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Dear Mr. Johnson:

SUBJECT: SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS OF LEADERS OF AFRICAN NARS ON THE STRUCTURE,
GOVERNANCE AND ORGANISATION OF THE CGIAR AND IARCS

Please find attached, a report entitled, "CGIAR and IARC Governance, Organisation and Structure: An African Perspective". The report provides a synthesis of views of African NARS leaders on the structure, governance and organisation of the CGIAR and IARCs. It is being submitted to you as the contribution of the African NARS leaders to the on-going discussions on the structure, and organisation of the system. It has been prepared by a team, representing the three Sub-Regional Organisations (ASARECA, CORAF/WECARD and SACCAR), which met here in Entebbe, on 16-17 October 2000.

The views and recommendations in this document represent a synthesis of discussions and observations of African NARS leaders, made in the different fora over the past five years as we have met and deliberated on agricultural research and development issues on this continent. Notable among these fora are the internal discussions, which have taken place in each of the Sub-Regional Organisations (ASARECA, CORAF/WECARD and SACCAR), where we have deliberated on, among other things, our collaborative programmes with the IARCs. This, therefore, does provide our collective view on what changes we think should be made to the structure and governance system of the IARCs and CGIAR to make them more responsive to the needs of agricultural development on this continent.

In developing our views, we also had the benefit of having before us the recommendations of the Synthesis Group of the CGIAR Oversight Committee (we wish to thank Mr. Andrew Bennett, the Chairman of the Committee for availing to us the document prepared at the Sonning, U.K. meeting of October 4-5, 2000). We also had the views and recommendations of the CDC/CBC following their retreat in The Hague of September 2000. We also thank Dr. Fernando Chaparro,
the Executive Secretary of GFAR for assistance, which GFAR has provided to FARA to facilitate some of our meetings.

We do hope that the CGIAR system will receive and consider these recommendations, among others, in its discussions during ICW 00. We are prepared to make a presentation and elaborate on any points, to the plenary session or working groups at ICW 2000. We look forward to a fruitful discussion on a new structure for the CGIAR.

With best regards
Yours sincerely

Joseph K. Mukiibi
Chairman, FARA

CC:
(i) Chairpersons and Executive Secretaries of SROs (ASARECA, CORAF, SACCAR)
(ii) Dr. Fernando Chaparro, Executive Secretary, GFAR/NARS Secretariat
(iii) Dr. Robert Thompson, Director Rural Development, The World Bank
(iv) Dr. Alexander von der Osten, Executive Secretary, CGIAR
(v) Dr. Andrew Bennett, Chairperson, Oversight Committee
(vi) Dr. Moctar Toure, Executive Secretary, SPAAR, The World Bank
INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1990s, there has been an increasing concern on the impact of agricultural research systems in sustainably increasing agricultural productivity and production and thus contributing to economic growth and poverty eradication. Nowhere has this concern been more pronounced than in sub-Saharan Africa. While the CGIAR system and its IARCs, jointly with the NARSs, were the main players in the Green Revolution of the 1960s/1970s, which led to significant improvements in the food security, incomes and economic growth of the countries of Asia and Latin America, the situation in Africa has been less than satisfactory. Thus over the past 30 years, per capita food production has declined, export of cash crops has stagnated and there has been increased environmental degradation in many parts of the continent.

As it was noted by the Third CGIAR Systemwide Review of 1998, while the CGIAR has been spending about 40% of its resources in Africa, success has been limited except in instances such as in the control of cassava mealy bug, and the dissemination of improved varieties of maize, wheat, cassava and a few other crops. The report further notes that fully one third of the population in sub-Saharan Africa will be food insecure in 2010. A number of reasons have been given for this state of affairs – poor policies, weak NARSs, etc. However, since the 1980s, considerable improvement in agricultural policies has occurred and increased investments have been made in strengthening the NARSs as well as other technology transfer institutions.

Through the Sub-Regional Organisations (SROs) - ASARECA, CORAF/WECARD and SACCAR, NARS scientists are increasingly cooperating in joint research projects in regional networks and programmes. The IARCs have contributed to supporting these efforts although more could have been achieved if the organisational structure of the NARSs and IARCs were such that they complement each other. In response to the recommendations of the systemwide review report of 1998, NARSs, SROs and IARCs have held several consultations [so called Meetings of Minds (MOM)] on a new CGIAR strategy for SSA. Progress on this has been reported in CGIAR plenary sessions in Beijing (MTM 99), Washington, D.C. (ICW 99) and Dresden (MTM 00).

