

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Thirteenth Meeting of the Executive Council

October 16-17, 2007

Rome, Italy

Summary Record of Proceedings



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
November 5, 2007*

Acronyms Used

AB	Alliance Board of CGIAR Centers
AE	Alliance Executive of CGIAR Centers
AGM	Annual General Meeting
AHH	Agriculture and Human Health
ARI	Advance Research Institution
BOT	Board of Trustees
CCER	Center Commissioned External Review
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIP	Internacional Potato Center
CONDESAN	Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion
CPER	Challenge Program External Review
CPWF	Challenge Program on Water and Food
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CP	CGIAR Challenge Program
CWANA	Central and West Asia and North Africa
DG	Director General
EC	European Commission
EIARD	European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ESA	East and Southern Africa
ExCo	CGIAR Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FORAGRO	Foro de las Américas para la Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
HR	Human Resources
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Center
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
ICT-KM	Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
IPG	International Public Goods

IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
MDTF	World Bank Multi Donor Trust Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTP	Medium-Term Plan
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NERICA	New Rices for Africa
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PGRFA	Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
PM	Performance Measurement
PSC	Private Sector Committee
SC	Science Council
SMTA	Standard Material Transfer Agreement
SO	System Office
SP	System Priorities of the CGIAR
SPMS	SC Standing Panel on Mobilizing Science
SPPS	SC Standing Panel on Priorities and Strategies
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWEP	Systemwide and Ecoregional Program
TOR	Terms of Reference
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WARDA	Africa Rice Center
WCA	West and Central Africa

Contents

ExCo 13 Conclusions and Recommendations	iv
1. Opening Session.....	1
2. CGIAR Status Report	1
2.a. Report from Director	1
3. Science Council and Program Matters.....	3
3.a. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan.....	3
3.b. Report from Science Council	7
4. Challenge Programs	8
4.a. Challenge Programs External Reviews.....	8
4.b. Challenge Programs: Lessons Learned	11
4.c. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Pre-Proposals	13
5. Evaluation.....	15
5.a. CIP EPMR.....	15
5.b. IITA EPMR.....	16
6. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers	17
7. Alignment in the CGIAR	18
7.a. Final Report from ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities.....	18
7.b. Scoping Team Proposal	20
8. Evaluation.....	23
8.a. WARDA EPMR.....	23
8.b. CIAT EPMR	24
8.c. EPMR Meta-analysis	26
8.d. Follow-up to EPMRs	28
8.e. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR (Closed Session)	29
9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee.....	29
10. Planning ExCo Business	31
11. Other Business	31
12. Closing Session.....	31
Attachments	
List of Participants	32
Agenda	34
Summary: ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 13.....	37

All documents for ExCo 13 are available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/exco13/index.html>

ExCo 13 Conclusions and Recommendations

2.a. Report from Director

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked R. Wang for his report.*
- *A presentation on the methodology and work plan of the CGIAR External Review should be organized at AGM07.*
- *K. Sierra also thanked Fionna Douglas for her leadership as Acting CGIAR Director during the transition.*

3.a. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommends CGIAR approval of the 2008 financing plan.*
- *ExCo requested the CGIAR Secretariat to:*
 - 1) *Improve presentation of the financing plan with more clarity;*
 - 2) *Further analyze the impact of the weakening US dollar on the 2008 funding projections;*
 - 3) *Make every effort to clear any bottlenecks in the disbursement of Member funds through the MDTF in the World Bank.*
- *Further analysis of the SC proposal to de-link the MTP output planning from the PM system is required. ExCo requested SC and the CGIAR Secretariat to submit a proposal to ExCo 14 that does not devalue but optimizes the utility of the PM System, maintains incentives, and ensures high output goals.*
- *ExCo endorsed the SC recommendation for analysis of Center MTPs by the SC every third year, or as required by SC assessment, instead of automatically yearly. It also expressed support to the online tool linking the MTPs, the finance and the PM databases.*

3.b. Report from Science Council

Conclusion and ExCo Endorsement:

- *ExCo thanked the SC for the report and complimented it for its clarity and the quality of the in depth and comprehensive analyses.*
- *ExCo endorsed the proposed SC structure changes to mainstream priorities and strategies, and mobilizing science into the work of the entire SC. ExCo recommends the CGIAR approve the change, while the required amendment of the CGIAR Charter resulting from the change should be postponed for one year pending outcome of the facilitated change management process during 2008.*
- *SC should determine what metrics to use to measure results of mainstreaming mobilization of science, and report back to ExCo on the results.*
- *ExCo endorsed the SC Work Plan and Budget for 2008-2009. The footnote on page 8 of the work plan and budget document should be re-drafted to note that SC is funded by an annual levy on Centers' total budgets.*

4.a. Challenge Program External Reviews

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated HarvestPlus for a favorable external review report, and recommends that the CGIAR endorse the HarvestPlus CPER recommendations and the CP should proceed to Phase 2.*
- *ExCo should have more in depth discussion and develop a strategy in response to the fact of one new donor providing a significant amount of funding to the HarvestPlus CP.*
- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the CPWF CPER recommendations and the CP should proceed to Phase 2. CPWF was requested to report back to SC and then to ExCo in May 2008 for a review of its Phase 2 plan towards a more focused program and reformed governance structure.*
- *ExCo should determine the minimum requirement for CP governance and agree on a set of principles on governance and good practices with adequate flexibility.*

4.b. Challenge Programs: Lessons Learned

Conclusion:

- *ExCo considered that this is a very useful opportunity to pause and learn from experience.*
- *Lessons from the report and the discussion at ExCo should be incorporated into Cycle 2 CP proposals and the design of CP Cycle 3, in particular efforts should be made to simplify the process.*
- *ExCo requested the Science Council, together with the Alliance and the CGIAR Secretariat to develop a toolkit of mechanisms which could be best used to meet the CGIAR's diverse research objectives. This work should feed into the Scoping Team's discussions to avoid duplication of ideas.*

4.c. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Pre-Proposals

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo expressed appreciation to the Science Council for its assessment of the Challenge Program Cycle 2 Pre-proposals.*
- *ExCo also expressed disappointment with the low quality of the pre-proposals, but recognized these are important research areas and the CGIAR should signal a willingness to move forward.*
- *With respect to the pre-proposals on Oasis and High-value Crops, ExCo decided the following:*
 - 1) *The proponents of the pre-proposals on Oasis and High-value Crops should incorporate lessons learned from the first cycle of CPs presented at ExCo 13, and guided by inputs from the SC on the pre-proposals, develop full proposals for SC review.*
 - 2) *Oasis should be submitted by February 29, 2008, for assessment by SC and discussion and recommendation at ExCo 14.*

- 3) *High-value Crops should be submitted at the latest by July 31, 2008, if not earlier for assessment by SC and discussion and recommendation at ExCo 15.*
 - 4) *After submission of the full proposals, if ExCo does not believe the full proposals are of sufficient quality, they would be withdrawn from further consideration.*
- *With respect to Climate Change, ExCo decided:*
 - 1) *The Alliance, Science Council, and CGIAR Secretariat should take stock of where we are on work that is already being undertaken within the CGIAR on climate change and use this as a basis to develop a strategic initiative on climate change to be announced in December 2007, in order to position the CGIAR as a leader in climate change research. This should be available two weeks prior to AGM07 for review and endorsement by the CGIAR Membership.*
 - 2) *The proponents of the pre-proposal on climate change should incorporate lessons learned from the first cycle of CPs, comments from the SC, and information on gaps identified by the stock taking, and develop a more focused full proposal for submission to SC by February 29, 2008, for assessment by SC and discussion and recommendation at ExCo 14.*
 - 3) *In addition, the CGIAR would convene a conference in 2008 on climate change to bring together key representatives of the international research community to identify ways to move the mitigation and adaptation agendas forward.*
 - *To initiate proposal development, proponents should seek clarification and guidance from the Science Council.*

5.a. CIP EPMR

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated CIP for a positive review and thanked the panel for its report.*
- *ExCo agreed with CIP's response on recommendations 11-14.*
- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 6th CIP EPMR recommendations and CIP's response to recommendations 11-14.*

5.b. IITA EPMR

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated IITA for a positive review and thanked the panel.*
- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 6th IITA EPMR recommendations.*
- *ExCo encourages more publication of results from IITA to ensure better communication of activities and impacts to the CGIAR community.*

6. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thank the Alliance for the report.*
- *ExCo stressed the need for Centers to comply with implementation of the stripe review recommendations on corporate governance, and would like to see a plan to get all Centers on board.*
- *There are more opportunities for collaboration with the private sector and the CGIAR should seriously consider how to achieve those goals.*

7.a. Final Report from the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities

Conclusion and ExCo recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorsed the recommendations of the ExCo ad hoc committee, subject to the understanding that discussion at AGM07 should be undertaken with a sense of likely support from CGIAR Members.*
- *ExCo requested the ad hoc committee to canvass Members to gauge the willingness to develop timelines and implement the recommendations.*

7.b. Scoping Team Proposal

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorsed the Scoping Team proposal recommendations and recommends the CGIAR move forward with the change management process.*
- *To ensure all of the relevant voices are heard and issues identified, ExCo requested the Scoping Team continue to survey stakeholders, including focus groups of young researchers.*
- *ExCo members were requested to consult with their constituencies and identify names of persons that should be consulted by the Scoping Team.*
- *It is important to build trust in the System, and to begin by placing trust in the change design team, establish future roles and responsibilities at AGM, and give flexibility to the change design team to do what needs to be done, in order to help the process move forward without undue delays.*
- *Additional funding for the change management process from members will be welcome to supplement World Bank funding.*
- *The scoping team was requested to incorporate ExCo's comments and feedback in their proposal and develop specific immediate proposals that could be considered by CGIAR at AGM for decision.*

8.a. WARDA EPMR

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo is pleased with a positive EPMR and recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 5th WARDA EPMR recommendations. The momentum to move forward should be maintained by the Center.*

8.b. CIAT EPMR

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 6th CIAT EPMR recommendations, including the SC recommendation for a follow-up review within 18 months to report on progress in implementing the recommendations.*
- *ExCo also requests the Center to report back to ExCo 14 on the new management team and strategy.*
- *The new finance director of the Center needs to be of a high caliber and should report directly to the DG.*
- *The reinvigoration plan should ensure real and lasting change, and engage scientists at the Center to help turn the crisis into a new future.*
- *ExCo commends the scientific community at the Center for their resilience in the face of severe problems, and for the scientific excellence of their research.*
- *The CGIAR System should reflect on how it reacts to warning signs, and what might have been done differently given the complexities and limitations of the System.*

