



Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

Document No: MTM/01/10
Distribution: General
Date : May 21, 2001

Mid-Term Meeting 2001
May 21 - 25
Durban, South Africa

Charting the CGIAR's Future – Change Design and Management

Feasibility Study on Establishing a Genetic Resources Fund

The attached final report and recommendations of the Feasibility and Planning Study on Establishing a Genetic Resources Fund is being circulated for information. This is a background document for Agenda Item 7-Presentation by Future Harvest.

This item is for: Information Discussion Decision

Proposed Action: None



FEASIBILITY AND PLANNING STUDY

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Prepared for

FUTURE HARVEST CENTRES OF THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

20 April 2001

Prepared by:



Fund Raising

Community Counselling Service Ltd
27/29 Cursitor Street, London EC4A 1LT
Tel: +44 20 7731 3439 Fax: +44 20 7731 1051
E-mail: ceslondon@cesfundraising.com

www.cesfundraising.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Objectives	6
Findings	7
Evaluation	12
Recommendations	16

Appendices

- 1. Interview Participants as of 20 April 2001**
- 2. Constituent breakdown**
- 3. Discussion points used in the interviews**
- 4. Interview request letter**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Community Counselling Service (CCS) would like to express its sincere appreciation for the co-operation, courtesy and frankness provided throughout the Feasibility & Planning Study period by all connected with the project.

We are indebted to the personal assistance provided by Dr. Norman Borlaug, Dr. M.S. Swaminathan, Dr. Geoff Hawtin, Director General of IPGRI, and Ruth Raymond, Senior Scientist at IPGRI. We are particularly indebted to Ms. Silvana Bonas, Programme Assistant for DIT/Public Awareness for her tireless assistance and great integrity, and Ms Geralynn Batista, Ph.D. candidate in economics, for her passion for the CGIAR. We also wish to thank all others within the CGIAR who helped to ensure a welcoming atmosphere.

Finally, a special word of thanks is extended to those who made their valuable time available to engage in a personal interview and for sharing their opinions and offering advice regarding a significant appeal for the Future Harvest Centres supported by the CGIAR. All were most generous with their time and insights.

CCS STUDY TEAM

**William Hanrahan, President
Robert Kissane, Executive Vice President
John Connelly, Vice President and Managing Director, Europe
Antony W. Kalm, Study Director
Leigh Higgins, Programme Director
Janet Carrigan, Executive Assistant / Research
Linda Deschampsneufs, Executive Assistant / Research**

A concerted effort has been made to ensure the correct spelling of all names and titles in this report. We deeply regret any errors that may be contained therein.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The attached report represents the findings from the Feasibility and Planning Study undertaken by Community Counselling Service on behalf of the Future Harvest Centres supported by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. The study tested the readiness of the Centres and the CGIAR stakeholders to lead and participate in a \$1 billion endowment campaign. Counsel interviewed 130 senior officials from government ministries, corporations, and private foundations around the world.

We conclude that the Future Harvest Centres can conduct a successful fundraising campaign, albeit at a less ambitious level. A goal of \$200-250 million is a more credible goal at this point in time. Funds could come from non-traditional sources (e.g. foundations, wealthy individuals). In addition, new and additional funding from traditional donors is available for endowment. However, the success of the campaign depends upon the completion of several critical tasks before launch. These include:

- consensus approval of the campaign is obtained from all Future Harvest Centres;
- the support and/or implicit/explicit endorsement of the campaign is obtained from the World Bank, FAO, and developing countries;
- a compelling case statement is developed that appeals to a variety of donor audiences;
- a high-calibre campaign committee to open doors and make funding requests is established; and,
- a lead gift or gifts is/are received from a foundation or public sector donor.

If these five tasks can be accomplished, Counsel recommends the immediate development of a campaign to raise \$200 to \$250 million to support the conservation of plant genetic resources collections held in trust for humanity, and the development of a blueprint for a rational global genebank system. It should be noted that while the proposal to endow a global genetic resources system did not receive explicit support from interviewees, this appears to relate more to the difficulty of costing and supporting a system that does not yet exist than to a lack of interest in the concept. Interviewees did respond favourably to the concept of developing a blueprint for a global system, indicating that, once such a system is operational, the prospects for funding it are positive. Counsel recommends that the process of blueprint development also consider the costs of running a global system and move towards establishing a mechanism for endowing that system.

All of the interviewees feel that the conservation and sustainable use of germplasm is an international public good, and that the CGIAR has the credibility and reputation to lead the effort. Governments, foundations and select corporations have expressed a willingness to provide financial support for the campaign, many of them at levels ranging from \$5 to \$25 million. This represents new money, over and above current levels of funding provided to

the centres. Their final decision will be based on how successfully the CGIAR leadership prepares itself before the launch of a fundraising campaign.

This document makes several recommendations to the CGIAR after presenting the study's findings and analysis. The recommendations primarily focus on the development of a detailed campaign plan, to be ready by early June 2001. The development of a compelling case statement and campaign cabinet are also important first steps. Counsel believes that a campaign to raise funds for genetic resources conservation will be of great value to the entire CGIAR system, not only financially, but also in terms of public awareness, and will serve as the flagship for other CGIAR fund-raising undertakings.

INTRODUCTION

Community Counselling Service (CCS) is pleased to submit this feasibility and planning report to the Future Harvest Centres supported by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

Process

To begin the process, we developed the operating materials that would be used over the course of the study period. Samples of the material can be found in the appendix and included the following:

The interview list-

The primary objective of the study was to test the viability of a fundraising campaign with three distinct constituencies: Future Harvest Centre Directors and System staff; current donors and friends; and a wider audience of those not currently in a relationship to any CGIAR entity.

The interview request letter-

The letter was drafted for Geoff Hawtin's, Norman Borlaug's and/or M.S. Swaminathan's signature and was sent to European, American and developing country contacts.

The draft background statement-

The draft background statement, which was sent to all of the prospective interviewees, was intended to generate reactions that would help to create the formal rationale for the campaign.