In Dresden, it was noted that the elements of a framework for better coordination of future CGIAR activities in Africa had been developed, and its implementation will be influenced by, among other things, discussions on the CGIAR structure, as well as internal developments in the SROs (their strategy development, etc.). As the CGIAR and IARCs are such important players in agricultural research in Africa, NARSs leaders on the
continent have discussed in various fora the strategies and partnerships of this system. Notable issues of concern include, among others, congruence (or lack of it) of priorities of IARCs and NARSs in a sub-region, the structure of the system, its longevity and sustainability; exploration of opportunities for the system to be more involved in capacity building, as well as avail specialist services and facilities; competition between IARCs (and at times even divisions within one IARC) leading to each wishing to establish its own enclave in the NARSs.

In response to the on-going discussions on the structure, organisation and governance of the CGIAR system, representatives of African NARS leaders met in Entebbe, Uganda on 16-17 October 2000 to discuss and prepare an African perspective on this issue. This document summarises the deliberations of the Entebbe consultation, which draws on various other discussions held over the past 5 years in the Committees of Directors of the three SROs (ASARECA, CORAF and SACCAR) as well as in the Regional Organisation (RO), FARA. This is, therefore, the African NARS/SRO/RO contribution to the on-going discussions on the structure and governance of the CGIAR system.

THE SETTING

The CGIAR system has been in existence for about thirty years now since its formal establishment in 1971. Prior to that, the four first generation IARCs had existed as independent centres under the Foundations (Ford and Rockefeller) since the 1960s. Two of these four centres (IRRI & CIMMYT) had evolved into independent international centres from the research programmes/projects of the Foundations, which had been operational since the 1940s and 1950s. A poignant point to note, in this respect, is that the first four centres (IRRI, CIMMYT, IITA and CIAT) were essentially ecoregional, established to undertake research in their respective regions. While IRRI and CIMMYT focussed on rice (for Asia), as well as maize and wheat (largely for Latin America) respectively, IITA and CIAT focussed on the tropical regions of Africa and Latin America.

With the expansion of the system in the 1970s and 1980s, nearly all the centres assumed global mandates either on particular commodities and/or on particular ecoregions. Thus IITA assumed a global mandate on bananas, cowpeas, etc, while new centres were established for the semi-arid (ICRISAT) and arid zones (ICARDA), among other things. Funding also increased considerably and the system expanded and established research stations and/or posted scientists to many parts of the developing world. Suffice it, therefore, to state that the CGIAR and IARC activities in SSA started in their earnest in 1970s when construction of IITA facilities was completed at Ibadan.
In considering the structure for the system for the twenty-first century, African NARS leaders would like to propose that the process takes cognisance of the following points/principles/issues.

THE WORLD HAS CHANGED

While it was reasonable to assume in the 1950s and 1960s that agriculture in the entire third world countries was, by and large, at the same level of technological development, it is quite apparent that the world is quite different now than it was 40 years ago, when the CGIAR system was crafted. Major changes have occurred in the political, economic and technological arenas which make it necessary to review the structures set up in the 1970s so as to create new structures which are more in consonance with the situation at the beginning of the 21st century and beyond. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the use of yield enhancing inputs (see Table 1) in agricultural production. Similar trends are also observed in other factors which facilitate growth in agricultural productivity and production – e.g., agricultural institutions, infrastructure, etc. The first proposition, therefore, is that:

The CGIAR system and the IARCs it superintends should be structured and organised taking cognisance of the level of technological development of the different regions of the world. From the African perspective, the structure should facilitate and catalyse the goal of African NARs and countries to increase agricultural productivity, as well as natural resource management and achieve much higher growths in agricultural production than was achieved in the 1960s to 1990s. In other words, Africans have got to run while others are walking.

The above is consistent with the recommendations of the systemwide review – as given in recommendation 10 on SSA, and the strategy for agricultural research in Africa as developed by FARA/SPAAR and endorsed in 1999 by the CGIAR.