8.c. EPMR Meta-analysis

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *The EPMR guidelines should be revised, building on the key findings and recommendations of the EPMR meta-evaluation.*
- *Clarity should be made on how the PM System could be used effectively in the conduct of EPMRs.*
- *Formulation of a rating system for EPMRs and conduct of a lessons learned exercise every five years would be useful to further strengthen EPMRs.*
- *ExCo recommends a modified Option 2 in the CGIAR Secretariat's commentary in the process of CGIAR handling of EPMR reports, with the following additions:*
 - 1) *All EPMR reports should be sent to CGIAR Membership including those not requiring full discussion at AGM as determined by ExCo.*
 - 2) *Centers should also be given the option to request an EPMR report be discussed at AGM.*
 - 3) *ExCo should recommend discussion of a particular EPMR at AGM, if ExCo feels the EPMR contains either positive or negative lessons for the System.*
- *The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to revise the option to include these additions for discussion at AGM07.*

8.e. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR (Closed Session)

Conclusion:

- *ExCo remains interested in this matter and requested a progress report from the ICRAF Board Chair for ExCo 14.*

9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

Conclusion and ExCo Decision on GRPC Work Plan and Budget:

- *ExCo members need more time to fully analyze the issue before it could recommend anything definitive to the CGIAR.*
- *ExCo members are requested to send their written comments to the GRPC through its Secretary (Emile Frison, Director General, Bioversity International).*
- *The issue will be scheduled for further discussion at ExCo 14.*
- *ExCo endorsed GRPC's work plan and budget for 2007-2009.*

1. Opening Session

CGIAR Chair Kathy Sierra welcomed ExCo members to ExCo 13. She thanked the Government of Italy and Ministry of Foreign Affairs for hosting the meeting, and all of the support provided. She extended a special welcome to new CGIAR Director Ren Wang. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1.)

Welcome by Host Country

Minister Renzo Maria Rosso, Development Cooperation Multilateral Coordination, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy, welcomed ExCo to Italy. He highlighted the importance of agricultural research to the development process. He also noted that the development process must focus attention on socio-economic factors in order to develop appropriate policies that contribute to poverty reduction, food security, and protection of natural resources. He stressed the importance of cooperation to research effectiveness and the continued support of the Italian government to the CGIAR.

Election of Meeting Co-Chair

Rodney Cooke (IFAD) was nominated and elected Co-chair of the meeting.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with the following modifications: 1) Discussion times for items 8.b. (CIAT EPMR) and 5.b. (IITA EPMR) were switched, and 2) Item 8.e. (Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR) was moved to be discussed following lunch on the second day in closed session (see Attachment 2). Please note that items appear in this summary in the original order of the agenda.

2. CGIAR Status Report

2.a. Report from Director

CGIAR Director Ren Wang updated ExCo on developments in the CGIAR since ExCo 12 not covered in other agenda items.

Finance: He reported that USAID and the World Bank have reached agreement on the USA accession to the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), which is a major achievement. The European Commission (EC) and IFAD have also completed an agreement that ensures the 2007 EC contribution will be dispersed to CGIAR Centers. Efforts to update CGIAR fiduciary standards continue. The CGIAR Secretariat is working with the CGIAR finance community and external experts on the procurement guidelines, to be followed by indirect cost allocation and auditing standards. The CGIAR Secretariat is also facilitating a discussion among interested Members on a reinvigoration

plan for CIAT. The expected 2008 Science Council (SC) budget of \$3.6 million will receive extraordinary support of \$1.5 million from investment income on the old CGIAR trust fund in the World Bank. All Members that contributed to the trust fund have agreed to this arrangement. This implies a lower levy on Centers' total budgets in 2008 for SC funding. Overall CGIAR System funding (including Challenge Programs) for 2007 is estimated at \$510 million.

Governance and Accountability: R. Wang updated ExCo on the External Review of the CGIAR, noting that the terms of reference (TOR) for the review were approved by the CGIAR after incorporating comments received from Members. The panel membership was also approved. The timeline for the review has been adjusted; an inception report will be available in November 2007, followed by an interim report in March 2008, and the final report in July 2008. R. Wang noted that panel members were in attendance at ExCo 13 as observers. At the beginning of agenda item 7.b. (Scoping Team Proposal) on alignment in the CGIAR, Panel Chair Elizabeth McAllister briefly outlined the activities of the panel and how they plan to link to the change management process. The CGIAR Secretariat continues to work with the ExCo ad hoc committee on selection and appointment of CGIAR Nominees to Center Boards. Six Centers are participating in the current cycle (September 2007-March 2008) to fill seven vacancies. At the end of this cycle, all Centers will have at least one CGIAR Nominee on their boards, and most will have at least two.

Search and Nominations Committee for Science Council: The Search and Nominations Committee for Science Council has been reconstituted. Two members of SC will leave the SC at the end of 2007, and the committee will start the search for their replacements. R. Wang noted that in order for SC to be at full strength at its next meeting, ExCo and CGIAR would need to handle the appointment process virtually.

Partnerships: R. Wang noted that the strengthening of ties with civil society organizations (CSOs) continues. The competitive grants program recently selected four projects to receive funding and a workshop was held. The CGIAR is also currently exploring with the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) the creation of a joint blog for CSOs. The Private Sector Committee (PSC) held a workshop in Rome on October 13, 2007, prior to ExCo. A research productivity workshop and a high-level dialogue between private sector and the CGIAR are planned for 2008. He also highlighted the France-CGIAR and Japan-CGIAR partnerships and planned activities.

Communications and Outreach: The CGIAR Secretariat continues to work closely with the System Office Media Unit to expand media coverage. Ongoing capacity development efforts include story development workshops held with Centers, and media training workshops. He also updated ExCo on the ongoing Climate Change Communications Campaign, publications and exhibit program, and events with the Parliamentary network.

AGM06: R. Wang shared with ExCo a schedule for the week of AGM07, highlighting key events including the Crawford Lecture to be held at the Great Hall of the People in Beijing.

Concerning the CGIAR business follow-up checklist, most items are either on track or have been completed.

Discussion:

- Several members expressed appreciation to R. Wang for his report and the work of the CGIAR Secretariat during the transition.
- Clarification was requested on whether Center staff compensation information had been posted to the Members Only site. R. Wang clarified that reports are still being received and formatted, and will be posted soon.
- EIARD was pleased that its concerns on the external review were taken seriously, noting the importance of the review to the CGIAR System and change process, and recommended that a presentation of the methodology and work plan be organized at AGM07 as a crucial step for Members to discuss contents, methodology and time frame. Stressing the vital importance of interaction among the scoping team, external review panel, ExCo ad hoc advisory group on the external review, and CGIAR Members, EIARD proposed an informal workshop to discuss the implications of the report and possible ways forward.
- One member sought a clarification on the France-CGIAR workshop. R. Wang explained that it is scheduled based on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the French government and CGIAR. Pierre Fabre, who was attending from France, was invited to further explain the background and main objectives of the workshop.
- GFAR noted that it looks forward to a closer relationship between the CGIAR and GFAR for maximum synergy, and confirmed its agreement to help organize a dialogue of partners on CGIAR reform.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked R. Wang for his report.*
- *A presentation on the methodology and work plan of the CGIAR External Review should be organized at AGM07.*
- *K. Sierra also thanked Fionna Douglas for her leadership as Acting CGIAR Director during the transition.*

3. Science Council and Program Matters

3.a. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan

Science Council Chair Rudy Rabbinge presented the SC commentary on Center and Challenge Program MTPs for 2008-2010; Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) followed with presentation of the 2008 Financing Plan.

R. Rabbinge reported that, overall, discipline and effort have gone into preparing the current MTP documents that, in general follow a standardized format and show improvement in quality over last year's submissions. The improvement was especially noted in the descriptions of the background and rationale for the proposed research and capacity building efforts, the results to be delivered in the plan's timeframe, and the plausible outcomes expected in the near and long term.

As the goal for the Centers and CPs is to develop quality MTPs such that they would require less in-depth SC commentary, this year the SC identified six quality MTPs that will not require in-depth review in 2009.

This was the second year in which Centers and CPs used the MTPs to demonstrate the contribution of their research agenda to the approved System Priorities (SPs). Centers, by and large, allocated their research to the SPs much more appropriately this year than last year. However, the SC noted that development of frameworks for implementation of the SPs was moving more slowly than anticipated, and thus the SPs allocations still do not present a coherent agenda for priority research in the System. In cases where a framework had been drafted (e.g., SP 1A), the plan should have been used as the organizing principle for formulating the Center's research. The SC looks forward to seeing a more integrated (across Centers) approach to addressing SPs in subsequent MTPs with clear roles and responsibilities elaborated.

He noted that there seems to be oversubscription to the SPs, as only 5.7 percent of allocations are to non-SP activities, due to downstream research and development activities, while noting SC's praise for the efforts of IRRI and IFPRI for their inclusion of new and innovative research in the MTP. The SC noted that Centers cited the weaknesses of the NARS as justification for conducting certain activities themselves that are not appropriate for an international agricultural research center. The SC expects that during framework planning these non-SP activities will be either dropped or devolved or, if Centers consider them essential for securing impact, that they are presented in the non-SP agenda.

The SC recommends a change in the process of monitoring achievement at Centers. Setting output targets against which achievements can be monitored has become one of the key purposes of the MTPs. Presenting a set of clear, measurable and verifiable outputs and output targets that are ambitious and that contribute to achieving the research goal has greatly enhanced the quality of the logframes. In the first years of the Performance Measurement (PM) System exercise, emphasis was put on using the MTP as a basis for monitoring annual research achievement through the output target indicator. Experience to date suggests that this created a strong disincentive to aim high, and may have adversely affected setting ambitious but appropriate targets for CGIAR science. Therefore, the SC recommends de-linking the MTP output planning from the PM System. The monitoring of achievement of output targets should be the responsibility of the Centers and CPs themselves.