The discussion points-

Discussion points were used to help the interviewer steer the conversation. Because each interview was unique, the questions needed to be tailored accordingly.

The tracking chart-

IPGRI assumed responsibility for calling interview prospects to arrange the interviews. A tracking chart was developed in order to keep track of the last date called, new phone numbers and fax numbers and other new information.

OBJECTIVES

In August 2000, CCS was retained by the Future Harvest Centres supported by the Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research (CGIAR) to assess the feasibility of a \$1 billion campaign to upgrade and endow the in-trust genetic resources held by the Centres, and to support the creation and endowment of a global germplasm conservation system. The goals and objectives of the feasibility study included conducting personal and confidential interviews with Future Harvest Centre Directors, donors, volunteers, philanthropists, corporations and foundations identified as having an interest in genetic resources conservation for food security, poverty alleviation, and environmental protection. These strategic discussions covered five fundamental issues including:

1. General familiarity and perceptions regarding the CGIAR and Future Harvest.
2. Specific responses and attitudes to the case elements, and the fundraising potential for the proposed campaign.
3. **Discussion and advice on crucial features of an endowment campaign:**
 - ◆ **Prospective leaders**
 - ◆ **Prospective donors**
 - ◆ **Campaign dollar goal**
 - ◆ **Potential obstacles to a successful campaign**
4. Personal attitudes regarding the campaign including the interviewee's interest in being involved as a leader, donor and/or advocate.
5. The interviewee's advice and thoughts on strategies for conducting the campaign and communicating its goal and objectives.

130 personal interviews were completed including discussions with representatives from all 16 Future Harvest Centres, 15 donor governments, 9 foundations, and 12 corporations.

FINDINGS

Perceptions of the CGIAR and the Future Harvest Organization

91% of interviewees expressed admiration for the work of the CGIAR, referring to it as low-cost, high-impact research that directly benefits poor farmers.

Participants also cited the following as organisational strengths:

STRENGTHS	# OF TIMES MENTIONED
◆ Strong science-based work that benefits poor farmers	65
◆ Independent, apolitical organisation with direct access to policy-makers at the World Bank, FAO, and donor governments	47
◆ Reputation for honesty, integrity and credibility	38
◆ Highly committed, talented staff	36
◆ The power of the name and the coordinated system – one voice	32
◆ System-wide networks in Latin America, Africa and Asia	22
TOTAL	240

Similarly, those familiar with the Future Harvest organization (68% of interviewees) expressed support for its role and success in generating public awareness for the Centres, and for the importance of international agricultural research overall. 40% indicated that, where appropriate and possible, Future Harvest should strengthen relationships with policy-makers and media outside the U.S.

Without exception, those familiar with Future Harvest stated that the Future Harvest ambassadors could prove invaluable to the campaign, opening doors and providing guidance on specific funding requests.

12% of interviewees expressed concern that the 16 Future Harvest Centres often compete with one another for funding. They were thus pleased that the Centres were united in this possible effort to endow the in-trust genetic resources.

Centre interviewees expressed concerns about whether this campaign would compete with existing CGIAR funding, particularly from “traditional donors.” It is important to note that traditional donors expressing support for the

campaign indicated that any funding provided would be additional to that already provided to the CGIAR, not a renaming or reshuffling of existing funds.

14% of the respondents expressed concern about the timing of the campaign, citing the current negotiations of the Food and Agriculture Organisation's (FAO) International Undertaking (IU). This view was based on the possible perception by developing countries that the campaign was an attempt to circumvent the negotiations concerning the establishment of an access and benefit-sharing system. The majority of interviewees indicated that the support of the South would be necessary for the campaign's success. However, they also believed that while the issues raised in the IU must be solved, "we cannot wait for them to be solved."

Most of those expressing an opinion believe that this campaign will complement the proceedings of the IU Individuals from FAO and several developing countries have expressed this view.

78% of those interviewed believe that the FAO should endorse the campaign, as well as coordinate the creation of the global germplasm conservation system.

Those expressing this opinion believe that the FAO support and/or endorsement will optimize the campaign's ability to secure funds to begin negotiating and drafting the blueprint for a rationalised global genebank system, a key component of the funding strategy and one that is called for in FAO's global plan of action for plant genetic resources.

Benefits of genetic resource conservation

All of the interviewees agreed that the conservation of the world's genetic resources is an international priority – to provide food security, alleviate poverty, and provide for the sustainable use of natural resources.

77% expressed the opinion that the CGIAR, as an apolitical organisation with direct ties to the World Bank and FAO, should lead the effort to endow worldwide genetic resources.

There was unanimous support for creating a sustainable financing mechanism for the Future Harvest genebanks. Many shared the opinion expressed by one interviewee, that "with governments shifting their priorities to social issues, and increased competition for philanthropic support, an endowment is the way to go."

30% of respondents indicated that agricultural research, and specifically genetic resources conservation must be presented as more than an "overseas development issue", but as one that affects the developed world as well.

Government ministries of foreign affairs, development cooperation, agriculture, trade and the environment all see this work as indispensable, while recognizing the difficulty of "telling the story", because, as one interviewee put it, "agriculture isn't sexy."

62% of participants cited the need for a strong public awareness programme – by the Centres individually and by the system as a whole – in order to interest non-related industries and individuals to participate in the campaign.

An endowment campaign

88% of interviewees believed that the goal of \$1 billion was not realistic at a first go, given shifting donor priorities to social issues and the difficulty of conveying the importance of agricultural research in a compelling way.

92% of respondents indicated that a goal of \$200 to \$250 million was feasible, considering the depth of the prospect base and the proven benefits of the in-trust genebanks.

32% expressed concern about the mechanism of an endowment for two reasons: first, that some governments are legislatively prohibited from funding endowments; and second, that some donors feel that with an endowment they lose control over how funds are invested and disbursed.

