

YPARD Strategic Planning meeting

20-22 January 2014, FAO HQ, Rome, Italy

Please find the list of participants at the end of the document.

Contents

Opening, welcome introductions.....	3
External Review of YPARD	5
Identify YPARD stakeholders and their interests	6
Revisiting YPARD ‘raison d’être’	8
GCU’s perspective	8
Results from the Walk the Wheel exercise.....	9
YPARD Regional and National Activities	11
Nigeria:.....	11
Russia:	11
Nepal:.....	11
India:	11
Pakistan:.....	12
Vietnam:.....	12
Bangladesh:.....	12
Kyrgystan:.....	12
China:	12
Asia:.....	12
Europe:.....	12
Logframe	13
List of participants.....	15

Opening, welcome introductions

Opening introduction to the meeting from the Vice Chair

F. Kruijssen thanked all the participants. She expressed that the Steering Committee agrees with the review's results about the great progress YPARD has made in the last 4 years. She was glad that YPARD is no longer 'navel gazing' and is pleased to see that this planning phase is including the presence and inputs from partners and stakeholders attending the meeting (GFAR, CGIAR, IFAD, FAO, CTA, IFAD, FANRPAN, YUNGA).

Introduction from GFAR, Mark Holderness

M. Holderness summarized the reasons behind GFAR and YPARD's collaboration. Everything was born in 2005. He encourages YPARD to keep the same spirit, to be committed to be the voice of the young people. YPARD is now part of the GFAR SC. Good arrangements with FAO are in place for the hosting of YPARD. In cash term this amounts at 125,000 USD a year, plus communication, etc, provided free of charge by GFAR. Besides GFAR provides other support, for example in mobilizing resources.

YPARD has shown measurable and quantifiable outcomes, but a lot can still be done. Youth needs incentives to get into rural development and agriculture (for example 5,000 farmers per year are leaving agriculture in the UK). Youth need new way of using tools, attracting youth in agriculture in university and celebrating youth. YPARD has a say on how young people should be represented in GFAR, in research, development, private sector and civil society. Just continue the good work in an even more innovative way, while diversifying the stakeholder groups and keeping a light administrative structure.

Introduction from SDC, Marlene Heeb, SDC responsible for YPARD

SDC is a donor fully committed to support the youth. They are glad about the results from the review about the last 4 years. YPARD got heard; it raised its visibility; now the key is to work on development of content. M. Heeb shares the view of Mark, on opening to other stakeholders, and maintaining a light structure. If we continue to support YPARD, we want to do it by continuing with a core support (back up to be active on specific topics). This support could continue, with the commitment from YPARD to diversify the donors' sources. She states that once SDC will receive a GOOD planning document, SDC is willing to share it with other donors' platforms to seek more funds. She supports the review's recommendation on mentorship: it is an interesting topic, it's a key one.

Introduction from Anne-Laure Roy from: IFAD

IFAD is working on youth. There is no global strategy. They try to mobilise governments they are working with to put the youth as specific target group in the projects, during the design phase. There is more than just a difference between young men and women: also levels of education and environment. Intergeneration complementarity is also key; IFAD experiments some mentorship programs. Young people are complementary with senior in terms with skills, etc. youth links with rural peri-urban and urban areas. IFAD tries to invest in capacity building of young people. Some projects try to link with potential employers. The projects do not see Migration as a bad thing. Migration can be good with a

goal (to be chosen), and thanks to the people they are interacting with. Training people is not enough. They are designing a new generation of projects with a first component on capacity building, increase access to credits, and support from many types of stakeholders. Financial service providers should diversify the type of services to provide to young men and women. They work on finding co-funders to work on projects on improving an enabling environment in rural areas, providing services, to make agriculture more attractive to youth.