Table 1: Input Use in Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertiliser (Kg/ha)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated Land as a percentage of cultivated area</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors in use</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IARCS SHOULD ADD VALUE TO NARS EFFORTS

In 1999, the 16 IARCs employed 907 international staff (most of them being internationally recruited scientists). If it is assumed that the number working in Africa or on African problems is proportional to the level of CGIAR expenditure on the continent (at 42%) then about 380 of these international scientists were working on Africa or on African problems. At the same time the NAROs (NARIs and faculties of agriculture) in SSA employed over 6000 scientists (FTE). Empirical evidence from Asia and Latin America shows that the success of the Green Revolution, while catalysed by the work of the IARC scientists, was based to a large degree on having well organised and strong NARS.

Further, there was a clear distinction of what was done by the IARCs and what the NARS scientists did. Of late, due to, among other things, the structure (IARCs competing to demonstrate impact in isolated enclaves) or priorities and strategies of the entire system (push towards more downstream work) the distinction between what the IARC scientists and NARS scientists are doing is becoming increasingly blurred. In our view, the IARC scientists should add value to what the NARS scientists are doing rather than trying to duplicate, in isolated enclaves, what the latter are doing. If the problem is that the NARSs are not well organised to fulfil their role, then the system should endeavour to help the NARSs to reorganise and restructure to be able to work effectively and efficiently rather than international scientists trying to do work in which they have no comparative advantage. This leads us to the second proposition:

The structure of the system should be such that the IARC scientists add value to what the NARS are doing. The centres should be reorganised to ensure that their role in the different regions is clearly defined and the two systems (i.e., IARCs and NARSs) complement each other. It should also avoid overloading the NARS with competing partnerships. If possible NARSs should deal with much fewer centres than the current sixteen.

This may well require a restructuring of both the NARSs (especially in SSA where many are small) as well as the IARCs but it is better to undertake this exercise if agricultural research and technology transfer systems are going to play their appropriate role in rural development. In our view the impact of the IARCs should be measured more by what they have done to help the NARSs to work as effective and efficient institutions for the farmers in the region. There is a tendency to blame the lack of impact on weaknesses of the NARS rather than the IARCs undertaking self-criticism to ascertain whether they do not themselves compound the problems of the NARSs.
While considerable efforts have been made over the past 4 decades to strengthen the NARS, it is also quite apparent that there is a limit to how far we can go in this regard. Given the fact that most NARSs in Africa are likely to remain small (with less than 100 scientists) there will be quite a number of specialised services and activities which they cannot each perform/undertake. If the farmers in this region are to benefit from world class science, it is apparent that such services should be set up regionally to exploit economies of scale and scope. The IARCs at the moment perform a limited number of such services. However, the current structure with global mandates is vertically integrated – if a scientist in Congo wants a specialist service on beans, he/she has to take his/her samples all the way to Cali, Colombia. There is no question, therefore, that the NARS in Africa will require some specialised services and support and the CGIAR system and IARCs, if properly restructured, are best suited to provide them.

Secondly, the current structure of the system is based on centres having global mandates on commodities. Most of the commodities are food crops/livestock. The system does not deal with cash crops or export crops. The strategy of the system focuses on poverty eradication and natural resource management. This is supposed to be attained through increased food production and incomes for the rural poor, and reduced food prices (through increased productivity) for the urban poor. To facilitate cheaper food or increased incomes through selling of surplus produce by farmers may require investments in non-research factors (e.g., roads, transport systems, etc.). To provide this, governments have to ensure not only economic growth but also more exports in an increasingly competitive world. Productivity of cash crops has to increase and hence the research system has to play an increasing role here. This includes high value commodities, which are exportable.

Thirdly, the agricultural sector will have to produce an even greater amount of food to feed an ever increasing urban population – expected to be more than 50% of total population of most African countries in the next ten years. The political reality is such that governments in Africa cannot rely on subsistence farmers (who only market a small proportion of their produce and only in good years and are increasingly ageing) but will rely more on commercial farmers (be they small, medium or large scale) who market a substantial part of their produce.

The technology development and transfer systems at national or regional or international levels have to pay increasing attention not only to increasing productivity on the farm, but also to developing technologies and systems as well as provide policy advice which ensures that whatever is produced on the farm is efficiently processed, transported and
marketed to an increasing urban population, as well as to an increasingly competitive and globalised world market.