Other oft-cited challenges to be addressed in early campaign organizational activity include:

CHALLENGES	# OF TIMES MENTIONED
◆ The CGIAR's lack of visibility and name recognition	58
◆ Lack of donor understanding and competing demands	42
◆ Political sensitivities relating to: genetically modified organisms and intellectual property rights of donated accessions.	30
◆ Timing and objectives of the campaign – i.e. potential conflicts with the FAO's International Undertaking on Genetic Resources	11
TOTAL	141

70% of interviewees expressed confusion about the funding strategy, whether one or two endowments were envisaged, and, most importantly, the justification for the \$740 million figure originally proposed to support an endowment for the global genetic resources system.

44% believe that the fund must be established as a separate, independent entity, with occupationally and geographically representative governance, including representatives from the Future Harvest Centres and the CGIAR.

30% of respondents believe that the issue of genetically modified foods must be explicitly addressed in the case statement.

22% expressed concern about the perceptions that might be created by significant investment in the campaign by particular corporations, and thus recommended that the fund have a transparent constitution and guidelines for disbursement, granting special benefits to none.

28% pointed out that while the Future Harvest genebanks are essential, they have neither a scientific nor political monopoly on genetic resources conservation. They may, however, provide a model for best scientific practices for germplasm conservation. Thus, these individuals favour taking immediate steps, with the direct involvement and coordination of the FAO, to develop the rational global germplasm conservation system as called for in the Global Plan of Action. In fact, some donors are specifically interested in funding this activity.

Preliminary Support

During the interviews, we asked the participants if they/their institution would support a campaign financially.

Of the 36 donor institutions interviewed, which included governments, foundations, and corporations, 16 (44%) indicated they would support the campaign financially. Ten (10) out of 15 governments said they would support the campaign financially; as did 3 of 9 private foundations; and 3 of 12 corporations.

These 16 indicated that, under ideal conditions, they would consider providing a specific level of support ranging from \$500,000 to \$25 million (over five years). The aggregate total of funding cited ranges between \$86 million and \$140 million. Based upon our experience and upon the levels indicated, the total value that could likely be raised (from other prospects) would be in the \$100-\$130 million range. However, because the range variance is so wide, the eventual goal may need to be recalculated after the first phase of gifts is completed.

All of the gifts indicated from government ministries would require significant commitment at the level of Minister/Secretary or Prime Minister/President. There appear to be two necessary preconditions to this commitment – the support of key developing countries, perceived to be the primary beneficiaries of agricultural research, and high-calibre leadership (e.g. endorsement by the World Bank and/or the U.N.). In fact, 94% of those interviewed suggested that the funding request come from World Bank leadership.

Most interviewees representing organisations that would most likely not contribute at a level greater than \$100,000 indicated they would support the campaign modestly and via testimonials.

24% had a favourable response to the draft background document.

68% of interviewees would be willing to serve on a campaign committee.

EVALUATION

Summary:

A campaign to raise a minimum of \$200 to \$250 million for the conservation of plant genetic resources collections held in trust for humanity, and the development of a blueprint for a rational global genebank system and its subsequent support should proceed if the following are achieved:

- **Support and direct involvement of the Future Harvest Centres – WELL UNDER WAY.**
- **Endorsement and participation of the World Bank, the FAO, and key developing countries – WELL UNDER WAY.**
- **Recruitment of four top-shelf leadership teams – one to draft the case, one to create and manage the fund as an independent body, one to raise money for the fund, and an internal team to manage the campaign.**
- **Development of a comprehensive case statement, which represents a realistic and justified funding plan.**
- **The receipt of several leadership gifts in the \$5 to \$25 million range.**

Additionally, the campaign would require:

- **An extensive public awareness/public relations programme geared to lead donors, corporations, and the general community.**
- **An effective campaign plan involving participation from Future Harvest Centre staff.**
- **The cultivation of government, corporate, and foundation prospects.**

Point-by-point Analysis:

The CGIAR's Role

Worldwide, there is strong recognition of the importance of the work carried out by the CGIAR. At the same time, the organisation struggles for sustainable funding in changing political climates. CCS is steadfast in its belief that the CGIAR has an opportunity to make a bold statement for the common good it provides – by going forward with dynamic leadership to secure new financial partnerships.

A successful campaign will require the consensus of the Future Harvest Centres. While each has expressed support in principle for the effort, the campaign will require a real commitment of resources from the Centres – both human and financial. This may include: financing the campaign, generating public awareness in respective host countries, cultivating policy-makers and

the media, making donor visits, providing information and technical support, and agreeing not to compete with the system-wide effort for genebank financing. Counsel recommends that nothing be undertaken without an explicit consensus. The Centre Directors should address this issue at the soonest possible date.

Counsel believes that every effort should be made, both by campaign organisers and individual Centres, to explicitly demonstrate a consensus commitment to the campaign to the World Bank.

Campaign "authorizing environment" or "moral authority"

Without exception, traditional donors have advised that the likelihood and level of their gifts to the campaign would increase significantly were the request to come from the World Bank.

Many of those interviewed believe this campaign fits well within the context of the World Bank's vision for ensuring the long-term viability of the CGIAR, in which public-private partnerships are developed to address "global challenges".

Developing country endorsement of the campaign is essential. Counsel believes that a combined effort from the FAO, the World Bank, and the Future Harvest Centres will be necessary to counter the possible perception that this campaign is an attempt to side-step the International Undertaking.

Counsel strongly advises that developing countries should be invited to provide leadership to the campaign and thereby help strengthen the resolve to create a global genebank system.

Leadership

Counsel believes that the success of the campaign hinges on the right leadership. Every effort should be made in the coming weeks to identify candidates for the three external campaign committees: fundraising, governing, and the case statement task force.

All of those interviewed offered to support the campaign's in one way or another, if not financially, then by endorsing the concept within their respective organisations, by making introductions to potential supporters, etc. Many offered strategies for assuring the best chances of success. In addition, more than half of those interviewed said they would consider serving on a campaign committee. Most of these individuals offered to visit prospective donors on the campaign's behalf, where appropriate.

In all, interviewees offered over 100 different names for various campaign volunteer leadership positions. (This list will be provided as a separate confidential memorandum.)