Introduction from Enrica Porcari, CGIAR consortium

E. Porcari is a real supporter of youth. She tried, herself, to make a change in the CGIAR when she arrived. Having gone through the transition in an organization where she was part of the 'minority' (young and a woman), she has big hopes. There are opportunities coming from chief executive officers: the organization is now more open to youth than it has ever been. 15 centers in the consortium, looking at the workforce as one. They are looking at how many young professionals are working and where they could be more engaged. YPARD should not wait to be asked to get into the discussions and inputs to the 16 CRPs. There is a growing interest and awareness in youth, looking at solutions for the future, working with people that the future will affect. She was supporting the social network in the CGIAR (and played a major role in involving YPARD into GCARD2 social reporting). Age in CGIAR is going down, the youth can be coupled with wisdom of senior staff.

Introduction from Sithembile Ndema, FANRPAN

S. Ndema was already involved with some YPARD activities, but it is the first time that she was meeting national representatives from other regions. She started working on youth since 2010 with the support of CTA. They conducted case studies on 6-10 countries, on which policies are in place to facilitate engagement of youth in agriculture. They invite the youth to think critically and give their input about the policies, with recommendations (some have been taken in, other less). Review CAADAP policies in some countries. Opportunities to push the engagement of youth in agriculture. Try to train youth in understanding policies and policy making. Also trying to celebrate the youth (introducing an award for young people doing well in agriculture to serve as example). Biggest challenge: when you talk about agriculture people don't have a great model to look at (such as bill gates for IT, etc.). This is should created: maybe YPARD could help doing that?

Introduction from Alashiya Gordes from YUNGA

YUNGA is hosted by FAO since 2009. They have the vision for youth to be agent of change, to act as mouthpiece of new ideas, rethink the way we do business. Junior farmers school and lifeschool programme focus on: "learn by doing, the longer you learn the better it is". FAO works in partnership with ILO. YUNGA works with 3 age categories: aged from 5 to 20. They work with different UN agencies in different topics. Youth in general has been very high in the UN agenda which is included in the new FAO strategic framework and there is a 5 year action plans for youth within the UN.

Introduction from Moses Abukari IFAD/GYIN

GYIN has been in partnership with a US-based organization receiving a small grant for the 'global youth innovation network' - GYIN. Young people should be seen as a main actor and not only as a party. GYIN

was launched in 2011, with many youth from different countries. An event launched the programme in 2011 during the governing council.

External Review of YPARD

The ER was started in September 2013, by a junior and a senior consultant, in the spirit of YPARD.

Approach:

- Face-to-face meeting with the GCU (activities, achievements, challenges, plans), plus meeting with GFAR (Mark Holderness and Harry Palmier) about the hosting agreement
- Review of documents (including the last review 2009)
- 30 stakeholders interviewed: SC members, former coordinator, regional coordinators, other senior stakeholders in ARD
- 2 surveys: one for members and one for ARD community members (low response, as they could not reach out all the YPARD members)

Conclusions and recommendation of the review:

- Significant increase of membership over the last 4 years (400% more members)
- Continued gender gap (70% and male), same as 4 years ago. YPARD has spent efforts to fill that gap, but it remains a challenge and may be representative of a reality
- Stakeholder representation: the least represented group are the farmers as well as private sector and NGOs. Most of the members come from research and university. There is a large difference in the number of students as well from 40% students four years ago to 20% students today.
- Members' satisfaction and efficiency: members are happy with the website and social media. There is room for improvement in networking. Members have increased their networks with young professionals and less with senior professionals (this should be improved).
- Prominence of YPARD in the ARD community: visibility has increased. YPARD has participated actively in ARD strategic events (in particular, in social media). Thematic collaboration should increase.
- Governance: challenges given by the increasing membership giving more and more responsibilities. The charter should be revised
- Regional and national representatives: engagement in the work with YPARD. One common challenge is the lack of time to dedicate to YPARD activities, within their responsibilities. Hosting arrangements should be reviewed and possibly improved. For national representatives it would be good to have the same type of arrangements as for the regional coordinators.
- YPARD should focus strongly and strategically on a content-driven agenda to bring a stronger impact and attract more funds.
- Need to diversify resource base and increase the budget for the next phase in order to address the growing membership and achieve the sought after results.

- Increase the regional coordinators time to cover countries which are not yet represented. The GCU should increase its staff.
- Mentorship: put in place a mentorship programme is a key recommendation.