Finally, the SC will continue to work with Centers and CPs to streamline the development of the rolling MTPs. The ICT-KM unit of the System Office, in collaboration with a number of Centers is developing a very promising MTP reporting tool that will be comprised of a Center/CP module for compilation and submission, and a System database. With this system and the generally more satisfactory level of reporting now observed in the Center MTPs, the SC believes it may not be necessary to assess MTPs every year in similar detail. The SC therefore expects to gradually move from reviewing MTPs to reviewing the strategic plans of Centers and CPs.

S. Tata presented a summary of the investment proposals and financing plan of the 2008 CGIAR agenda, prepared this year in collaboration with ICRISAT.

The proposed research agenda for 2008 requires an investment of US\$529 million, which includes the CPs. This represents an increase of \$71 million (16 percent) over the actual 2006 level. The financing of the proposed research agenda is expected to be provided from \$478 million in investor grants, \$22 million from Center income, and \$29 million from other sources and Center reserves (other sources refer to funding still under negotiation that cannot yet be attributed to specific investors). The projected level of investor grants would represent an increase of \$52 million (12 percent) over the actual 2006 level. Eleven Centers propose an increased funding over 2006 while five project a decrease. Nearly one-half of the budget (49 percent) will be spent on research programs for Sub-Saharan Africa. Unrestricted funding was projected to decrease from 43 percent in 2006 to 37 percent in 2008.

S. Tata also presented a progress report on the Centers that had been requested by ExCo 12 to submit an action plan to address their low reserves or liquidity levels. Bioversity, CIAT and IWMI had reserves below the CGIAR-recommended minimum benchmark (of 75-90 days of operating expenditures). CIAT's liquidity level was also alarmingly low (below 90-120 days), while IRRI and WorldFish were cited for "high reserves" (over 180 days). Based on the action plans submitted, clarifications provided and analysis by the CGIAR Secretariat, the conclusion was that there was continued progress in addressing these issues by all Centers, except in the cases of CIAT and IWMI. In the case of CIAT, the ratios deteriorated in 2006 (compared with 2005) as a result of a restructuring by the Center. The Center is developing a reinvigoration plan, which coupled with ongoing management changes since the release of the sixth EPMR, will need to be analyzed before a clearer picture of its financial situation can be assessed. In the case of IWMI, the Center has requested additional time to develop a new strategic plan with the arrival of its new Director General, which will be used as a vehicle for addressing its low reserves situation. The plans of these two Centers will be monitored and reported to AGM07.

Discussion:

- R. Rabbinge was commended for the clear and comprehensive SC commentaries on the MTPs. The continued improvement of the Center and CPs MTPs, which would allow the SC to move in the future to review of strategic plans was welcomed.

- It was recognized that alignment of the research agenda into the SPs was still in progress, and requires more time before it will be fully aligned. There was appreciation about the proposed online database to link the MTP with the finance and PM data.
- EIARD suggested SC to interact closely with FARA to streamline its recommendations on the SSA CP, considering this is the only CP which is led by an organization external to the CGIAR System.
- One member asked whether the SP-based analysis of MTPs also considered the international public goods (IPG) nature of networks and knowledge platforms. There were also some concerns about the low percentage of resources going into new research areas.
- The progress in the development of SP framework plans was recognized, as well as the need for the Alliance and SC to complete development of framework plans for the other SPs.
- Further analysis of the SC proposal to de-link the MTP output planning from the PM system was requested. A member suggested an approach of scoring the PM indicators which could be used in the MTP planning. Another member cautioned that we need to avoid the PM system “falling into cracks” as a result of de-linking MTP planning from the PM System.
- R. Rabbinge clarified that that SC was still concerned about SSA CP and its vague multitude of objectives and the deliverable outputs for monitoring and evaluation. He also commented that theoretically the output indicator could be improved but it was very difficult to do in practice.
- There were strong concerns about the continued trend of declining unrestricted funding and also the low recovery of indirect costs, which pose considerable challenges to Center financial health, and should be reversed. Another member also highlighted the need for Centers to have “business plans” which combined the programmatic and the financial aspects of operations.
- The impact of the continuing strengthening of major contribution currencies against the US dollar on the projected 2008 contributions was noted.
- EIARD also noted that some of the figures concerning projected contributions in the financing plan might be different (e.g., UK).
- A comment was made on the format of the finance plan presentation which was difficult to understand and should be improved. Clarifications are needed for some of the figures and terminology (e.g. “other sources” and “Center earned income”). A clarification was sought on the increased budget of the System Office. S. Tata clarified that the increase in the SO budget was due to the cost of two large initiatives—the CGIAR External Review and the change management process.
- Italy requested a clarification on why there were delays in dispersing its funding to the Centers. S. Tata explained that the issue had now been sorted out.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommends CGIAR approval of the 2008 financing plan.*
- *ExCo requested the CGIAR Secretariat to:*
 - 1) *Improve presentation of the financing plan with more clarity;*

- 2) *Further analyze the impact of the weakening US dollar on the 2008 funding projections;*
 - 3) *Make every effort to clear any bottlenecks in the disbursement of Member funds through the MDTF in the World Bank.*
- *Further analysis of the SC proposal to de-link the MTP output planning from the PM system is required. ExCo requested SC and the CGIAR Secretariat to submit a proposal to ExCo 14 that does not devalue but optimizes the utility of the PM System, maintains incentives, and ensures high output goals.*
 - *ExCo endorsed the SC recommendation for analysis of Center MTPs by the SC every third year, or as required by SC assessment, instead of automatically yearly. It also expressed support to the online tool linking the MTPs, the finance and the PM databases.*

3.b. Report from Science Council

R. Rabbinge briefed ExCo on some of the main activities of the SC and outcome of its meeting in August 2007. He noted that there was a rich scientific discussion at the recent meeting on biofuels and the assessment of research spillovers.

On monitoring and evaluation, the SC Standing Panel on Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME) continues to oversee the conduct of the annual review of Center MTPs, EPMRs of Centers and Challenge Programs. SC welcomes the work of the ExCo ad hoc committee on funding System Priorities. SC remains concerned about the lack of focus in the SSA CP. The SC report also contains comments on the SSA regional research plans.

He noted the work conducted by SC on documenting impact to build investors confidence in their past and future investments in the CGIAR, including reports on strategic guidelines for impact assessment and a policy-oriented research impact assessment study, the key findings of which will be presented at AGM07.

The development of System Priority framework plans by the Alliance is on track and the SC continues to provide advice and inputs as needed.

A study on CGIAR Centers' partnership with CSOs has also been completed and will be presented at AGM07 as well. SC plans to promote further mobilization of science from advanced research institutes, private sector and academies of science through specific studies and science workshops.

Work Program and Budget (2008-2009)

SC work plan and budget for 2008-2009 was presented for ExCo consideration. SC has prioritized a key set of strategic activities and proposed a reduced budget with the same or even increased level of work.

Proposed SC Structural Changes

The SC also proposed an internal structural change such that the functions of Standing Panel on Priorities and Strategies (SPPS) and Standing Panel on Mobilizing Science (SPMS) would be mainstreamed into the entire SC beginning 2008.

Discussion:

- One member clarified that the Centers' contribution towards SC funding, according to the AGM05 decision, is not from Centers' unrestricted funding alone as noted in the SC Work Plan and Budget (p. 8), but on the total budgets of Centers. R. Wang confirmed this clarification.
- Several members expressed support for the proposed structural change.
- The World Bank expressed appreciation to the SC for its work on the World Development Report 2008.
- Private Sector Committee Chair Bill Niebur committed to a closer relationship with the SC and the Alliance.
- The status of activities was welcomed in the SC report. One member suggested adding a column in the table on the status of implementation of SC activities to show which activities are demand and which are supply.
- The need for improvement of the performance indicators was discussed, noting that monitoring of performance quality should not suffer.
- There was some concern about the SC involvement in shaping partnerships, particularly for the new CPs, and then also in evaluating the partnerships, which could raise potential conflict of interest issues.

Conclusion and ExCo Endorsement:

- *ExCo thanked the SC for the report and complimented it for its clarity and the quality of the in depth and comprehensive analyses.*
- *ExCo endorsed the proposed SC structure changes to mainstream priorities and strategies, and mobilizing science into the work of the entire SC. ExCo recommends the CGIAR approve the change, while the required amendment of the CGIAR Charter resulting from the change should be postponed for one year pending outcome of the facilitated change management process during 2008.*
- *SC should determine what metrics to use to measure results of mainstreaming mobilization of science, and report back to ExCo on the results.*
- *ExCo endorsed the SC Work Plan and Budget for 2008-2009. The footnote on page 8 of the work plan and budget document should be re-drafted to note that SC is funded by an annual levy on Centers' total budgets.*

4. Challenge Programs

4.a. Challenge Programs External Reviews

R. Rabbinge presented SC comments on the two CP external reviews, HarvestPlus CP and CP on Water and Food (CPWF).

He congratulated HarvestPlus for a positive review and highlighted the following:

- SC agrees with the review panel that HarvestPlus is a value-adding program with major potential impacts on nutrition and health of the poor in developing countries. SC endorsed all the program-related recommendations of the review panel.
- On recommendation 3 which is about deployment, testing of adoption and the impact of nutritionally enhanced varieties, SC concurs with the panel's recommendation for the program to involve NARS at an early stage of the development of implementation strategy.
- SC also agrees that stronger links should be forged with conventional breeding programs that aim at improving other traits of value to farmers. It considers this as a critical factor to adoption and therefore an important component of the testing of proof-of-concept of biofortification.

On the CPWF external review report, he pointed out the following:

- SC compliments the review panel for the good analysis of key issues concerning CPWF and endorses its recommendations and suggestions.
- The panel's assessment confirms SC's views (based on its review of the CPWF MTP) that the CP should have a more focused set of objectives and overall program strategy.
- SC supports the panel's recommendation to critically reassess the benchmark basins concept and choice of basins to achieve greater focus.
- SC recommends that the development of a "well-conceived and more tightly focused strategy and implementation and monitoring plan for Phase 2, as well as clear strategy and timeline" be set as condition for continuation of CPWF.