The Case for Support and Fundraising potential

Interviewees indicated their strong support for conserving the world's genetic resources, and for the work of the CGIAR, yet many believed it was not appreciated worldwide. Counsel believes that the CGIAR must take a lead role

in communicating the importance of public sector agricultural research and genetic resource conservation and use in poor and wealthy countries alike.

Endowments are difficult to fund, particularly for national governments. All those interviewed supported the creation of a sustainable financing mechanism to ensure the continued operation of the genebanks. However, many traditional donors have legislative obstacles to endowments, and suggested presenting the case for support as a multi-year programme or as a stewardship fund.

The CGIAR needs a case statement that has wide appeal for varied levels of understanding of agricultural research, and that distinguishes the various efforts to be supported by the campaign – i.e. one-time versus ongoing costs (upgrading the in-trust genebanks and the blueprint development are considered one-time costs).

Some helpful comments on the background statement provided to interviewees included:

- ***“It needs to be more alarmist! The language is too neutral.”***
- ***“Research must be linked to development, or it will be a futile exercise. You must bridge the gap, and show how the work of the Centres translates into helping people.”***
- ***“We’re trying to save the world’s biodiversity, not all of it, just the part that feeds, clothes, houses, and heals human beings.”***
- ***“We’re saving Mendel’s garden.”***
- ***“There is confusion about the replacement of farmers’ traditional crop varieties. It will occur, but the document seems to argue that it won’t happen. The point is to save the varieties before the genes are lost, rather than keeping the farmers growing poorer materials.”***
- ***“People cannot connect emotionally to genetic resources.”***
- ***“Someone who knows nothing about plant genetic diversity would not understand the real issues.”***
- ***“This document must show impacts, that the money is well spent.”***
- ***“We must conserve biodiversity for its own sake, as well as for poverty reduction and food security. We will be vulnerable if we don’t have enough varieties of crops. Because of natural/environmental changes, we need access to different types. And, when disasters strike, as in Rwanda, India, or Central America, we can respond with the exact plant varieties that farmers in those areas lost.”***

Financial support

The financial support indicated by the interviewees is positive. Traditional donors have made clear that their expressed level of support would represent additional funding to the system.

Many interviewees indicated that their gift would be influenced by a high-level request, and peer contributions. Hence, a lead gift from one of these donors, i.e. national governments, trusts/foundations, individuals and business, could make the difference for the campaign early on.

The amount of money that is eventually raised will depend on what is received in the beginning. If the leadership gifts fall on the lower end of the range, the subsequent gifts will be proportionately lower.

The campaign must raise the majority of its funds from a limited number of gifts. In our view, an ideal scenario would see funds coming from governments, foundations, corporations, and individuals in roughly equal proportions.

Table showing the expected number and level of gifts needed to raise \$250,000,000

Number of Gifts	Level of Gifts	Totaling	Cumulative
1	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000
1	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$75,000,000
4	\$10,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$115,000,000
8	\$5,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$155,000,000
12	\$2,500,000	\$30,000,000	\$185,000,000
20	\$1,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$205,000,000
50	\$500,000	\$25,000,000	\$230,000,000
80	\$250,000	\$20,000,000	\$250,000,000
176			\$250,000,000

RECOMMENDATIONS

CCS offers the following recommendations in the light of its findings and based upon the comprehensive experience of the firm. CCS believes that with the explicit support of the World Bank, the endorsement of key countries in the South, and a lead gift, the CGIAR has an opportunity to raise significant levels of funding and should act immediately to secure the above and launch a campaign.

The success of the campaign will depend upon the steps the CGIAR takes before launching the campaign.

We offer the following recommendations:

1. The organisation should move immediately to secure the consensus of the Future Harvest Centre Directors for a campaign to provide sustainable funding for the genetic resources collections held in trust for humanity, and the development of a blueprint for rational global germplasm conservation.

The campaign should seek to raise \$200 to \$250 million from governments, corporations, foundations, and individuals. It should be noted that while the proposal to endow a global genetic resources system did not receive explicit support from interviewees, this is related more to the difficulty of costing and supporting a system that does not yet exist than to a lack of interest in the concept. Interviewees did respond favourably to the concept of developing a blueprint for a global system, indicating that, once such a system is operational, the prospects for funding it are positive. Counsel recommends that the process of blueprint development also consider the costs of running a global system and move towards establishing a mechanism for endowing that system.

2. The campaign should be implemented sequentially, beginning with the organisational phase. Each phase should form a platform for the success of subsequent phases, raising sights and increasing financial potential.

If the objectives of the organisational phase are met, a campaign should then be launched and conducted over a period of 24 months: June 2002 through June 2004. An extension of this timetable should be considered if early Major Gift research and support should indicate that greater potential exists.

3. A campaign plan should be developed to include: strategies, timetables, gift plans, and financial goals.
4. The campaign goal should not be finalized or announced until the first leadership gifts are secured, and if they do not meet the necessary criteria, the goal should be lowered.
5. Professional counsel should work closely with the Future Harvest Centres and Future Harvest to support a global programme for public awareness.

6. **Organisational structure:** CCS recommends the formation of the following initial committees for the campaign, and critical functions of each:
 - a. ***Case Statement Task Force (approximately nine members):*** This group's first task is to develop a compelling case statement that explains the CGIAR's rationale for a fundraising campaign. It will draw upon some of the interviews and from an appropriate geographic and occupational cross-section of people. The Case Statement Task Force will help the CGIAR appeal to prospective donors with varying levels of knowledge of the CGIAR, and be sensitive to numerous scientific and political concerns. This task force could convene as needed to develop supporting campaign documents, e.g. concerning the system's position on GMOs, governance of the Trust, etc.
 - b. ***Campaign Committee (approximately 21 members):*** This committee will be the active fund-raising arm of the campaign, and should include several Future Harvest ambassadors, as well as CEOs of corporations and foundations.
 - c. ***Governing Committee (approximately 15 members):*** This committee would be made up of the largest campaign donors, the highest profile supporters identified for the campaign, and some Future Harvest Centre Directors, and would convene periodically in order to advise on budget issues, and long term funding needs. Many large donors would appreciate the opportunity to be involved after making a large pledge. The committee would also have significant long term fundraising advantages as it provides a solid base of support. This panel should also include World Bank, UN and government officials, as well as other volunteers as needed such as attorneys.
 - d. ***CGIAR Campaign Management Group (approximately eight members):*** To advise, counsel, and vet all campaign materials, and make tactical and strategic operational decisions. This is the "in-system" management group for the entire appeal.
7. **Develop a worldwide prospect list and ensure that there are enough good prospects at each giving level. Take into consideration all constituent groups and all geographic areas.**
8. **Tailor the gift request to the Minister/CEO level. The success of the campaign will depend largely on our ability to attract and gain access to top decision makers.**
9. **The success of this campaign will depend on the calibre of leadership recruited, the effective coordination of leading prospect requests, and the support and involvement of Centre Directors, the World Bank, the FAO, and developing countries.**
10. **Specific quarterly benchmarks should be established in order to monitor the required action steps.**
11. **The Campaign: Programme and Budget**