QUESTIONS and answers / discussion points

- What are the members' needs? To receive funding opportunities, but members are also interested in obtaining partner opportunities, particularly with senior professionals
- How do we explain the lower age groups now, but fewer students?
- What is more important? Focusing on content or strengthening the network?
- Why are those groups less represented – farmers, private sector? Maybe because the start of the target group was YPs in ARD. Farmers are more difficult to reach and the private sector may be less interested. We must make an effort to include them.
- Agree on strengthening the GCU. But the funds will be difficult to fund coordination positions. So it should be thought that the regional coordinators can contribute more, so that the workload on the global coordination unit is lessened.
- Challenge of funds. SDC may not support YPARD anymore. Looking at diversifying the donors at regional level is fundamental (for example embassies).
- We need to looking at the sustainability of YPARD.
- Gender gap should be compared with the involvement of women in the sector in different countries. 30% of women may be representative of the share of women involved in agriculture as a broad sector.
- How can we handle a content-driven agenda when we are dealing with a very diverse and not a homogenous group: what does it mean and how to raise the voice of the youth if they are so diverse? For example, per stakeholder groups?
- CGIAR is engaging youth in shaping the agenda. Learn from the gender focal points. Gender has taken its own mainstreaming path. The CGIAR is more advanced in the gender issue but less advanced in the youth issue, but they are on the way to bring youth voice on board. It should be seen as part of the process: embed in the SRF from the beginning to be part of the solution and not just been given a slot in the participation as youth in the panel. Youth is a privilege as it won't stay there for very long!! Just make the most of it! (Enrica)
- What is the level of members' role (400% plus) – but how to engage them in concrete terms? Are they active? How many?
- Mentoring: we could work on informal association inside an organization, for example associations, ask for help, it may be very welcome.
- Look at other organizations' youth agenda.

Identify YPARD stakeholders and their interests

The group was solicited to reflect on the present stakeholder chart from the charter and respond these basic questions: “Are we missing anything? Should anything be removed?”

When starting the discussion the participants were struggling with the definition of stakeholders due to the not clear structuring of which stakeholders were being talking about.

Questions: Who are YPARD’s primary and secondary stakeholders? What are the interests of stakeholders?

Grade	Stakeholders	Interest
Direct stakeholders	Funding agencies on ARD related projects	To consider the perspectives and inclusion of young people
	Young agricultural extensionists	
	Young ARD professionals in research / science	
	ARD students tertiary level	
	Policy makers	Access to young people
	Young entrepreneurs	
	Young farmers	
	Rural development agencies	
	Media	
	Policy makers	
Secondary stakeholders	Young pupils before they have made their job decision	
	Agricultural/environmental Universities	Curriculum matches the job market
	NGOs in agriculture food security etc.	
	Farmers Producer Organizations	Pool of professional researchers
	Agricultural Research Institutes	

Stakeholders as per the table above: Funding agencies Donors at ARD related projects, Young agricultural extensionists, Young ARD professionals in research / science, ARD students tertiary level, Policy makers, Young entrepreneurs, Young farmers, Rural development agencies, Media, Policy makers (direct stakeholders), Young pupils before making their job decision, Agricultural/environmental Universities, NGOS’s in agriculture food security etc., Farmers Producer Organizations, Agricultural Research Institutes (Secondary stakeholders)

Note:

→ We may need to also target rural development stakeholders; even if they do not have an agricultural background as they are part of the broader picture

→ Who are those stakeholders benefiting from knowledge generation and how to make use of that knowledge?

→ Some discussions stressed the difference between: “agricultural entrepreneur” and “farmers”, both mentioned in the stakeholders table. One must differentiate “agricultural entrepreneurs” and “farmers”, depending on their background and type of professional activities.

Revisiting YPARD ‘raison d’être’

The exercise revisited the vision, mission and core values/principles of YPARD to create a common understanding as a foundation for the MTP.

New Vision (to add the notion of Youth):

Sustainably improved livelihoods worldwide where young professionals are proactively contributing to innovative agricultural development.