Namita Datta (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the CGIAR Secretariat comments on the governance, management and finance aspects of the CPER reports. She pointed out the following on the results of the HarvestPlus external review:

- HarvestPlus governance structure is pragmatic. The governance body is largely external but has four institutional members from the two Centers who have displayed a high degree of professionalism and sensitivity to ensure quality of research and independence of governance. The CGIAR Secretariat agreed with the review panel's observation that independence of the governing body of HarvestPlus from institutional interests is critical.
- The CGIAR Secretariat complimented HarvestPlus for its good financial health but cautioned the risk on overdependence on a few large donors.
- The idea of maintaining a cash reserve, as endorsed by the Panel, is good but the level should be much lower than what is expected of a Center.

On the CPWF review, she highlighted the following:

- The CGIAR Secretariat endorsed the panel's recommendation that the CP should undertake a reform plan in its governance mechanism, i.e. in structure, composition, and functioning, giving emphasis on the need for a higher degree of

independence. The CGIAR Secretariat is pleased that CPWF has taken this recommendation into account in developing its plan for Phase 2 of the program.

- There is a need for greater clarity in the respective domains of the CPWF and IWMI, its host institution, in terms of programs, governance and finance.
- The CGIAR Secretariat also agrees with the panel's recommendation that the Program Coordinator be given greater responsibility in performance evaluation of the program management team members, theme leaders and basin coordinators.
- The fiduciary standards of the CP should be strengthened.

N. Datta further pointed out that both reviews should have undertaken a more in-depth analysis of how partners, particularly the NARS, assessed the CPs, i.e. in terms of clarity of their roles, contribution to their own research objectives, and overall effectiveness of the CP partnership model.

Discussion:

- ExCo has an obligation to establish a best practice governance model for CPs, i.e. one that is streamlined and cost-effective.
- A concern was expressed about proposed changes in governance and structure of CPWF in terms of cost involved and potential confusion to partners.
- Citing the case of HarvestPlus which depends a great deal on the support of one donor, ExCo stressed the need for Members to support a more balanced funding portfolio for CPs.
- CPs need to be reassessed in terms of overlaps with Centers' work and key assumptions when they are first established.
- Responding to the issue on the relationship of CPWF with its host institution, the Program Coordinator indicated that a working group is preparing proposals for changes in the steering committee, including how its chair is identified.
- While a formal recommendation from ExCo is not necessary, it is understood that both HarvestPlus and CPWF should proceed to Phase 2.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated HarvestPlus for a favorable external review report, and recommends that the CGIAR endorse the HarvestPlus CPER recommendations and the CP should proceed to Phase 2.*
- *ExCo should have more in depth discussion and develop a strategy in response to the fact of one new donor providing a significant amount of funding to the HarvestPlus CP.*
- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the CPWF CPER recommendations and the CP should proceed to Phase 2. CPWF was requested to report back to SC and then to ExCo in May 2008 for a review of its Phase 2 plan towards a more focused program and reformed governance structure.*
- *ExCo should determine the minimum requirement for CP governance and agree on a set of principles on governance and good practices with adequate flexibility.*

4.b. Challenge Programs: Lessons Learned

R. Rabbinge presented comments on lessons learned from CPs. The SC supports and confirms some of the CPs' founding principles, namely that they should address global issues; engage partners with competencies beyond those of CGIAR Centers; have a results delivery orientation, and operate within a fixed timeframe. In addition, SC considers two additional principles should be required: 1) All CPs should incorporate a clear exit strategy, and 2) CPs should not undermine the work of CGIAR Centers.

In future the SC believes it will be necessary to re-examine the selection process which is currently too complex and which incorporates an artificial distinction between the pre-proposal and proposal stages.

Manny Lantin (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the CGAIR section on lessons learned. On organizational structure of CPs, an independent governance body appears to have more advantages for effective and efficient performance. CP management should also play a stronger leadership role, particularly in strategic thinking and planning. CPs have been successful in generating new funds from traditional and non-traditional donors. The difference in governance structures of CPs has added a level of complexity to accountability standards which makes it difficult to obtain comparable data on transaction costs. However, transaction costs have decreased as expected since the inception phase, but continue to require close oversight. The competitive grant funding mechanism has been an effective tool for opening the CGIAR research agenda to other suppliers.

In general, the partnership model of CPs has been effective. NARS partners have been appreciative of the skills gained through capacity building activities. There are challenges that will need to be addressed by CPs in the future.

Discussion:

- ExCo members endorsed the principles upon which the CPs are founded. EIARD sees the founding principles as opening up the System; bringing in new science to the System, including NARS and attracting new funds.
- While members welcomed the many positive elements in the lessons learned, several common areas of concern were identified:
 - Lack of substantial inclusion of advanced research institutions (ARIs) and NARS;
 - Use of competitive grants scheme: while views differed on the value of competitive grant programs, concerns were raised about the transaction costs inherent in these processes. There was agreement that lessons regarding the applicability and extent of competitive programs should be considered in designing the next cycle of CPs;
 - Generation of new ideas: concerns were expressed regarding how effective the CPs were in capturing innovative and new ideas;
 - One ExCo member indicated that until accountability lines were made clear, they would not invest in CPs, another indicated that more attention should be paid to fiduciary responsibility within the CPs as this had

attracted much less attention than either governance or management issues yet would have major impact on success of the programs;

- Umbrella mission approach: there was a consensus that the breadth of the objectives identified by the CPs may be problematic and that the CPs are trying to accomplish too many diverse objectives. There is a need to keep in mind objectives and then determine best mechanisms and processes to achieve them.
- Several members agreed that the current process may have reduced the number of high quality applications because of the high level of complexity, onerous requirements on applicants and as a result, the time necessary to develop applications. There is therefore a need to simplify the process and establish clear guidelines. There were suggestions about the need for Centers to work with different consortia in the development of the proposals instead of operating as an Alliance which may restrict competitive submissions.
- The Alliance pointed out that one of the original rationales for CPs was to enable Centers to better work together, while another member noted that there are other ways to do this, especially through SWEPs.
- Current CP coordinators were invited to contribute to the discussion and emphasized that the CPs are about new ways of working. The CPWF coordinator noted that there are partnership costs and a time lag in results associated with approaches such as action research and social learning through networks; this has implications for how IPGs grow from research that is initially local. Results from these innovative approaches are also often less predictable at the outset and therefore require development of innovative planning methods which is a challenge, while CP's still have to comply with CGIAR requirements. The point was also made that one person's transaction costs may be another's investment in partnerships. In addition, the importance of CGIAR investment in the CPs was emphasized as it has been the catalyst for investment from new donors for the HarvestPlus CP. Current accountability structures were also discussed and it was clarified that the lead Center has full fiduciary responsibility for the CP it leads.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo considered that this is a very useful opportunity to pause and learn from experience.*
- *Lessons from the report and the discussion at ExCo should be incorporated into Cycle 2 CP proposals and the design of CP Cycle 3, in particular efforts should be made to simplify the process.*
- *ExCo requested the Science Council, together with the Alliance and the CGIAR Secretariat to develop a toolkit of mechanisms which could be best used to meet the CGIAR's diverse research objectives. This work should feed into the Scoping Team's discussions to avoid duplication of ideas.*

4.c. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Pre-Proposals

R. Rabbinge introduced the item noting the SC concluded that only the following three pre-proposals show promise, but recommended all three be revised and resubmitted for SC consideration in early 2008:

- Climate change, agriculture and food security;
- Oasis
- High-value crops – fruits and vegetables

Discussion:

- EIARD agreed with the SC recommendation and noted the SC has taken into account some of the lessons learned, but it is important the design of the full proposals considers other lessons learned, such as on governance. This may require a change in planning and suggested to use the lessons learned to redesign the process in subsequent CP cycles. EIARD also questioned the January 2008 deadline considering the next ExCo meeting is not until May 2008.
- ExCo should consider asking the SC to look at lessons learned before going forward with the current cycle of CPs or perhaps reopening the competition.
- One of the objectives of CPs is to encourage collaboration among Centers, in addition to encouraging partnerships from outside the System. On a topic like climate change, there is room for all Centers to work in an interdisciplinary way.
- Financial support to the proponents could be considered in order to make significant progress between now and resubmission of the pre-proposals.
- On partnerships, concern was expressed about the lack of NARS involvement in the design of CPs. The Alliance noted that it is difficult to choose partners at the pre-proposal stage when research sites have not yet been identified.
- One member asked whether CPs have created the cooperation among Centers and also with partners which was envisioned; a SWEP could do what a CP does in terms of partnerships and systemwide activity.
- Concern was expressed about reputational risk if the CGIAR does not make a decision on moving forward. Despite the low-quality of the pre-proposals, these are important areas of research.
- K. Sierra highlighted particular importance of the CGIAR providing a leadership role on climate change, especially on adaptation, and the need to act quickly. The CGIAR should be able to announce its position at the upcoming international conference on climate change in Bali in December 2007.
- Several members agreed that the CGIAR can not stay silent on climate change. It was suggested that a broader initiative would be a more appropriate research vehicle to address climate change and gaps could be filled by a CP.
- The CGIAR is already doing a great deal of work on climate change and this could be used as a starting point for a broader initiative.
- Taking into account the concerns and suggestions of ExCo members, R. Rabbinge suggested that ExCo consider the option to (a) recommend the pre-proposals on Oasis and High-value crops be revised to incorporate CP lessons learned and resubmitted for SC consideration as suggested by the SC; and reopen the competition if the revised pre-proposals still do not meet ExCo approval, and (b)

develop a broader CGIAR initiative on climate change that includes a paper on what the CGIAR is already doing in the area; “fast-tracking” development of the CP full proposal, and organizing a conference on climate change in 2008 to bring together leading researchers and consortia to move the agenda forward. This could be announced at Bali in December 2007.