Programme

A three-year Appeal is envisaged, comprising an Organisational Phase of 6 months, a Major Gift Phase of 6 months, and a Campaign of 24 months. To keep up the momentum already established, this should commence – ideally – in June 2001.

The campaign programme is envisioned as follows:

Campaign Programme 2001 – 2004 (3 years)

Phase	Action
Campaign Organisation, Leadership Development & Lead Gifts (June 2001 – December 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit Case Statement Task Force • Draft case statement • Assemble Campaign Committee • Establish campaign office • Establish specific goals and time frame for each campaign division • Establish detailed promotional and cultivation plan • Establish immediate Leadership Gift prospect list (top 5, 10, and 20 prospects) • Establish gift giving and crediting policies • Recruit Campaign Chair(s) • Conduct gifts solicitation instructional briefings and debriefings • Establish prospect research system and overall plan. • Approach top 10 prospects

Phase	Action
<p style="text-align: center;">Major Gift Phase (January 2002 – June 2002)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct preliminary meetings and research on top Major Gift prospects • Visit key prospects • Establish initial guidelines for leadership briefings/receptions • Prepare personalized gift proposals, letters of intent, and appropriate gift documentation • Hold special receptions and leadership briefings if appropriate • Complete approach of the 50 to 75 Gift prospects • Recruit leadership teams within each constituency and region • Complete all preparations for public announcements for campaign kickoff • Initiate key foundation proposals
<p>Public Phase (June 2002 – June 2004)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campaign public kick-off at RIO +10 conference • Focus on the next 250 large gift prospects • Intense request period • All campaign committees activated • Quarterly campaign newsletters and monthly updates • Quarterly campaign executive committee meetings • Campaign final reports

Budget

The Organisational and Major Gift Phases of 12 months would cost \$420,000 in professional fees (estimate based on CCS' own fee schedule), and estimated operational costs of \$500,000. The Campaign of 24 months would cost \$1,680,000 in professional fees, and estimated operational costs of \$1 million.

The operational costs are a guideline only and do not take account of the costs incurred by Future Harvest Centre staff (Centre Directors, public awareness officers, genebank managers) who are expected to play an important role in the campaign. It is hoped that Centres will offer staff time as an in kind contribution to the campaign. An exception is made for IPGRI, which, as lead Centre, will be devoting a full time senior staff position to supporting campaign activities.

Organisational and Major Gift Phase: June 2001 – June 2002 (12 months)

Professional fees at \$35,000 per month x 12 months	\$ 420,000
Operational Budget:	
Senior Staff time	\$100,000
Secretarial	\$ 40,000
Telecommunications/Post	\$ 20,000
Public awareness materials	\$ 80,000
Meetings	\$160,000
Travel	\$ 50,000
Management costs of lead Centre @10%	\$ 50,000
Operations Total	\$ 495,000

The Campaign: July 2002 – June 2004 (24 months)

Professional fees at \$70,000 per month x 24 months	\$1,680,000
Operational Budget:	
Senior Staff time	\$ 200,000
Secretarial	\$ 80,000
Telecommunications/Post	\$ 40,000
Public awareness materials	\$ 160,000
Meetings	\$ 320,000
Travel	\$ 100,000
Management costs of lead Centre @10%	\$ 90,000
Operations Total	\$ 990 000

Total Professional Fees	\$2,100,000
Total Operational Budget	\$1,485,000*

<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>\$3,585,000</u>
--------------	--------------------

If \$150m is raised, total costs as a percentage are: **2.40%**

If \$200m is raised, total costs as a percentage are: 1.80%
If \$250m is raised, total costs as a percentage are: 1.40%

*Estimated but subject to revision after the first 12 months experience of conducting the appeal. This figure is based on CCS' recent experience, but because of the ever-increasing costs of airfares, transportation, IT and telephonic services, the figure could be higher.

12. Professional Counsel |

CCS recommends full-time executive consultation and hands-on assistance to the CGIAR.

In the organisational and major gift phases, each gift prospect must be approached as an individual campaign.

A budget of 1.2-2.0% of the total dollars raised should be established for professional counsel, staff, and campaign operating expenses.

13. Conclusion |

The 16 Future Harvest Centres supported by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research have passionately and effectively worked to improve food security and alleviate poverty.

The CGIAR has a unique, one-time opportunity to build its case for support and raise money worldwide to support its mission.



Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

APPENDICES

1. Interview Participants as of 20 April 2001
2. Constituent breakdown
3. Discussion points used in the interviews
4. Interview request letter

Appendix 1**Future Harvest Feasibility Study****Interview Participants (130)****As of 20 April, 2001**

Ambrose, Mike, John Innes Centre, UK
Barwala Zehr, Usha, Maharashtra Hybrid Seed Company Ltd., India
Barriga, Claudio, University of Chile, Chile
Baum, Holger, Media Company, Germany
Beachy, Roger, Danforth Plant and Science Center, USA
Bevege, Ian, ACIAR, Australia
Bie, Stein, ISNAR, Netherlands
Brader, Lukas, IITA, Nigeria
Brown, Linda, DFID, UK
Caitley-Carlson, Margaret, Canada
Cantrell, Ronald, IRRI, Philippines
Carabba Tettamanti, Dr. Gioacchino, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy
Carlisle, Bob, DFID, UK
Chaparro, Fernando, GFAR, Italy
Christou, Paul, John Innes Centre, UK
Clements, Robert, ACIAR, Australia
Cockcroft, Laurence, The Gatsby Charitable Foundation, UK
Cotterill, Ralph, Canada
Dar, William, ICRISAT, India
De Greef, Willie, Syngenta, Switzerland
de Haas, H.-Jochen, Federal Ministry for Cooperation and Development, Germany
Dieckmann, Marlene, BEAF, Germany
Dragavtsev, Victor, VIR, Russia
Dryden, Sam, Emergent Genetics, USA
Duvick, Don, Iowa State University, Retired Pioneer, USA
Echeverria, Ruben, Inter-American Development Bank, USA
Eckebil, Jacques Paul, ADG, FAO, Italy
Egger, Paul, SDC, Switzerland
El-Beltagy, Adel, ICARDA, Syria
Esquinas-Alcazar, Jose, FAO, Italy
Everett, Les, University of Minnesota, USA
Falcon, Wally, Stanford University, USA
Fereres, Elias, Cordoba, Spain
Fizel Bieler, Ilene, Citigroup Foundation, USA
Fitzhugh, Hank, ILRI, Kenya
Flynn, John, Winrock International, USA
Foster, Fiona, Garfield Weston Foundation, UK
Foster, Rick, Kellogg Foundation, USA
Fowler, Cary, Norway

Frie, Jost, Novartis Foundation, Switzerland
Frisson, Emile, France
Fust, Walter, DG, SDC, Switzerland
Gale, Mike, John Innes Centre, UK
Gardinder, Peter, ICLARM, Malaysia
Gass, Thomas, SDC, Switzerland
Goldberg, Ronald, MFA, Netherlands
Grieder, Chirstine, SDC, Switzerland
Hajost, Scott, IUCN, USA
Harding, Paul, DFID, UK
Harwood, Richard, Michigan State University, USA
Havenor, Bob, USA
Hawtin, Geoff, IPGRI, Italy
Heffer, Patrick, ASG, ASSINSEL, Switzerland
Herdt, Bob, Rockefeller Foundation, USA
Higgins, Chris, MRC, UK
Holling, Henry, Caterpillar Funds, USA
Holz, Carl, Epcot/Disney, USA
Howell, Bruce, CIDA, Canada
Iwanaga, Masa, JIRCAS, Japan
Johnson, Ian, World Bank, USA
Karel, Frank, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, USA
Kennedy, Don, Stanford University, USA
Kimble, Melinda, UN Foundation, USA
Kleijer, Geert, Switzerland
Kondou, Tetsushi, MFA, Japan
Krueger, Roger, Monsanto, USA
Lamb, Chris, John Innes Centre, UK
Lampe, Klaus, Germany
Lass, Tony, Cadbury Schweppes, UK
Le Buanec, Bernard, SG, ASSINSEL, Switzerland
Leadlay, Etelka, BGCI, UK
Lefort, Marianne, INRA, France
Leisinger, Klaus, Novartis Foundation, Switzerland
MacGillavray, Iain, CIDA, Canada
MacKenzie, David, University of Maryland, USA
Macmillan, Whitney, Cargill, USA
McCalla, Alex, UC Davis, USA
McDonald, Linda, Future Harvest, UK
McPherson, Peter, Michigan State University, USA
Meek, Leslie, Citigroup Foundation, USA
Montgomery, Jill, Monsanto, USA
Mooney, Pat, RAFI, Winnipeg, Canada
Mukiibi, Joseph, Uganda
Nicolier, Felix, Novartis Foundation, Switzerland
Nordang, Inge, MFA, Norway
Nwanze, Kanayo, WARDA, Cote d'Ivoire
Nygaard, David, Aga Khan Foundation, Switzerland
Ohlssen, Eva, SIDA, Sweden
Ozgediz, Selcuk, World Bank, USA
Pettit, Fred, Epcot/Disney, USA

Pinstrup-Anderson, Per, IFPRI, USA
Ponce, Eliseo, Bureau of Agricultural Research, Philippines
Reeves, Tim, CIMMYT, Mexico
Reifschneider, Francisco, World Bank, USA
Rijsberman, Frank, IWMI, Sri Lanka
Roberts, Esq., Tim, UK
Rose, Barbara, Future Harvest, USA
Rowe, Roger, ICLARM, Malaysia
Saint-Martin, Gilles, Ministry of Research, France
Sanchez, Pedro, ICRAF, Kenya
Sas, Luc, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgium
Sayer, Jeffrey, CIFOR, Indonesia
Schon, Mary, Epcot/Disney, USA
Schwartz, Constance, Arista Records, USA
Shands, Henry, USDA, National Seed Storage Laboratory, USA
Simmons, Emmy, USAID, USA
Sittenfeld, Ana, Costa Rica
Sohlberg, Ragnhild, Norsk-Hydro, Norway
Sontot, Andree, BRG, France
Strahm, Wendy, IUCN, Switzerland
Strayer, Jacqueline, United Technologies Corporation, USA
Stuart, Simon, DG, IUCN, Switzerland
Swaminathan, M.S., Swaminathan Research Institute, India
Tammingha, Klaas, MFA, Netherlands
Tetsushi, Kondou, MFA, Japan
Thompson, Bob, World Bank, USA
Thornstrom, Carl-Gustav, SIDA, Sweden
Van den Berg, Rob, MFA, Netherlands
Van Raalte, Rob, Ministry of Agriculture, Netherlands
Von Mielecki, Rainer, Syngenta, Switzerland
Voss, Joachim, CIAT, Colombia
Wallerstein, Mitch, MacArthur Foundation, USA
Weltzien, Dr. Heinrich Carl, Germany
Werblow, Uwe, European Commission, Belgium
Wilson, Ed, IUCN, Switzerland
Wilson, Mike, DFID, UK
Winkel, Klaus, DANIDA, Denmark
Wyse Jackson, Diane, BGCI, UK
Yudelman, Monty, World Bank (Retired), USA
Zandstra, Hubert, CIP, Peru