The NARSs, therefore, require integrated regional centres, with world class facilities, to support their efforts rather than those with only a food commodity/factor mandate located in some far off corner of the world. Such regional centres will also provide NARSs in Africa with such specialist services which are uneconomical to establish nationally. This leads to the third proposition:

The structure and objectives of the CGIAR centres in Africa should be such that they enable the NARSs and other technology development and transfer institutions operating in the sub-region and/or region to become efficient and effective institutions and organisations serving the farmers of the region to increase productivity and production not only to meet national and regional food demands but also to increase production of export crops to increasingly competitive global markets.

Such a role for the IARCs can best be achieved by having an integrated regional centre which helps the NARSs and farmers in the sub-region/region to identify and exploit technical and economic opportunities for increased agricultural production and thus leading to poverty eradication through economic growth.

Further, the IARC in a sub-region/region should provide specialist and technical services in areas in which it is uneconomical to establish such facilities at national level. This can be done for a fee or gratis.

It is unlikely that the current system with 16 global centres can perform such a role effectively and efficiently and hence the urgent need to transform the CGIAR.

**ROLE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

There is no question that the private sector (both local and international) will play an increasing role in agricultural technology development and transfer. This is particularly the case with biotechnology and other proprietary products (herbicides, pesticides, machinery and equipment). Such private sector products will have to be licensed. There is need to test and licence them to ensure that their use does not lead to environmental and/or human health hazards. Given the complexities of the technologies involved, it is likely that many of the NARS in Africa will not be able to set up and finance the testing and licensing facilities required. Doing this regionally helps to save costs to the benefit of
both the private sector, as well as to the farmers and owners of the technology. At the same time there is need to ensure that the region's natural resources and germplasm are not unfairly expropriated and exploited by the private sector. If the private sector is to do this, it will be necessary to set up mechanisms where it can be licensed, pay royalties, which can then be used for the benefit of the people of the region. Such testing, licensing facilities can be handled economically by a regional centre. This leads to the fourth proposition:

In considering the structure of the CGIAR, it is important to factor in the role which the private sector will play in the development of proprietary products for agricultural production. Many of these products being developed by the private sector will need to be tested and/or licensed to ensure maximum environmental and human health safety. Further, there is also need to ensure that the private sector does not unfairly expropriate the natural resources of these regions and turn them into proprietary products. Given the complexities of all these issues and technologies, and the expensive nature of the facilities required, the NARSs in SSA will be greatly facilitated if they have a nationally and internationally accepted public centre within the region to undertake these tasks. This will also be to the benefit of the private sector.

NEED FOR SOME GLOBAL CENTRES

Notwithstanding the recommendations for regional international centres with exclusive regional mandate as outlined in the previous propositions, there will still be a need for a limited number of international centres with a global mandate. These will handle the issues which are crosscutting globally and in which there are economies of scale and scope in handling them globally. Such centres will be global, do very upstream work and could be organised around the following factors:

i  Germplasm and biodiversity – deal with such things as genebanks, conservation of plant and animal genetic resources, etc.

ii Advanced crop and forestry research – handle things which can best be done at global level on their own or in collaboration with international regional centres or advanced research institutes (including water and natural resource management technologies).

iii Agricultural policies and institutions – deal with cross cutting policy issues, IPR, institutions, organisations and management systems for agricultural and rural development.
Advanced livestock and aquaculture research – deal with advanced work on livestock research, aquaculture, apiculture, etc.

This leads to the fifth proposition:

The structure of the CGIAR should provide for a limited number of global centres, which should deal with advanced, globally cross-cutting issues/factors on their own or in collaboration with the regional centres and advanced research institutes. The principle of subsidiarity should be observed in deciding what they should be doing.

LONGEVITY OF THE SYSTEM

The IARCs as they are currently structured have evolved over the past 60 years in three phases:

1. First, as international research programmes of the philanthropic foundations (Rockefeller, Ford and Kellog) in Mexico, Taiwan/Philippines, Peru, etc. in the 1940s and 1950s.
2. Secondly, as independent international research institutes starting with IRRI in the 1960s and CIMMYT as well as IITA and CIAT, which, though international, remained under the overall ambit of the Foundations (1960-1970).
3. Thirdly, as international agricultural research centres under the CGIAR, with World Bank, UNDP and FAO as the sponsors of the system and funded by official development agencies (1971- to date).