- Communication on the process must be clear on whatever decisions are taken regarding CPs.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo expressed appreciation to the Science Council for its assessment of the Challenge Program Cycle 2 Pre-proposals.*
- *ExCo also expressed disappointment with the low quality of the pre-proposals, but recognized these are important research areas and the CGIAR should signal a willingness to move forward.*
- *With respect to the pre-proposals on Oasis and High-value Crops, ExCo decided the following:*
 - 1) *The proponents of the pre-proposals on Oasis and High-value Crops should incorporate lessons learned from the first cycle of CPs presented at ExCo 13, and guided by inputs from the SC on the pre-proposals, develop full proposals for SC review.*
 - 2) *Oasis should be submitted by February 29, 2008, for assessment by SC and discussion and recommendation at ExCo 14.*
 - 3) *High-value Crops should be submitted at the latest by July 31, 2008, if not earlier for assessment by SC and discussion and recommendation at ExCo 15.*
 - 4) *After submission of the full proposals, if ExCo does not believe the full proposals are of sufficient quality, they would be withdrawn from further consideration.*
- *With respect to Climate Change, ExCo decided:*
 - 1) *The Alliance, Science Council, and CGIAR Secretariat should take stock of where we are on work that is already being undertaken within the CGIAR on climate change and use this as a basis to develop a strategic initiative on climate change to be announced in December 2007, in order to position the CGIAR as a leader in climate change research. This should be available two weeks prior to AGM07 for review and endorsement by the CGIAR Membership.*
 - 2) *The proponents of the pre-proposal on climate change should incorporate lessons learned from the first cycle of CPs, comments from the SC, and information on gaps identified by the stock taking, and develop a more focused full proposal for submission to SC by February 29, 2008, for assessment by SC and discussion and recommendation at ExCo 14.*
 - 3) *In addition, the CGIAR would convene a conference in 2008 on climate change to bring together key representatives of the international research community to identify ways to move the mitigation and adaptation agendas forward.*
- *To initiate proposal development, proponents should seek clarification and guidance from the Science Council.*

5. Evaluation

5.a. CIP EPMR

R. Rabbinge congratulated CIP for improvements in the Center since the last EPMR and presented the following main points from the SC commentary:

- SC expressed concern that CIP's increased reliance on restricted funding has drifted the Center away from its core areas of research;
- SC endorse all EPMR recommendations but at the same time accepts reaction of management and Board;
- SC shares the same opinion with the Panel on CIP's leadership of the CONDESAN (Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion) and other SWEPS, and the integration of the Agriculture and Human Health (AHH) research into the work of the Center's other divisions.

N. Datta presented the CGIAR Secretariat's comments on the governance, management and finance aspects of the EPMR report. The CGIAR Secretariat:

- is pleased with the breadth and dept of coverage with which the panel has reviewed CIP governance, management, and finance;
- supports the panel's recommendation on governance, management and finance and is pleased to note that the Center has accepted all of them;
- encourages CIP to ensure financial expertise on its Board, and also to ensure timely planning of succession of Board leadership;
- congratulated CIP for its sound financial health status as noted by the review;

CIP Director General (DG) Pamela Anderson was invited to comment. She noted that the Center accepted 13 of 18 recommendations. She also noted that the creation of the AHH Division validates the cross-sector approach and has allowed the Center to attract a public health epidemiologist as the leader for the research division who will function as a bridge between agricultural researchers in the Center and international public health research systems. On the panel recommendations on SWEPS, she suggested that perhaps the change management exercise should look more closely at the programs in terms of their value as a collective action vehicle and what should be done about them at the System level.

Discussion:

- ExCo debated on recommendation 11, 12, 13 and 14 which involves CIP's leadership in the SWEPS, specifically on CONDESAN and the Center's work on AHH research. The need for an exit strategy on CONDESAN was expressed.
- Several members expressed support for CIP's response and the work that it does in the areas of concern, versus the perception that the Center is drifting away from its core areas of research.
- With the reassurance of the CIP DG, R. Rabbinge agreed that the Center's work in AHH could be used as an entrance to mobilizing research talent in partner institutions.

- P. Anderson explained that the non-acceptance of the recommendation on CONDESAN is due to the positive results produced by the program and the benefits it still has to offer. It would be a mistake to disengage after 10 years without the benefit of a review.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated CIP for a positive review and thanked the panel for its report.*
- *ExCo agreed with CIP's response on recommendations 11-14.*
- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 6th CIP EPMR recommendations and CIP's response to recommendations 11-14.*

5.b. IITA EPMR

R. Rabbinge presented SC comments on the IITA EPMR. He thanked the EPMR panel and highlighted the following points:

- SC believes that the development of a new strategic plan by IITA is essential in order to address the EPMR recommendations;
- SC is pleased to note that the panel finds large impacts on cassava and commends IITA scientists for communicating these results. However, SC expressed concern about the long debate between IITA and CIAT on the work on cassava and looks forward to a timely resolution of the issue.
- SC notes the panel's cautions about possible misinterpretation by donors of some indicators in the Performance Measurement System, e.g. the nature of the impact indicators.

N. Datta presented the CGIAR Secretariat's comments on the governance, management and finance aspects of the report. She highlighted that the CGIAR Secretariat:

- Appreciates the steps the IITA Board has taken in reducing its size and promoting stronger alignment with others Centers through common board members;
- Emphasizes the importance for a senior level Board Secretary to coordinate all Board-related matters;
- Commends the DG for bringing the Center out of a deficit in 2001 to its current financial state.

IITA DG Peter Hartmann was invited to comment on the EPMR and SC/CGIAR Secretariat commentaries. He noted that the Center has expanded its partners to include ARIs, universities and the private sector. IITA activities cover approximately 85 percent of national systems in Africa. He stated that he is not sure why the statement that "there has been similarly slow progress in the initiation of the SSA CP at the West African site" is in the report or how it affects IITA since the Center has a very limited role in the CP. He pointed out that all senior management positions in the Center have been filled since 2006 and the use of elected project leaders ended in 2005.

Discussion:

- ExCo congratulated IITA for a positive review and expressed support for the Center.
- The issue of IITA capacity building role in Africa was raised.
- EIARD expressed concern that neither the partnership with FARA nor the role of the regional MTP for West and Central Africa were addressed by the EPMR.
- Communication of IITA activities and impacts could be improved.
- ExCo expressed concern about resolving the issue with CIAT on cassava research.
- P. Hartmann thanked ExCo for the positive feedback. On CIAT-IITA, he noted that IITA does more work with CIAT than with any other Center. On cassava, CIAT and IITA exchange germplasm, which benefit Latin America, Asia and SSA. CIAT and IITA also collaborate on high-end research via the CPs. He noted that he is not aware of any “debate” on the topic, except the concerns about possible spread of diseases between Africa and Latin America. A meeting is scheduled on this issue in 2008 in Tanzania which will involve the African Union.
- CIAT Board Chair Yves Savidan was also in attendance and noted he looks forward to participation in the meeting and coming to a conclusion soon.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated IITA for a positive review and thanked the panel.*
- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 6th IITA EPMR recommendations.*
- *ExCo encourages more publication of results from IITA to ensure better communication of activities and impacts to the CGIAR community.*

6. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers

Alliance Executive Chair Emile Frison presented the report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers. Topics covered included updates on development of framework plans for the System Priorities, an Alliance analysis of assessment mechanisms in the CGIAR System, a survey of lessons learned from the CPs, Alliance contributions to the change management process and external review of the CGIAR, collaboration with FAO and the private sector, and disclosure of Center salaries. A paper copy was provided in the ExCo 13 documentation. In addition, he noted that the Alliance looks forward to continuing dialogue on agricultural challenges facing the System and on financing with Members during the Alliance meetings at AGM07.

Alliance Board Chair Jim Godfrey, noted that the AB was requested to report back to ExCo on follow-up to the stripe review on corporate governance in CGIAR Centers. The CGIAR Secretariat developed a template questionnaire on the follow-up which was circulated to all Centers and appreciated by the AB. The information was provided to ExCo for information.

He also informed ExCo that a board orientation course is being organized for AGM07. Peter Core (Australia), Anne-Marie Izac (Alliance), Ren Wang and Namita Datta (CGIAR Secretariat) will join the course.

Discussion:

- R. Rabbinge stated that the SC is pleased with the report on assessment mechanisms and will use the information in its proposals to ExCo on reporting requirements in the CGIAR.
- One member noted that disclosure of Center staff salaries is very important, and looks forward to the forthcoming information.
- On exchanges with the private sector, the Alliance should also be interested in exchange with firms that are not part of the Private Sector Committee. It was suggested that this interaction could contribute especially in post-harvest activities, e.g. a CP on high-value crops.
- The Alliance noted that it has reached out to private sector firms on post-harvest, but there is room for further collaboration.
- The CGIAR Secretariat will also work with the PSC on ways to facilitate a high-level dialogue with the private sector building on past experience.
- On follow-up to the stripe review, the Alliance was asked about differences in Center responses to the recommendations in the Alliance response.
- K. Sierra stressed that ExCo endorsed the stripe review recommendations and there is an expectation that Center boards will implement the recommendations.
- J. Godfrey assured ExCo that follow-up to the stripe review would be on the agenda of the next AB meeting prior to AGM07.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thank the Alliance for the report.*
- *ExCo stressed the need for Centers to comply with implementation of the stripe review recommendations on corporate governance, and would like to see a plan to get all Centers on board.*
- *There are more opportunities for collaboration with the private sector and the CGIAR should seriously consider how to achieve those goals.*

7. Alignment in the CGIAR

7.a. Final Report from ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities

Jonathan Wadsworth, Chair of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities, presented the final report of the ad hoc committee to ExCo.

He described the work of the ExCo ad hoc committee, and reviewed the principles of CGIAR funding and the messages from the AGM06 Member Coordination Forum, including funding the System Priorities as a means to an end, the need for outcome orientation, and general support for a programmatic approach.

He reviewed the current three Center-based entry points for funding, and described the System Priority-based entry points envisaged, with varying levels of restriction. The proposed funding allocation mechanism would involve four steps:

- 1) Develop an Annual Demand Matrix from Center and CP MTPs to determine proposed investments based on System Priorities.
- 2) Donors declare what they will be funding in coming year (and as many subsequent years as possible), which would represent an Annual Funding (Supply) Matrix.
- 3) Subtract the Annual Demand Matrix from the Annual Supply Matrix to determine over-, under-, adequately-funded cells.
- 4) Donors willing to support this process to agree among themselves to reallocate some of their funding from over-funded cells to under-funded cells.