Appendix 2**Constituent breakdown**

**Future Harvest
Feasibility and Planning Report****Individuals interviewed - Breakdown by sector**Government, International Agency Officials

Bevege, Ian, ACIAR, Australia
Brown, Linda, DFID, UK
Carabba Tettamanti, Dr. Gioacchino, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy
de Haas, H.-Jochen, Federal Ministry for Cooperation and Development, Germany
Caitley-Carlson, Margaret, Canada
Carlisle, Bob, DFID, UK
Chaparro, Fernando, GFAR, Italy
Clements, Robert, ACIAR, Australia
Dieckmann, Marlene, BEAF, Germany
Echeverria, Ruben, Inter-American Development Bank, USA
Eckebil, Jacques Paul, FAO, Italy
Egger, Paul, SDC, Switzerland
Esquinas-Alcazar, Jose, FAO, Italy
Fust, Walter, DG, SDC, Switzerland
Gass, Thomas, SDC, Switzerland
Goldberg, Ronald, MFA, Netherlands
Grieder, Chirstine, SDC, Switzerland
Harding, Paul, DFID, UK
Howell, Bruce, CIDA, Canada
Johnson, Ian, World Bank, USA
Kleijer, Geert, Switzerland
Kondou, Tetsushi, MFA, Japan
Lampe, Klaus, Germany
MacGillavray, Iain, CIDA, Canada
Nordang, Inge, MFA, Norway
Ohlssen, Eva, SIDA, Sweden
Ozgediz, Selcuk, World Bank, USA
Reifschneider, Francisco, World Bank, USA
Saint-Martin, Gilles, Ministry of Research, France
Sas, Luc, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgium
Shands, Henry, USDA, National Seed Storage Laboratory, USA
Simmons, Emmy, USAID, USA
Tammingha, Klaas, MFA, Netherlands
Tetsushi, Kondou, MFA, Japan
Thompson, Bob, World Bank, USA
Thornstrom, Carl-Gustav, SIDA, Sweden
Van den Berg, Rob, MFA, Netherlands

Van Raalte, Rob, Ministry of Agriculture, Netherlands
Werblow, Uwe, European Commission, Belgium
Wilson, Mike, DFID, UK
Winkel, Klaus, DANIDA, Denmark
Yudelman, Monty, World Bank (retired), USA

Private Sector Corporations and Foundations

Baum, Holger, Media Company, Germany
Barwala Zehr, Usha, Maharashtra Hybrid Seed Company Ltd., India
Cockcroft, Laurence, The Gatsby Charitable Foundation, UK
De Greef, Willie, Syngenta, Switzerland
Dryden, Sam, Emergent Genetics, USA
Fizzel Bieler, Ilene, Citigroup Foundation, USA
Flynn, John, Winrock International, USA
Foster, Fiona, Garfield Weston Foundation, UK
Foster, Rick, Kellogg Foundation, USA
Frie, Jost, Novartis Foundation, Switzerland
Herdt, Bob, Rockefeller Foundation, USA
Holling, Henry, Caterpillar Funds, USA
Holz, Carl, Epcot/Disney, USA
Karel, Frank, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, USA
Kimble, Melinda, UN Foundation, USA
Krueger, Roger, Monsanto, USA
Lass, Tony, Cadbury Schweppes, UK
Leisinger, Klaus, Novartis Foundation, Switzerland
Macmillan, Whitney, Cargill, USA
Meek, Leslie, Citigroup Foundation, USA
Montgomery, Jill, Monsanto, USA
Nicolier, Felix, Novartis Foundation, Switzerland
Nygaard, David, Aga Khan Foundation, Switzerland
Pettit, Fred, Epcot/Disney, USA
Schon, Mary, Epcot/Disney, USA
Schwartz, Constance, Arista Records, USA
Sohlberg, Ragnhild, Norsk-Hydro, Norway
Strayer, Jacqueline, United Technologies Corporation, USA
Von Mielecki, Rainer, Syngenta, Switzerland
Wallerstein, Mitch, MacArthur Foundation, USA

Scientific/NGO/Trade Association Community

Ambrose, Mike, John Innes Centre, UK
Barriga, Claudio, University of Chile, Chile
Beachy, Roger, Danforth Plant and Science Center, USA
Christou, Paul, John Innes Centre, UK
Cotterill, Ralph, Canada
Dragavtsev, Victor, VIR, Russia

Duvick, Don, Iowa State University, USA
Everett, Les, University of Minnesota, USA
Falcon, Wally, Stanford University, USA
Feres, Elias, Cordoba, Spain
Gale, Mike, John Innes Centre, UK
Hajost, Scott, IUCN, USA
Harwood, Richard, Michigan State University, USA
Havenor, Bob, USA
Heffer, Patrick, ASSINSEL, Switzerland
Higgins, Chris, MRC, UK
Iwanaga, Masa, JIRCAS, Japan
Kennedy, Don, Stanford University, USA
Lamb, Chris, John Innes Centre, UK
Le Buanec, Bernard, ASSINSEL, Switzerland
Leadlay, Etelka, BGCI, UK
Lefort, Marianne, INRA, France
MacKenzie, David, University of Maryland, USA
McCalla, Alex, UC Davis, USA
McPherson, Peter, Michigan State University, USA
Mooney, Pat, RAFI, Winnipeg, Canada
Mukiibi, Joseph, Uganda
Ponce, Eliseo, Bureau of Agricultural Research, Philippines
Roberts, Esq., Tim, UK
Sittenfeld, Ana, Costa Rica
Sontot, Andree, BRG, France
Strahm, Wendy, IUCN, Switzerland
Stuart, Simon, IUCN
Swaminathan, M.S., Swaminathan Research Institute, India
Weltzien, Dr. Heinrich Carl, Germany
Wilson, Ed, IUCN, Switzerland
Wyse Jackson, Diane, BGCI, UK