Mission:

To serve as the collective global platform enabling young professionals to realize their full potential and contribute towards innovative agricultural development

Principles should be explained in a sentence for each value.

GCU’s perspective

The GCU presented the key achievements and brief perspectives for the future.

Courtney

- YPARD is better recognized by AR4D organizations. Still more improvement is needed. Courtney started in 2010; where a shift was made for ARD events. Now it is concentrated on 2 to 3 big events per year, trying to get into the main sessions. GCARDII, social media programs, and also getting in panel sessions, was successful.
- We conducted a study on skills and capacity gaps of young professionals.
- We should really look at our comparative advantage in order to prioritize our activities. What is YPARD’s comparative advantage?
- Challenges: we have weak capacities for the structure we have; we can’t respond to the requests in Africa.
- Regional support should be increased, e.g. through partnering. If anyone at the meeting is available to provide regional support (ie. hosting) let’s discuss.

Marina

- Social media strongly supports YPARD on its way forward!
- Agrivivo is a portal that serves to connect youth to senior professionals.
- Input from young people has been boosted.
- Work of GCU is highly appreciated by the senior partners.

Results from the Walk the Wheel exercise

WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM THE PAST ?

Priorities:

- Impact = social media mobilization
- Develop a long-term strategy instead of day to day opportunities
- Partner with the most relevant stakeholders (and not reinvent the wheel)
- Institutional support is key: it requires considerable engagement and support. Are sponsors / institutions receiving enough visibility? Is there transparency of the hosting arrangements?
- Relevance, need of presence
- Strong regional coordinators (Hosting & personal)

Further

- Experience of/ from the gender movement.
- Soliciting active contributions from members
- Diversified stakeholder group important
- Focus on key events
- Be proactive: don't wait to be called

WHAT ARE OUR GOALS AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE ?

Priorities:

- Fostering national groups
- Mentoring program (functional online and 1:1)
- Support and initiate youth policy (for institutions, CG....)
- Contribute to policy debates bringing content = youth voice

Further:

- Make use of the current network better
- Mobilize resources and funding to support activities
- Continuing acting as capacity building and as knowledge brokers
- Improve national and regional visibility and efficiency to act
- All the regional and national representatives should have a good communication
- Support outreach to young age category
- M&E improved: Indicators, type of report, content, mechanism.

WHAT DO WE WANT TO CHANGE AND LEAVE BEHIND US ?

Priorities:

- Diversify membership and be more relevant to other groups besides researchers
- From process driven to strategic content driven agenda
- Clarity of roles and responsibilities

Further:

- Diversify funding resources.
- Improve insufficient internal communications & sharing of best practices
- Centralization (we need more decentralized activities)
- Focus just/mostly on social media (more action from and on the field)
- Gap of status definition of platform at national level (in some countries)
- Address language issues/ barriers to include other regions

WHAT IS OUR WORST FEAR AND HOW WILL WE FACE IT?

Priorities:

- Loss of funding
- Diversifying funding sources (institutions / thematic (not only agriculture))
- Working with partners, in-kind support
- Activity based funding
- Inactivity of members
- Maintain engagement through needs tailored outreach
- Maintain strong presence on national and regional level
- Risk of focus on content driven agenda: a position or standpoint that may alienate certain members.
- YPARD itself doesn't need to take a position on issues but simply to communicate the position of its members
- Lack of strong content messages
- Capacity development
- Innovative communication of existing knowledge

Further:

- Ineffective interventions
- What happens when youth is no longer a priority area?

YPARD Regional and National Activities

Nigeria:

- a huge increase in members from 2012 to end of 2013. Nigeria has around 560 members now, with a big proportion of women;
- during to the presence at the FARA Science Week and through several awareness raising events in universities, YPARD Nigeria increased its visibility both among youth and in the eyes of stakeholders, being invited to give a presentation at IITA;
- YPARD Nigeria members had the opportunity to hold presentation at different regional conferences in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire etc.;

Russia:

- Started in July 2013, it has 13 members;
- Collaboration with "Voice of youth";
- Started a group on the Russian social media network VKontakte for exchange of information among members;
- YPARD presentation at the Agricultural University of Pushkin in September 2013;
- The language is considered as a barrier in further constructing YPARD Russia, but it is also an opportunity to engage new regions and promote YPARD on other networks;

Nepal:

- YPARD Nepal has 9 active members + 20 volunteers;
- 2 of its members are currently working as YPARD Social Media and Web4Knowledge Interns with the GCU;
- They've started a Google and a Facebook group;
- Organized YPARD Cafe and YPARD Awareness Program giving several presentations at universities;
- Technical Knowledge Sharing with undergraduates in different fields;
- A big increase in the YPARD website/social media content from Nepalese members;
- Future plans: National photo competition on family farming & National Youth Forum on Agriculture and Forest based Entrepreneurship Development;

India:

- New Country representative: Yashpal Saharawat;
- Built working group;
- YPARD represented at joint ICAR-APAARI-TAAS workshop on Foresight and future pathways of agricultural research through youth;

Pakistan:

- Regional Workshop on Youth and agriculture;
- YPARD Pakistan on Facebook;
- Email working group/list;

Vietnam:

- Workshop the role of biodiversity and biotechnology in response to climate change;

Bangladesh:

- Organized field visits for youth;
- Active Facebook group;

Kyrgystan:

- New Country representative Meerim Shakirova - active at international events;

China:

- Annual face2face workshop for YPARD China members;
- Extending collaboration with CAAS network;
- Cooperation with several types of stakeholders: private sector, civil society etc.;
- Organized 4 activities under all YPARD key objectives;
- Searched for various potential funding at local level: AgriTT, SW University etc.

Asia:

- Relocation of Regional Coordination unit from VIT University, India to CAAS China;
- Creation of Google Group;
- Preparations are being made for a YPARD Asia conference.

Europe:

- Started in mid 2012, hosted at HAFL Switzerland, with a contribution of around 24,000 \$/year;
- 9 Country Representatives have been identified and selected;
- Participated in the Tropentag 2013 (with a presentation stand) and the GLF;
- Started YPARD Europe Facebook group and page;
- 7 countries have Facebook groups and Russia has a YPARD group on VKontakte;
- Presentations about YPARD in 4 countries;
- Shot 3 short films presenting young farmers` visions and started panel discussions about the topic;
- Present at the International Leadership Workshop for Rural Youth organized in Herrsching;
- Language is considered a barrier for wide level dissemination of YPARD message;

The YPARD Africa regional coordinator was unable to attend the meeting at the last minute and gave some points via email in regards to some of the updates for the region. This included the youth and the CAADP meeting which was held at FARA in March 2013 and included many of the Africa country representatives.

The LAC Coordinator has resigned from her post due to increasing duties in CIAT. A new one will be announced by CIAT soon. This region has seen a slow development and expansion and we are hoping the new coordinator will bring more activity to the role. The representative in Trinidad and Tobago has made strong links to the Agribusiness society of the west indies and the Brazil representative has been very active in developing the country level activities.

Logframe

Goal / impact:

Sustainably improved livelihoods worldwide where young professionals are proactively contributing to innovative agricultural development.

Purpose / outcome:

To serve as the collective global platform enabling young professionals to realize their full potential and contribute towards innovative agricultural development

Results / outputs:

Results/outputs correspond to what we had as strategic objectives. The first question was about whether we had to change them.

No. 1: Facilitate exchange of information among YPsagreed.

No. 2: Proposal: Broaden opportunities for YPs to contribute to strategic policy debates in agricultural development.

Some people had felt that there were two objectives: 1. "broaden opportunities" and 2. "strategic policy debates". Another proposal was: strengthen capacities for YPs to contribute to strategic ARD policy debates. But this confused two of the objectives. In addition "Research" was deleted.

No. 3: It was discussed that promote agriculture among young people was not sufficient as an output. It needed additional words e.g. as a career? For what purpose? "...as a viable career path" /"improving perceptions among young people" Another change proposed was: Improve the perception of agriculture among young people? No because we cannot influence this.