The ExCo ad hoc committee believes the proposal delivers on all of its intended objectives and recommended that:

- 1) ExCo endorses the principles for funding SPs and suggestion to review assessment and computation of CGIAR-approved Center audited overhead rates.
- 2) ExCo endorses the step-wise process suggested, including joint preparation by SC, Alliance and CGIAR Secretariat of the information needed to enable considered discussion by those donors willing to discuss harmonization of all or part of their funding to the CGIAR.
- 3) The Members' Coordination Forum at AGM07 discusses the final report and possible ways forward. The discussion should address practical implementation and assess Members' views, likelihood and timescale for harmonization.
- 4) A standing panel on funding be established by ExCo as a means of continuing to provide a space to discuss System level, medium to long term strategic funding issues of the CGIAR.
- 5) A code of conduct for donors with respect to funding issues be elaborated and instigated for eventual incorporation in the CGIAR Charter.
- 6) The ExCo ad hoc committee continues to function until AGM07 with a view to assisting the CGIAR Secretariat in organizing the Members' Coordination Forum.

Discussion:

- Several members expressed support for the ExCo ad hoc committee recommendations.
- Framework plans are an important aspect of the proposed mechanism and provide for checks and balances.
- Establishment of the Alliance allows for such a system because funding can be approached systematically and collaboratively. For such a system to work, changes in behavior are required by both Centers and CGIAR Members.
- It is essential for donors who provide restricted funds to provide for full costs of projects, including full overhead recovery.
- EIARD endorsed recommendations and noted they are in line with the Paris Declaration. EIARD members are willing to participate in implementation of the recommendations and will do their best to overcome any impediments.

- The challenge to making such a system work is behavior change. Experience in other organizations suggests that individual cells add up to beyond what is available, and require strict discipline and a governing body.
- The goal is to get the System moving in the right direction. There is danger if a large philanthropist were to come in and distort funding, which may require the CGIAR to decline new donors if they are not prepared to adhere to funding the System Priorities.
- The proposed mechanism is no small undertaking and will require significant buy-in from all parts of the System. One could also consider the consensus based decision making and evaluate whether there could be another category of non-member donors who are only willing to fund projects but may not be interested in participating in CGIAR decision-making. There was also a suggestion of adding a separate column on innovative or blue sky research apart from the 20 SPs.
- There is need to ensure and maintain some sort of stability for Centers in the short term to avoid endangering Centers. Another member, however, pointed out that Centers do have the choice and have the option of not accepting project money that does not fund overhead costs.
- J. Wadsworth noted that the recommendations centered on the need for a strategic committee on financing, as there is currently no space in the System for deliberations on finance. It is a weak point of ExCo.

Conclusion and ExCo recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorsed the recommendations of the ExCo ad hoc committee, subject to the understanding that discussion at AGM07 should be undertaken with a sense of likely support from CGIAR Members.*
- *ExCo requested the ad hoc committee to canvass Members to gauge the willingness to develop timelines and implement the recommendations.*

7.b. Scoping Team Proposal

Peter Core, Chair of the Scoping Team introduced the item. He also invited Elizabeth McAllister, Chair of the CGIAR External Review Panel to make a few remarks on the work of the panel.

P. Core presented the Scoping Team proposal, noting that the TOR requested the proposal to include: 1) main challenges and emerging issues, 2) methodologies and design of the process that could be used for developing a new CGIAR vision, and 3) specific TOR for phase 2 of the process.

The Scoping Team identified the following key challenges that would provide relevant focus in the effort to revitalize the CGIAR:

- Research priorities and programs
- Strategic partnerships
- Donor behavior
- Governance
 - System level

- Center level

The scoping team proposes using the time between ExCo 13 and AGM07 (Phase 1) to continue stakeholder discussions on the change process to gather additional feedback and update the plan for change for presentation at AGM07. Additional discussions will take place at AGM to further map out Phase 2 of the process.

Phase 2 of the process would include 1) issue clarification and solution generation among working teams, 2) solution consolidation, testing and approval, and 3) broad implementation. It would be driven by a Change Design Team composed of a representative group of stakeholders. The process would focus on high impact and long term, sustainable change management issues, including more visible processes and structures to more hidden issues with a relationship focus.

The Scoping Team recommended the following for ExCo's consideration:

- 1) Recommend for approval of the CGIAR the five issue areas identified by the Scoping Team as the focus for the Change Process
- 2) Recommend for approval of the CGIAR the process for Phase 1 and Phase 2 as outlined in the paper

K. Sierra noted there is need to engage the various stakeholders and build excitement in the Alliance, and take a holistic view of the process. The External Review being conducted in parallel to the process could augment the effort as it may uncover potential issues that the change process does not see. The CGIAR should take advantage of this opportunity.

Discussion:

- ExCo recognized the importance of the exercise and expressed support for moving forward.
- There is need for effective participation of NARS and developing countries in the process.
- EIARD stated that it strongly supports change in the System and has always actively participated in groups and task forces that elaborated recommendations that were approved but unfortunately, were only partially translated into actual changes. It believes that conditions for change are now in place and fully supports the scoping exercise. EIARD suggested that interviews be conducted with a broader group of stakeholders including young researchers in Centers, partners, and high-level decision makers to bring in fresh points of view. Broader consultation may have led to identification of other crucial issues for focus. The change process should incorporate focus on accountability, structure and also stakeholder behavior. The inception report of the External Review will also be an important input into the exercise.
- One member noted that change often only happens when there is a high level of dissatisfaction and effort should be made to show a high rate of return as fast as possible, perhaps through rapid harvesting of "low hanging fruit" followed by

larger issues. Another member cautioned that we must bite off what we can chew, and only focus on the big ticket items.

- It was pointed out that there is a need to exercise caution when consulting with a broad range of partners, and raising the expectations of too many stakeholder groups. Perhaps the most relevant stakeholders should be targeted depending on the issue concerned.
- Any high-level meeting should ensure it will attract the appropriate high-level people to attend.
- GFAR reiterated support to the change management process and confirmed GFAR's willingness to help organize consultations with broader partners.
- K. Sierra clarified that after the proposal is discussed at AGM, a change design team would be constituted. Phase 2 would also require broader participatory groups with a high level of commitment. She also highlighted that many donors had indicated to her that they were impatient for some change in the CGIAR.
- P. Core reiterated the need for extensive input and participation by a broad group of stakeholders; otherwise, nothing is going to happen. The exercise needs to be conducted in a way that the CGIAR can move forward and do something significant in the next 3-5 years, but in pieces small enough to "chew."
- During implementation, timelines and roles/responsibilities must be clearly articulated and communicated.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorsed the Scoping Team proposal recommendations and recommends the CGIAR move forward with the change management process.*
- *To ensure all of the relevant voices are heard and issues identified, ExCo requested the Scoping Team continue to survey stakeholders, including focus groups of young researchers.*
- *ExCo members were requested to consult with their constituencies and identify names of persons that should be consulted by the Scoping Team.*
- *It is important to build trust in the System, and to begin by placing trust in the change design team, establish future roles and responsibilities at AGM, and give flexibility to the change design team to do what needs to be done, in order to help the process move forward without undue delays.*
- *Additional funding for the change management process from members will be welcome to supplement World Bank funding.*
- *The scoping team was requested to incorporate ExCo's comments and feedback in their proposal and develop specific immediate proposals that could be considered by CGIAR at AGM for decision.*

8. Evaluation

8.a. WARDA EPMR

R. Rabbinge presented SC comments on the WARDA EPMR. He congratulated WARDA for a positive review and expressed SC's agreement with the review panel's program-related recommendations. He highlighted the following:

- SC joins the EPMR panel in acknowledging that WARDA has continued to do good research in spite of the Ivorian crisis.
- On WARDA's planned expansion of research work into east and southern Africa, SC also agrees with the panel that this should be done in a phased manner. A significant amount of research capacity strengthening would be needed.
- SC advises WARDA to give further attention to the panel's doubt on NERICA's ability to tolerate or overcome weed problems, a major characteristic that NERICA has been claimed to possess.
- SC welcomes the recent alignment with IRRI and CIAT on rice research. This initiative is expected to further strengthen rice research in the region.

N. Datta presented CGIAR Secretariat comments on the governance, management and finance aspects of the EPMR. She pointed out the following:

- There is a need to strengthen the WARDA Board's oversight function on programmatic and strategic issues. This could be done through a smaller and more focused Program Committee. The creation of an external Scientific Advisory Committee as suggested by the review panel should be carefully considered.
- The CGIAR Secretariat congratulates WARDA for the substantial improvement in its financial situation in recent years. It encourages the Center to further strengthen financial expertise on the Board and its staff.
- The CGIAR Secretariat also congratulates WARDA in pursuing an effective alignment of corporate services with IITA, and welcomes WARDA-IRRI-CIAT partnership in rice research for Africa.
- The CGIAR Secretariat encourages an early decision on WARDA's headquarters location.

Discussion:

- ExCo members congratulated WARDA for a positive EPMR report.
- A concern was raised concerning the cost of transfer of IITA staff in Benin to WARDA. In response to some of the comments, Shellemiah Keya, WARDA Assistant Director General pointed out that a study by a WARDA consultant showed that the adopted arrangement would be more advantageous and cost-effective to the Center. He also informed ExCo that the Board had succeeded in appointing an external Science Advisory Committee to provide additional input on scientific issues.
- The issue of the complex governance structure of WARDA and especially its Council of Ministers was discussed.
- On the issue of the Center headquarters location, S. Keya clarified that Bouake, Cote d'Ivoire, is still the official headquarters site. A decision to move back to

Bouake will be made as soon as the political and security situation in the host country is determined to be stable.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo is pleased with a positive EP MR and recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 5th WARDA EP MR recommendations. The momentum to move forward should be maintained by the Center.*

8.b. CIAT EP MR

R. Rabbinge presented the SC Commentary on the CIAT EP MR. He noted that the SC endorsed the program related recommendations and highlighted the following:

- SC suggests the strategic planning exercise be immediately launched by the new administration.
- The SC recommends that, in addition to reviewing the draft strategic plan, a small team re-visit the Center within 18 months to report on progress in implementing the EP MR recommendations.
- CIAT and IITA should agree without delay on how to coordinate research on cassava in SSA.
- SC encourages donors to continue to fund CIAT, but is concerned at the lack of CGIAR financial oversight of the Center despite several years of evidence of financial problems.

N. Datta presented CGIAR Secretariat commentary on governance, management and finance aspects of the EP MR: She highlighted the following:

- The CGIAR Secretariat fully supports the seven recommendations on governance, management and finance.
- The EP MR was conducted during a time of severe financial crisis. A failure in governance and management was behind the crisis. One of the EP MR recommendations was for the board to take bold action to reconstitute management. The DG has since announced his resignation and an interim DG will be taking over in early 2008. The Center is also developing a reinvigoration plan with clear milestones.
- Various players were responsible for the crisis, e.g. board, finance/audit committees, DG/management, external auditor, and the CGIAR System. CGIAR noted red flags for several years but did not or was not able to influence the Center's response.
- CIAT has agreed to the recommendation on creation of a finance director position, but disagreed with the recommendation for the finance director to report directly to the DG. The key issue is that this may lead to a lack of supervision by the DG and oversight by the board.
- The CGIAR Secretariat agrees with the panel recommendation to end the board's intervening role, but understands it must be done in a phased manner.
- The CGIAR Secretariat also agrees with the panel recommendation for the board to strengthen its financial oversight role by augmenting financial expertise,

strengthening its control environment and preparing a risk strategy, and is pleased to note the action that the board is already taking on this matter.

- The EP MR raises key governance issues at the System level, and many lessons to be learned. The System should explore if there is a mechanism at the System level that goes beyond just sending warning signals to Centers on financial risks.

CIAT Board Chair Yves Savidan was invited to comment and noted that major change in the management team is underway. He also noted that leading up to the crisis the board had a serious weakness in financial expertise. Only two years ago, there was no one with financial expertise on the board, but the Center will have three financial experts upon completion of the current CGIAR Nominee cycle. He accepted the board's responsibility in the current crisis. The board has implemented a series of changes in finance controls and monitoring changes with the help of the CGIAR Secretariat.

It is too soon to say the Center is beyond the crisis. There are a large number of ongoing special projects that draw on core funding as they do not involve full cost recovery. The Center is further restricted due to the additional exchange rate loss with respect to the Columbian currency (25 percent loss in one year), which leaves little flexibility to reinvigorate the Center. He stressed that a lot of changes have been made but the Center will remain at risk for some time unless there is a change in funding.

CIAT DG Joachim Voss noted his recommendation to the Center board for him to leave the Center and make way for new management. Interim DG Geoff Hawtin will attend the board meeting in November and AGM07. It is in the best interest of the Center to move as fast as possible on the reinvigoration plan. He thanked the CGIAR Secretariat for its support in the current crisis. He also highlighted the EP MR commendation of high quality of science at the Center.

Discussion:

- ExCo agreed with the SC recommendation on a follow-up review 18 months after adoption of the draft strategic plans.
- An outcome-orientated plan is important.
- Improvement of staff morale is key for the future of CIAT. The recommendations fall short on timelines and specifically on what will be done to improve staff morale.
- CIAT has had red-flagged financial indicators for years but the financial crisis still occurred. It raises an important point on what ExCo/CGIAR could have done to avoid the crisis at CIAT and other Centers with red flags in the future.
- Scientists at CIAT should be commended for maintaining scientific quality at the Center during the crisis.
- Concern was expressed that the reinvigoration plan is not being designed by the interim DG, and some of the same people who caused the problem are now being asked to help find the solution.
- Given the concerns about the Center's ability to emerge from the crisis, ExCo should request a follow-up report from the Center at the next ExCo meeting.
- It is important that the finance director have a direct reporting line to the DG.

- Concern was expressed that the budget for 2006-2008 remains at the same level. When a Center faces such a crisis, it should not assume that it will stay the same size and function the same when in recovery.
- A finance committee could have possibly exercised adequate oversight and recommended corrective action to avoid the crisis.
- In response to some of the issues raised, J. Voss did not agree with comments made on the same people being asked to find a solution for the Center. He clarified that the new deputy DG for corporate services is leading preparation of the reinvigoration plan for the Center. He also noted that the Center implemented the recommendations of a recent Center commissioned external review (CCER). The model differed from the EPMR recommendation on the finance director reporting directly to the DG.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the 6th CIAT EPMR recommendations, including the SC recommendation for a follow-up review within 18 months to report on progress in implementing the recommendations.*
- *ExCo also requests the Center to report back to ExCo 14 on the new management team and strategy.*
- *The new finance director of the Center needs to be of a high caliber and should report directly to the DG.*
- *The reinvigoration plan should ensure real and lasting change, and engage scientists at the Center to help turn the crisis into a new future.*
- *ExCo commends the scientific community at the Center for their resilience in the face of severe problems, and for the scientific excellence of their research.*
- *The CGIAR System should reflect on how it reacts to warning signs, and what might have been done differently given the complexities and limitations of the System.*

8.c. EPMR Meta-analysis

At ExCo 10, ExCo requested the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to undertake a meta-analysis of recently conducted EPMRs to derive lessons learned. During discussion of the item at AGM06, the CGIAR concluded that options to streamline the process of handling EPMR discussion at meetings of SC, ExCo, and AGM should also be considered.

R. Rabbinge presented the following main points from the SC commentary on the EPMR meta-evaluation:

- SC agrees with the panel's conclusion that outsourcing of EPMRs or establishing a separate evaluation group would not make them more independent than they currently are. Outsourcing would also increase the transaction costs.
- On the issues of consistency and comparability of EPMRs, SC thinks that an assessment of the quality of EPMR recommendations should have been included in the report. An assessment of the way EPMRs have reviewed partnerships is also missing.

- SC believes that there is ample scope for Members’ involvement in the review process.
- SC considers that the Performance Measurement (PM) System still has weaknesses for being used by EPMRs as evidence of good performance.
- SC agrees with the panel’s idea of raising the perspective of EPMRs above just the Center level through the inclusion in the TOR issues of broad relevance for the CGIAR as a System. However, it disagrees with the panel’s recommendation to use an innovation systems framework for positioning the Centers strategically in the global system as an alternative to the pursuit of IPGs.

Jason Yauney (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the CGIAR Secretariat’s comments and options to streamline the process of handling EPMRs.

- The meta-evaluation emphasized that EPMRs have focused more rigorously on governance, management, and finance issues. The CGIAR Secretariat is pleased with the panel’s findings that there has been “an appreciable shift... in the way EPMRs examined the quality and effectiveness of Center governance and management.”
- Governance issues are now more focused on the role of Center Boards in stewardship and oversight.
- On finance issues, the CGIAR Secretariat agrees with the panel that EPMRs should not look at the Centers’ increasing reliance on restricted support as a single common issue and its negative impacts on many aspects of management operations; EPMRs should look instead at Centers’ ability to control and compensate for it.
- For the purpose of streamlining CGIAR handling of Center EPMRs, the following options were presented for ExCo’s consideration:
 - Option 1: No change to current process (i.e. discussion of EPMR reports by SC, ExCo, AGM)
 - Option 2: Discussion of EPMR reports by SC and ExCo (CGIAR delegation of decision making to ExCo with resulting schedule changes)
 - Option 3: Discussion of EPMR reports only by SC (as suggested by the CGIAR EPMR meta-evaluation)

Discussion:

- The panel’s findings provide validity to the importance of evaluations in the CGIAR System. A question that must be asked is how EPMRs could support CGIAR Member evaluation of Center programs.
- Appreciation was expressed for the panel’s finding that “PM System is improving the rigor of the MTP logframes and that clarity in the description of output targets and outcomes will facilitate the task of future EPMRs.”
- A score card of EPMR reports should have been established by the meta-evaluation.
- It would be useful to carry-out a “lessons learned” exercise on EPMRs every five years.

- Centers should also evaluate EPMR panels and the review process as a learning exercise.
- Preference was expressed by most members for Option 2 on CGIAR handling of EPMRs. However, it was also suggested to bring all three options for consideration by the CGIAR at AGM07.
- In addition to problematic EPMRs, there may be cases where ExCo would suggest a very positive EPMR that highlights best practice be discussed at AGM.
- There is need to assess what the contribution of discussion at AGMs have been to the EPMR process.
- A change in the process of handling EPMRs should consider the issue of reduced involvement of non-ExCo CGIAR Members and NARS in decision making.
- It was also suggested that Option 2 be augmented to note that all EPMRs would be sent to all CGIAR Members, and only those EPMRs requiring, in ExCo's judgment, full discussion by the CGIAR would be sent to AGM.
- Centers should also be given the option to request an EPMR be discussed at AGM.
- R. Wang pointed out that one aspect the panel missed was the appropriate interaction between the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat in the process of preparing commentaries.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *The EPMR guidelines should be revised, building on the key findings and recommendations of the EPMR meta-evaluation.*
- *Clarity should be made on how the PM System could be used effectively in the conduct of EPMRs.*
- *Formulation of a rating system for EPMRs and conduct of a lessons learned exercise every five years would be useful to further strengthen EPMRs.*
- *ExCo recommends a modified Option 2 in the CGIAR Secretariat's commentary on the process of CGIAR handling of EPMR reports, with the following additions:*
 - 1) *All EPMR reports should be sent to CGIAR Membership including those not requiring full discussion at AGM as determined by ExCo.*
 - 2) *Centers should also be given the option to request an EPMR report be discussed at AGM.*
 - 3) *ExCo should recommend discussion of a particular EPMR at AGM, if ExCo feels the EPMR contains either positive or negative lessons for the System.*
- *The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to revise the option to include these additions for discussion at AGM07.*

8.d. Follow-up to EPMRs

ExCo agreed at ExCo 8 that Centers which have undergone an EPMR in the past three years would include a section in their MTP submission on progress in implementing the EPMR recommendations. The information would be reported at the October ExCo meeting to monitor progress on implementation and recommend follow-up actions, if necessary, to the CGIAR. N. Datta presented a summary on implementation of the recommendations on governance, management and finance.

The Co-chair thanked the CGIAR Secretariat for providing the information

8.e. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMP (Closed Session)

ExCo discussed a progress report from the ICRAF Board Chair received in response to a request made at ExCo 12.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo remains interested in this matter and requested a progress report from the ICRAF Board Chair for ExCo 14.*

9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

Carlos Correa, Chair of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC), presented a GRPC think piece on issues to consider concerning financial returns from recipients of Center' research products from plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA).