Centre Staff

Bie, Stein, ISNAR, Netherlands
Brader, Lukas, IITA, Nigeria
Cantrell, Ronald, IRRI, Philippines
Dar, William, ICRISAT, India
El-Beltagy, Adel, ICARDA, Syria
Fitzhugh, Hank, ILRI, Kenya
Fowler, Cary, Norway
Frisson, Emile, France
Gardinder, Peter, ICLARM, Malaysia
Hawtin, Geoff, IPGRI, Rome
McDonald, Linda, Future Harvest, UK
Nwanze, Kanayo, WARDA, Cote d'Ivoire
Pinstrup-Anderson, Per, IFPRI, USA
Reeves, Tim, CIMMYT, Mexico
Rijsberman, Frank, IWMI, Sri Lanka
Rose, Barbara, Future Harvest, USA
Rowe, Roger, ICLARM, Malaysia
Sanchez, Pedro, ICRAF, Kenya
Sayer, Jeffrey, CIFOR, Indonesia
Voss, Joachim, CIAT, Colombia
Zandstra, Hubert, CIP, Peru

Appendix 3

Discussion points used in interviews

CONFIDENTIAL

***Feasibility and Planning Study
Questionnaire***

FUTURE HARVEST CENTRES

Interviewee:

Title/Business:

Address:

Interviewer:

Date/Time:

Location:

FUTURE HARVEST CENTRES
INTERVIEW DISCUSSION POINTS

1. How important is it for us to preserve and protect the world's plant genetic diversity?

1-most important
5-not important at all

2. What is your relationship to FHC?

3. How does/can the work of FHC benefit the health of your industry/organization?

4. What are the strengths/best attributes of Future Harvest Centres:

5. Which activity would you characterize as more important for FHC to accomplish?

Conservation
Research
Both
Other
don't know

6. What improvements to FHC would you suggest?

7. Did you have a chance to review the background statement? What is your reaction?

most favorable
favorable
unfavorable

Comments: What's missing? Is it compelling?

8. Sum up proposed campaign. How would you prioritize the following FHC objectives?

- ⇒ Bring all genebanks up to par technologically
- ⇒ Create an endowment for the ongoing support of these centers
- ⇒ Create an agreed upon blueprint and/or protocol for the collection, conservation, and research for the 1300-odd genebanks around the world
- ⇒ Create an endowment to support the ongoing operation of these genebanks

9. Is an endowment necessary?

yes
no
maybe
don't know

10. FHC is considering a campaign to raise \$1 billion. Is this achievable? If not what would be a more achievable goal?

yes
no
maybe

11. Who should FHC look to for financial or political support?

governments
foundations
private individuals
multinationals
associations

Who should we not look to?

12. This campaign, as outlined in our brief background statement, would need a dynamic leadership committee who could guide the organization in making funding

requests to potential donors. Who would you identify as being the right sort of person for this committee if the campaign goes forward?

13. Who do you think would make an effective chairperson for the leadership committee if we were to proceed with this campaign?

14. Would you be willing to serve in a leadership or advisory capacity if we proceed?

15. Would you be willing to approach a few prospective donors? If yes, who would they be?

16. Who else do you think we should definitely interview concerning this proposed project?

17. Who are the best major donor prospects at:

- \$US 50 million
- \$US 25 million
- \$US 10 million
- \$US 5 million
- \$US 1 million

18. How does the proposed campaign for FHC rate as a philanthropic priority of yours/your organisation's?

- highest
- high
- medium
- low

19. If we were to proceed, in which of the categories do you think you (your organization) would be if you were asked to make a donation? (Ask present funders whether they would increase their giving)

20. Are there any obstacles that might affect the success of the proposed campaign?

yes
no
maybe

21. Should FHC conduct the proposed campaign?

yes
no
maybe

22. Are you familiar with FHC Ambassadors like Jimmy Carter, Queen Noor, etc?
How can they best serve the organization? (advocacy, donor requests, etc.)

yes
no

Comments and/or advice related to this project:

Appendix 4**Interview request letter**

«Name»
«Title»
«Company»
«Address1»
«Address2»
«Postcode»
«Country»

Date

Dear «Salutation»:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Future Harvest Centres supported by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

Over the past 30 years, the Future Harvest Centres and their partners in national agricultural research systems have made significant progress in bringing food security to poor countries. In large measure, this has been accomplished by successfully breeding and disseminating improved crop varieties. The plant collections of the Centres have been absolutely critical to this work. These collections hold the largest stocks of the diversity of major crops in the world, material that provides resistance to diseases and pests, climatic and other environmental stresses, improved quality and yield traits for crop improvement. The Future Harvest Centres hold the material in trust for the world's people under the auspices of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Ensuring a sustainable food supply for the world will require making better use of a broader range of plant diversity. The plant collections represent a perpetual responsibility – and with it, a perpetual cost. To put into place a sustainable and secure funding base for the collections will require greatly expanding the network of partners involved in supporting the challenging but obtainable goal of world food security. To date, the work of the Future Harvest Centres has been mainly funded by national governments, the World Bank and the United Nations. The Centres, however, need to develop stronger partnership with public and private funding to create a food secure future. As we enter the 21-century, perhaps, it is timely for us to explore ways in which new as well as existing supporters can provide a solid foundation for the future.

The Centres have retained Community Counselling Service (CCS), an international consulting firm, to assist them in developing a long-term funding plan. We wish to

conduct a series of face-to-face or telephone interviews – whichever is more suitable -- lasting about 30 to 45 minutes, on a confidential basis to discuss our current situation and future opportunities. A Background Statement is attached.

I should be most grateful if you would agree to interact with Tony Kalm, an executive from CCS, sometime over the next few weeks as we hope to have some preliminary feedback for the Mid-Term Meeting of the CGIAR in May, 2001. We will telephone you shortly to arrange the interview.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Yours sincerely,

CC: Dr. Geoffrey C. Hawtin

Att: