

**CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets**  
**PRIORITY-SETTING SESSION**  
**New Delhi, July 3, 2012**  
**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS**

*This document summarizes the main points of the discussions that took place during the workshop.*

### **General discussions**

It was observed that there is a need to identify the **comparative advantage** of the program, versus what the other initiatives are doing. Although the scope of the program is very broad, the program won't be able to achieve everything!

The CGIAR should focus on regional issues and NARES on national issues. However, this repartition of work would require an increased capacity in NARES.

**Rural institutions at local level** are crucial and need to be more organized.

There should be a centralized farmers' institute to represent farmers at the CGIAR level. For India, the website [www.indianfarmers.org](http://www.indianfarmers.org) aims at empowering farmers by sharing knowledge.

Another recurring topic was the way to **demonstrate the impact** of the program research, and to bring research to producers. The program monitoring and evaluation framework is designed to allow outputs, outcomes and impacts of the program to be monitored and communicated.

Emphasis was laid on **capacity building and partnerships** for success. The program will have partnerships and capacity building strategies.

### **Comments on the priority-setting process**

It was noted that, in spite of the attempts of the organizers to balance representation across gender and regions, **women were under-represented, as well as participants from the Pacific region**. The small percentage of female participants (28%) may account for the relatively small average weight assigned by participants to the gender objective (13.5%).

Some participants commented that the four main objectives used in the priority-setting process (Reduce rural poverty; Increase food security, nutrition and health; Improve sustainability of natural resources; Enhance opportunities for and participation of women) were not mutually exclusive and not on the same level.

There were questions on **how the results of the priority-setting session will be used** and on the timeframe for the priority-setting. The output of the session will be one of several inputs to the selection of tasks for years 2013 and beyond.

Participants asked how the results of the consultation will be shared with governments. The program will develop a strategy for communications and outreach at the different levels. Partnerships will be an important way of conveying results to decision makers.

## **Comments on the scope of the program themes and subthemes**

Subtheme 1.3 should:

- look into **food processing/distribution technologies**, not only agricultural production technologies;
- focus particularly on **sustainable production, water management and climate change**;
- also focus on fisheries.

Under Subtheme 2.3, conditions of successful collective action should be examined.

Theme 3 was deemed very broad and deserving to be broken into more subthemes under the overarching value chains topic. Under Theme 3, there was a general interest in learning lessons from **successful contract farming experiences**.

Under the Gender Theme, it was proposed to include work on policies in favor of **other discriminated groups**.

### **Regional/country specificities**

In India, it would be worth to explore opportunities to harvest more fresh water; and work should be done on flood control and areas with excessive rainfall/water logging/salinity (East India, Bangladesh). Managing the transition from small farms to larger farms and to the non-farming sector is also a priority.

For Bangladesh, coastal areas (which represent one third of the country's land) should be a priority in the program, and more work should be done in support of policies on GM crops.

In Nepal, technologies should be developed for rainfed areas and mechanized hills.

### **Concluding remarks**

Compared to the global program proposal, the discussions held during the workshop brought richer and more complex views on how the CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets should address the priorities of the Asia-Pacific region.

The results of this workshop show that the research areas of the program have different levels of priority. This is a strong signal in favor of a differentiated funding allocation between the subthemes for the Asia-Pacific region. Based on both the scoring and the ranking exercises, Subtheme 1.3 "Production and Technology Policies" is the most important subtheme. Subthemes 1.1, "Foresight and Strategic Scenarios", and 3.1 "Innovations across the Value Chains" are also a high priority for the region.