The following key points were made:

- A changing scenario for Centers' research and transfer of outputs is characterized by the following:
 - Decline of unrestricted funding;
 - Need to obtain access to biotechnology;
 - Partnerships with private sector;
 - Adoption of the International Treaty on PGRFA and special conditions for the transfer of 'products under development';
 - Need to revise Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) Guiding Principles (1996).
- There have been a number of systemwide statements pertinent to the issue. They consistently reflected a number of core principles. They are as follows:
 - Centers' research must be in pursuit of the mission of the CGIAR;
 - Centers should not change research direction to obtain financial gains;
 - Centers' research products may be exceptionally subject to restricted access;
 - But these restrictions must not impede free access by poor farmers in developing countries;
 - Centers will not engage directly in commercialization of their research products;
 - Commercialization should be done by third parties, with benefits flowing back to the Centers.
- There are also areas of uncertainty:
 - Conditions under which Centers may seek IPRs over their research products;
 - Whether research products must be made available in developed countries;

- Disclosure of the reasons for seeking IPRs protection;
- Whether returns as a source of operating funds are absolutely excluded, or excluded only when they create a conflict of interests or compromise the objectivity of work;
- Whether use of returns should be in support of the CGIAR's mission only.

ExCo's inputs to address the following questions were requested:

- Should Centres seek financial compensation when providing access to their research products?
- Should CGIAR Centers provide *exclusive* access to research products to anyone (companies, Agricultural Research Institutes (ARIs), other Centers, etc)?
- If some form of exclusive access is justifiable, who may/may not be excluded from access?
- Should CGIAR Centers seek IPRs over PGRFA under development?

A GRPC work plan and budget for 2007-2009 was included in this item for consideration by ExCo.

Discussion:

- ExCo members expressed appreciation to GRPC in bringing to its attention the issue of handling of PGRFA in the context of IP. However, the Committee is urged to give more clarity on the issue.
- EIARD recognized the work of the GRPC in establishing the Standard Material Transfer Agreement (SMTA) that places the PGRFA collections in the framework of the Treaty. At the same time, further discussion on the handling of PGRFA in the context of IP issues has somewhat disappeared from the ExCo agenda and was treated very randomly at AGM06. EIARD supports the proposition made by the GRPC to discuss the questions raised at AGM07.
- Some members, including EIARD, are in favor of setting minimum standards with systemwide application, but not in favor of financial compensation. The generation of income on priority research is seen not only as a risk of influencing the research agenda but also as an issue that must be treated with caution because of its significant implication on CGIAR's pursuit of IPGs.
- The question on whether research products should be made available in developed countries should consider the CGIAR mission of producing global public goods.
- The CGIAR needs to be clear on exactly what questions need to be asked.
- It would be useful to provide ExCo/CGIAR with the results of a survey of Centers' current practices conducted under the auspices of the GRPC.
- A major concern was expressed about the proposal to have a discussion of the issue at AGM07. The AGM07 agenda is already very full and sufficient time to for discussion on this topic would not be guaranteed. It was strongly suggested that a public discussion of the issue should only be carried out when the CGIAR is more informed and prepared for such a discussion.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision on GRPC Work Plan and Budget:

- *ExCo members need more time to fully analyze the issue before it could recommend anything definitive to the CGIAR.*
- *ExCo members are requested to send their written comments to the GRPC through its Secretary (Emile Frison, Director General, Bioversity International).*
- *The issue will be scheduled for further discussion at ExCo 14.*
- *ExCo endorsed GRPC's work plan and budget for 2007-2009.*

10. Planning ExCo Business

ExCo Business Agenda

A timetable showing the ExCo business agenda was made available to members for information.

Post AGM07 ExCo Rotation

Members were reminded to review the schedule for ExCo rotation with their constituencies following AGM07, and requested to notify the CGIAR Secretariat of changes in ExCo membership.

Outgoing ExCo member Jean Lebel (IDRC) thanked ExCo for the opportunity to serve and noted his positive experiences on ExCo. He encouraged ExCo to actively engage incoming ExCo members to ensure their involvement and participation.

Future Meetings

The next ExCo meeting is scheduled for mid-May 2008. Exact meeting dates and meeting location will be communicated to ExCo when they are available.

11. Other Business

There were no items added to Other Business.

12. Closing Session

Co-chair R. Cooke thanked the Government of Italy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for hosting ExCo, and the CGIAR Secretariat for organizing the meeting. He closed the meeting by thanking members for their participation, and commended outgoing ExCo members for their contribution to ExCo and the CGIAR.

Attachment 1

List of Participants Thirteenth Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chair:</i>	Kathy Sierra	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Isabel Alvarez	FAO
	Mark Cackler	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>Alliance of CGIAR Centers:</i>	Emile Frison	AE Chair
<i>SC:</i>	Rudy Rabbinge	SC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Adel El-Beltagy	GFAR Chair
<u>OECD/DAC:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Franklin Moore	U.S.A.
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Peter Core	Australia
<i>Europe</i>	Katharina Jenny	Switzerland
	Marina Puccioni	Italy
	Jonathan Wadsworth	United Kingdom
<u>Developing Countries:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Silvio Crestana	Brazil (could not attend)
<i>SSA</i>	Romano Kiome	Kenya
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Lijian Zhang	China (could not attend)
<i>CWANA</i>	Jafar Khalghani	Iran
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Mario Allegri	FORAGRO
<u>Foundations:</u>	Jean Lebel	IDRC
<u>Partners:</u>		
<i>Civil Society</i>	TBD	
<i>Private Sector</i>	Bill Niebur	PSC Chair

Observers:

Pamela Anderson	CIP
Enrico Baccioni	Italy
Howdy Bouis	HarvestPlus
Gioacchino Carabba	Italy
GK Chadha	CGIAR External Review
Carlos Correa	GRPC
Gabriella D'Elia	Italy
Ruben Echeverria	Science Council Secretariat
Pierre Fabre	France
Dennis Garrity	ICRAF
Jim Godfrey	Alliance Board/CIP
Peter Hartmann	IITA
Bryan Harvey	IITA
Anne-Marie Izac	Alliance Office
Jos Kalders	Belgium
Wolfgang Kasten	Germany
Inge Kaul	CGIAR External Review
Shellemiah Keya	WARDA
Jorge Braga de Macedo	Portugal
Iain MacGillivray	Canada
Elizabeth McAllister	CGIAR External Review
Shantanu Mathur	IFAD
John Mugabe	CGIAR External Review
Eija Pehu	World Bank
Paolo Sarfatti	European Commission
Yves Savidan	CIAT
Monika Szamko	Trium Group
Marja-Liisa Tapio-Bistrom	Finland
Javad Tavakolian	Iran
Joachim Voss	CIAT
Jeff Waage	CGIAR External Review
Ken Watson	CGIAR External Review
Jonathan Woolley	CPWF

Executive Secretary, ExCo: Ren Wang
CGIAR Secretariat Support: Lori Dagdag
Namita Datta
Fionna Douglas
Manuel Lantin
Danielle Lucca
Shey Tata
Feroza Vatcha
Jason Yauney

Agenda

1. Opening Session

- Welcome by Host Country
- Election of Meeting Co-Chair
- Adoption of the Agenda

2. CGIAR Status Report

- 2.a. Report from Director
 - Discussion

3. Science Council and Program Matters

- 3.a. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- 3.b. Report from SC
 - Work Program and Budget (2008-2009)
 - Proposed SC Structural Changes
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

4. Challenge Programs

- 4.a. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPER)
 - HarvestPlus
 - Water and Food
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- 4.b. Challenge Programs: Lessons Learned
 - Discussion
- 4.c. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Pre-proposals
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

5. Evaluation

- 5.a. CIP EPMR
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

- 8.b. CIAT EPMR
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

6. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers

- Follow-up to Stripe Review
- Discussion

7. Alignment in the CGIAR

- 7.a. Final Report from ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- 7.b. Scoping Team Proposal
 - Discussion
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

8. Evaluation (cont'd)

- 8.e. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR (Closed Session)
 - Discussion
- 8.a. WARDA EPMR
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- 5.b. IITA EPMR
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- 8.c. EPMR Meta-analysis
 - Introduction
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- 8.d. Follow-up to EPMRs
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

9. Genetic Resource Policy Committee

- Think piece on Policy Guidelines on Income from Intellectual Property
- Work Plan and Budget
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

10. Planning ExCo Business

- ExCo Business Agenda
- Future Meetings

11. Other Business

12. Closing Session

Summary: ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 13

ExCo 13 Agenda Item	Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.	ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.	Outcome as summarized accurately reflects the discussion.
	1=not enough 4=just about right 7=too much	1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree nor disagree 7=agree strongly	1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree, nor disagree 7=agree strongly
	Average	Average	Average
2.a. Report from Director	4.23	5.77	5.82
3.a. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan	4.23	4.69	5.77
3.b. Report from Science Council	4.27	5.92	6.46
4.a. Challenge Program External Reviews	3.54	3.43	5.71
4.b. Challenge Programs: Lessons Learned	4.17	3.69	5.77
4.c. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Pre-Proposals	4.14	4.64	5.2
5.a. CIP EPMR	4.08	5.81	6.31
5.b. IITA EPMR	4.8	4.86	6
6. Report from Alliance of CGIAR Centers	4.75	5.18	6.25
7.a. Final Report from ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities	3.93	5.53	6.14
7.b. Scoping Team Proposal	4.46	5.73	6.36
8.a. WARDA EPMR	4.21	5.36	6
8.b. CIAT EPMR	4.42	4.67	6.13
8.c. EPMR Meta-analysis	4.33	5.09	5.92
9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee	3	1.9	6.27

ExCo 13 Feedback

(1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

	Average
1. Overall, the ExCo meeting was a productive use of my time.	6
2. Time available for the meeting allowed for an appropriate level of discussion and debate.	5.9
3. The meeting agenda included the most important issues facing the CGIAR.	5.8
4. ExCo members are knowledgeable about the CGIAR/ExCo business agenda.	5.4
5. The documentation provided enabled me to discuss and decide matters adequately.	5.4
6. I read all of the relevant documentation.	4.3
7. I have actively participated in ExCo 13 discussions.	5.5
8. The Chair encouraged full and open discussion and invited questions, including eliciting divergent views, and accurately summarized outcomes.	6.67
9. Overall, the decision making process at the ExCo meeting was effective.	6.2
10. CGIAR/ExCo recommendations and decisions are adequately followed-up by ExCo.	5.5
11. I find the use of the electronic assessment methodology during the meeting useful.	5.9

Full ExCo 13 Feedback Results available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/meetings.html>