Decision: keep the old version: promote agriculture among young people

No. 4: Facilitate access to resources and capacity building opportunities. OK

No. 5: Should a new result be added on diversifying fund raising? No it is a means to achieve the results. In that same logic you would also need to add the partnerships, communication etc.

SDC would like to see it as a result of the next phase so that it is easier to justify further funding as a result of the next phase.

The groups of participants were split into group in order to work on identifying activities and indicators.

Day 3

The day started with a review of the discussions during the past two days. The logframes prepared by each of the respective teams were presented to receive feedback. It was agreed that the logframe will be referred to for M&E both at internal (within YPARD's own structural functioning and reporting lines) and external levels. Keeping this in mind, it was generally decided with all the members present on the occasion that necessary amount of details can be agreed upon for each of the defined objectives, however certain degree of flexibility will remain as the part of working and delivering outputs. More specifically, we must retain YPARD's fundamental principal as a platform for open ideas and thoughts which cannot always be monitored with strict conventional guidelines.

The working group for objective 1 presented the indicators to measure outcomes. Some of those included the use of multi-media such radio and TV to communicate YPARD's message more widely and also get members actively involved. Discussions were held whether primary and secondary schools should also be target of YPARD's outreach campaigns; however it was decided secondary school only. In addition, suggestions were made to target special events like World Food day and Youth Day etc....It was raised by the GCU members that the products used by national or regional units should have a common language and quality control measures. National and regional points can translate these into their language as may be required. The above set of argument captures the intense discussion around each of the indicators that were selected and included in the final version of the logframe

Working group for objective 2 explained that indicators should well reflect the action at regional and local level. For example number of blog posts by each country, this would mean each country should have a dedicated web space. E-discussions were suggested as a good medium for widespread impact and reflective of a content based agenda for the upcoming strategic action plan (2014-2018). Concern was raised about the quality control and relevance of the information generated at regional and local level which would need additional human resources at the GCU or at least some champions at those levels who can handle this action appropriately. Discussion around training initiatives for capacity development of the YP's by YPARD was also reported; conduction of such activities in partnership was discussed as an option. Similar discussions were initiated for other groups as well (objective 1 to 6), though the first four objectives contribute directly to the outcome mapping of the last two. It was clarified as well to see that management functioning structures and need for diversified funding sources are dimensions well reflected in M&E. All in all the detailed deliberation added to the understanding and clarity on the details that we finally entered into the log frame document.

It was generally agreed that having clarity on agreements with the hosting organisation at regional (local/national) level with help set a positive tone for fulfillment of YPARD objectives, not only functional (activity based objectives) but also for management's requirements and fund raising strategies.

List of participants

Panday	Dinesh	YPARD Nepal
Gaye	Sokhna Rokhaya	YPARD Senegal
Bi	Jieying	YPARD China and YPARD Asia coordinator to be
Ojo	Olawale Isaiah (online)	YPARD Nigeria
Perevoshchikova	Iana	YPARD Russia
Giuliani	Alessandra	YPARD Former SC member and founder
Oliveros	Oliver	YPARD Former SC member and founder
Kruijssen	Froukje	YPARD Former SC member /External reviewer 2009
Paveliuc Olariu	Codrin	YPARD SC Chair
Nagabhatla	Nidhi	YPARD SC member
Graf	Martina	YPARD Europe
Odularu	Gbadebo (absent)	YPARD Africa
Mwamakamba	Sithembile	FANRPAN
Lohento	Ken	CTA
Roy	Anne-Laure	IFAD
Abukari	Moses	GYIN/IFAD
Gordes	Alashiya	YUNGA
Porcari	Enrica	CGIAR
Holderness	Mark	GFAR
Heeb	Marlene	SDC
Wang	Jie	FAO/YPARD China
Paisley	Courtney	YPARD Director
Cherbonnier	Marina	YPARD Web&Com
Schneider	Monika	Moderator +++
Cespedes	Lisa	External Reviewer
Andriese	Wim (online)	External Reviewer