The architects of the system were driven by the desire of meeting world food requirements and reduction of poverty in rural areas. Implicit in this was the notion that the centres will work themselves out and be phased out as the tasks were completed.

While food production has globally increased significantly over the 60 years, there is still quite a large part of the developing world which is suffering from food deficits – this is particularly the case in Africa. Further, it seems that the rural (and also urban) poverty will remain a problem for quite some time to come. While considerable progress has been made in strengthening the NARS, it is also quite apparent that there are many activities and functions in the agricultural research domain which cannot be economically done at the national level and some form of regional centre will need to be created to perform them. This is particularly the case in Africa where many of the NARSs are small.
In the 1950s/1960s, there were such regional institutes set up by the colonial authorities but many of them were disbanded in the 1970s due to political and other problems.

The experience of managing these regional centres in the 1960s/1970s (being more politically influenced) as well as that of managing the CGIAR centres in the 1970s and 1980s (being non-political) leads us to believe that the regional centres, which are apolitical and offer quite a number of services to farmers and NARSs can be created and be a permanent feature of the agricultural research system in the regions. This leads to the sixth proposition:

*In restructuring the IARCs, the longterm needs of the NARSs in a region (in particular SSA) should be considered. Longterm, in this regard, is beyond 40 years. The structure to be put in place should be such that the sub-regional and regional centres should evolve into permanent, not-for-profit, non-political research centres, which ultimately will be responsible for those activities which cannot be undertaken economically at national level.*

**MAINTAIN THE INTERNATIONAL FEATURE OF THE SYSTEM**

The experience of managing regional research centres which our countries inherited from the colonial authorities, as well as managing several regional research institutes, coupled with what we have seen so far in the operations of the IARCs (the non-political, international character) makes it necessary for us to recommend that, notwithstanding centres being regional, these should remain under international management and, to the extent possible, should be staffed by internationally appointed scientists, be they from the region, from other developing regions or from the developed countries. Merit and excellence should be the main criteria for filling senior scientific positions. Further, the entire system of global and regional centres should remain under one umbrella and be sponsored by the World Bank/UNDP/FAO as in the current system. This leads us to the seventh proposition:

*The structure should remain under one institutional and organisational umbrella and maintain its international features with the sponsorship of the World Bank/UNDP/FAO, whether for the regional centres or global ones.*

**FINANCING OF THE SYSTEM**

Donors have financed the operations and capital investments of the CGIAR and the IARCs. As long as they continue producing public goods – be they international, regional
or national, it is likely that the system will continue to be funded from public sources. While it has been argued that the system can be financed from private sources, it is difficult to see how this can be done if the products of the system are to remain public goods whether regional or international. Indeed even in the USA, which has the most privatised economy, agricultural research is still funded to a considerable degree by the public sector. Ultimately, however, those who benefit from the public goods/services developed by the agricultural research systems and increase their wealth or welfare will have to pay (directly or indirectly) for such goods/services.

While developing countries have increasingly become contributors to the CGIAR, their contribution is still a small percentage of the CGIAR budget (less than 5% of total). Notable progress has been made especially the willingness of the multilateral and bilateral donor agencies to allow a portion of their bilateral loans/grants to be used to finance the activities of the IARCs or for direct contributions to the CGIAR in some cases. Agricultural research, however, is a long term activity and requires stable and long term commitments. The endeavour to establish a future harvest endowment is a step in the right direction.

If regional centres are established, and if it is clearly demonstrated that they are adding value to the work of the NARSs in the region, it will be much easier to convince political leaders to contribute more to such centres notwithstanding our poverty. This will be the case if sustainable financing mechanisms for such centres are developed and contributions are made as a one-off payment. Countries could also be assisted by provision of soft loans by the multilateral and regional banks to enable them to pay their contribution to such an endowment fund. It is conceivable, therefore, that an endowment fund which is internationally managed, can be created out of country and international donor contributions which could finance at least the core budgets of the regional centres (50%) and the centres can then raise the remaining budget out of services to NARSs/countries, sponsored research and other outright grants from donor agencies.

Proposition no. 8:

*The structure to be instituted should factor in long term sustainable financing of the centres in particular the regional ones. Ultimately, such centres should be increasingly financed either directly or indirectly by those who benefit from the public goods and services produced by them. The key issue, in our opinion, is to design financing systems, which facilitate and enable countries in a region to contribute to the funding of the core budgets of the centres (e.g., create an endowment). Also, there will be need to ensure that such centres are seen to clearly add value to*
the work of the NARSs and demonstrate impact. A similar effort could also be initiated for the global centres.

NUMBER OF REGIONAL CENTRES FOR AFRICA

Currently the NARSs in Africa have grouped themselves into 3 sub-regions, each with its own Sub-Regional Organisation (SRO), namely: ASARECA for eastern and central Africa, CORAF/WECARD for western and central Africa and SACCAR for southern Africa. Each of these SROs has a number of regional networks/programmes/projects, which bring together scientists from the NARSs who work jointly on common problems. Quite a number of the regional networks/programmes are technically backstopped by the IARCs and ARls. Taking cognisance of the above recommendations on global and regional centres, African NARS leaders would like to recommend that the current CGIAR effort in SSA be restructured into two regional centres – one for western and central African region and the second one for eastern and southern Africa.

These two will take a systems approach and tackle jointly with the NARSs the priority commodities/factors in their respective geographical areas. On some commodities they may undertake joint efforts. Some countries may receive services from both (D.R. Congo which straddles the eastern, central and western zone). As African NARS leaders, we are convinced that reorganising the CGIAR centres in Africa into these two autonomous regional centres will lead to a significant increase in the effectiveness and efficiency of the entire agricultural research system on the continent. Each of these centres will have as its major activity, on its own or with regional and overseas universities the task of capacity building for the NARSs – training scientists for MSc, Ph.D. and other short term programmes. Thus, our proposition number nine:

The CGIAR and IARCs in Africa should be reorganised into two regional centres – one for western and central Africa and the other for eastern and southern Africa. Countries in these two sub-regions should be encouraged and facilitated towards contributing to a sustainable financing mechanism for a portion of the core budget of these two centres. Donor agencies should be encouraged to assist these two centres, and synergise their assistance such that the regional programmes and the two systems complement each other. The centres should retain their non-political, not-for-profit and international character.
CENTRAL ORGANS

We are convinced that there will be a need for central organs, which will manage the system of global and regional centres. Such central organs should coordinate the system, ensure synergies, facilitate the sponsors, assist in investing endowment funds, etc. This leads us to our tenth proposition:

"The structure should retain a central and coordinating apex mechanism/or organ for the global and regional centres. It should be neutral and have a legal charter to operate globally and be inviolable. It should also be non-political, and not-for-profit."

FROM THE CURRENT STRUCTURE TO THE NEW ONE

We are convinced that the above ten principles/criteria should guide the restructuring of the governance system of the CGIAR and its IARCs. We are convinced that the structure, organisation and governance of the system need to be changed to make it fit with changes in other parts of the agricultural research systems as well as to ensure its longterm effectiveness and efficiency. This may well be regarded as radical restructuring but we are convinced half measures will not help the system. In our opinion, and as key intended beneficiaries of the system, it is better to go through a three to five-year significant structural adjustment rather than prolong the process through a series of half measures.

Our recommendations for implementation of the structural changes are, therefore, that:

i. The system should consider and agree on the principles which should govern the structural changes – including giving clear indications on what type of structure the system should aim for.

ii. An independent management company/organisation should be appointed to design a new structure based on the principles agreed on in (i). It should be given clear ToR and be required to complete the task within 6 months. We regard the competence and integrity of the senior managers of the IARCs (CDC&CBC) with very high respect. However, we feel that, based on our experience of operations of the IARCs on this continent and partnerships we have forged with them over the past 20 years, they may be too inward looking to recommend and effect the desired changes.

iii. An independent reference team should be appointed to superintend the process.
Within one year, agreement should have been reached on the new structure.

A ministerial (if possible higher) level conference should be convened in 2002 to approve the new structure (second Lucerne conference).

Thereafter, restructuring of the system should take place and be completed within 2 years. Thus the whole process should take three years to complete.

Transitional and consequential measures should be put in place by the reference team (contractual obligations, etc.) as soon as the structure is agreed [i.e., (iv)].

Entebbe, Uganda, 17th October 2000
Prepared by a FARA team comprising representatives of ASARECA, CORAF, SACCAR
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