agricultural research are even less well understood.
The major initial objective of NSOs would be to increase public awareness of international agricultural research. They would also focus on the role of centers and related institutions in promoting international agricultural research. As awareness and interest grows, this information function would be more sophisticated — tailoring it to specialized audiences. The primary by-product of achieving public awareness will be the creation in donor countries of influential constituencies that support international agricultural research in government circles, in the media and elsewhere.

A subsidiary but important longer term objective of starting NSOs will be to broaden the resource base for the system, centers and related institutions. Resource development will include marshalling in-kind contributions and identifying possible collaborative ventures. In some countries, it will eventually mean initiating fundraising activities for target programs such as fellowship or specific crop research or for core support.

3. Boards of Trustees or Boards of Advisors of NSOs

Any effort to increase public understanding and support of the Group's work in different countries and cultures will necessarily be complex and will have to accommodate national differences in the nature of philanthropy, the voluntary sector, the scientific research community and business involvement with development issues. One way to assure that NSOs reflect the character of the host country is for boards of trustees or advisors to be composed of the following types of leaders:

a. business;
b. philanthropy;
c. trade associations;
d. scientists;
e. farmers;
f. non-profit, voluntary organizations (referred to in some countries, as non-governmental organizations and in other countries, as private voluntary organizations);
g. statesmen (former Ministers of Government, former Heads of State);
h. environmentalists.

Initial boards of NSOs will differ from more broadly representative boards that evolve over time. With the advice of host country governments, CG members, centers, the secretariat and other interested friends, initial boards will probably be small [5-7 people?]. They will be composed of recognized leaders, most likely from the business, related technical and philanthropic sectors. They are likely to be people who have an existing interest in agricultural research, some knowledge of the CGIAR system and the centers, and a desire to help create and make operational an organization that will promote international agricultural research. An example of the kind of person who would be an ideal candidate as an initial board member is a current or former member of the board of one of the private foundations or trusts that supports the system and who is also a business or academic leader.
The initial board would be charged with the responsibility of designing the initial program of work for the NSO and deciding how that work is to be carried out (for example, through paid staff or through volunteers).

As the NSO evolves, its board will be expanded to reflect the expertise needed. Later boards, depending on the circumstances in the country, the nature of the NSO itself and the interest that it generates could be as large as thirty people, representing the broad spectrum of private sector institutions and experience listed above.

4. Policies and Programs

Initial work of the NSO will be to establish short and long-term goals and to decide on appropriate mechanisms to achieve the goals set.

In the area of public information, for example, the first priority will be to determine which audiences the NSO wishes to reach first. Appropriate materials will be designed, drawing on the centers, members and the secretariat's existing stock of materials and talent, to assist in reaching these audiences. These materials will be used by board members, staff and other volunteers to interest these audiences. In all of this work, care should be taken not to duplicate the expertise that exists elsewhere in the system. So, for example, the secretariat, centers or members may provide needed expertise in explaining the system or a particular line of research to a group of parliamentarians or to a consortium of non-governmental organizations.

Where non-governmental fund-raising work is an appropriate goal, it will be necessary to design specialized material for special donor audiences. Foundations require proposals that differ in form and content from government donors; likewise corporations have different requirements; Band Aid and Live Aid have their own approaches. Follow-up with funding sources will be critical.

5. Sample Work Plan to Initiate an NSO

The establishment of an effective and viable NSO requires substantial groundwork before it can become fully operational. The following is a sample work plan that illustrates the type of steps that should be taken:

a. Retain staff (whether permanent or temporary, paid or volunteer must depend on the circumstances of each individual NSO).

b. Do extensive research to identify individuals who would be interested in helping think through the formation of the NSO, and who might be willing to join an initial board. Likely candidates would generally have some knowledge of and interest in work of international agricultural research centers (i.e., foundation leaders, scientists, agribusiness executives), but possibly could include statesmen with little prior knowledge of centers' work but a strong belief in the necessity of agricultural research as one way of helping the developing world.
c. Develop a statement of mission or case to explain the reasons the NSO has been established. This will serve as the basic document to introduce the NSO to the individuals described in 1. above.

d. Develop a strategic plan and a budget for the NSO. The strategic plan must answer, at least preliminarily, questions like: What are the short and long-term objectives of the NSO? How much will it cost to achieve them? How is the NSO going to raise the initial funds to allow it to come into existence?

e. Once a few individuals express willingness to help increase public awareness of the NSO, extensive research will begin in order to locate others, from a variety of fields, who should learn of the NSO's existence. Fields will include business, academia, government agencies not directly concerned with agricultural research but interested in third world development, the press and media. Appropriate individuals will be invited to a meeting hosted by a prominent individual or organization. The meeting will have a dual purpose: it will disseminate information about the NSO and international agricultural research, and also serve as an excellent mechanism to begin recruitment of NSO board members.

f. The momentum of the meeting will be sustained if there is appropriate follow-up, which will vary according to interest of participants.

g. Even when fund-raising activities have been initiated by centers and not by NSO's, NSO's will be available to do necessary follow-up work, such as sustaining the initial contact, writing proposals and generally being responsive to the needs of potential donors.

These six or seven proposed steps are by way of illustration only. They suggest how an NSO might proceed, but would be modified according to local circumstances.