

CHANGE MANAGEMENT

TRANSFORMATION OF THE CGIAR

PROGRESS UPDATE: WORKING GROUPS 2 - 4

WORKING GROUP 2: PARTNERSHIPS PROGRESS UPDATE

Working Group 2 – Partnerships: Target and Objectives

TARGET

Propose the objectives, possible strategies and specific modes of operation that a revitalized CGIAR could use in the development of efficient and effective partnerships

OBJECTIVES

1. Clarify global issues of partnerships, including, how partnerships relate to CGIAR functions, why partners are needed and what makes a partner
2. To review and analyze documented experiences on CGIAR partnerships and extract and summarize relevant lessons
3. To identify and map out the different types of potential institutional partners and assess their relevance (present and future) *vis a vis* the different functions of a revitalized CGIAR
4. To develop criteria, options and guidelines in regard to operational aspects related to these different functions and types of partnerships
5. To analyze, and make proposals in interaction with other WGs regarding the needs and implications that partnerships may have on vision, governance and funding of the CGIAR
6. To define and propose elements for an overall policy on partnerships in the CGIAR

Working Group 2 – Partnerships: Our Progress to Date

- 1. We are framing our work and developing our formal plan. The result are two short papers still in draft form “Mapping our Work” and “Issues Paper” (see work in progress on the CMP Web)**
- 2. We are reviewing relevant documents and extracting key learnings**
- 3. We have commissioned six papers:**
 - Four papers to identify issues specific to each of the four different types of partners: Private Sector, International NGOs, Local NGOs and GFAR members.
 - One paper addressing the experience of Challenge Programs in regards to partnerships.
 - Harry Palmier produced one paper on Regional and Sub-Regional organizations in SSA as CGIAR partners.
- 4. A Subgroup to work on Private Sector partnerships is being organized with contributions of resource persons**
- 5. Interactions have started with WG1, particularly on the issue of CGIAR functions, and a strong interaction with WG3 is expected after Ottawa**

Working Group 2 – Partnerships: Project Plan for 2008

1. We have prepared a detailed Work Plan. The four key phases of our Work Plan are:

- Phase 1 - Review and reflection (relevant materials) – mostly completed
- Phase 2 - Diagnosis and analysis of issues (in consideration of initial vision)
- Phase 3 - Development of options
- Phase 4 - Identification of preferred option

2. Our major next steps include:

- Progress in the identification of major issues;
- Complete background information and;
- Reach an agreement on a methodological framework to derive recommendations

3. At the same time, we continue to advance in organizing activities of the Subgroup on Private Sector partnerships

WORKING GROUP 3: GOVERNANCE PROGRESS UPDATE

Working Group 3 – Governance: Target and Objectives

TARGET

Propose governance and organizational structure options for the CGIAR, covering the System-, Center- and program-levels, that are simple, transparent and cost effective and promote openness, inclusion, accountability, and impact, being mindful of the trade-offs that will be needed to incorporate all of these characteristics

OBJECTIVES

1. To review and extract relevant lessons from previous governance reform proposals considered by the CGIAR
2. To develop governance and organizational structure options for the CGIAR, including associated principles, based on agreed characteristics and describe them in general (or “skeletal”) terms
3. To agree and apply a set of criteria for comparing the governance and organizational structure options
4. Frame and reframe the governance options based on the outputs from WG1 on vision, WG2 on partnerships, and WG4 on funding. At the same time, provide the other WGs with appropriate and timely inputs which result from analyses of governance and organizational structure issues and that are relevant to the central concerns of those groups
5. Describe the recommended governance arrangement and organizational structure in some detail, including implementation considerations such as incentives required and adoption pathways

Working Group 3 – Governance: Our Progress to Date

1. Identified and reviewed key relevant materials.
2. Prepared a matrix of past reform efforts showing the major diagnostics and recommendations, why these succeeded or failed, and we are working to explicitly identify driving forces that could make reform viable today
3. We are also reviewing governance and organizational structure of European research networks and other global programs like the CGIAR
4. We began a paper on governance goals and principles, but agreed to postpone completing it until after WG1 completes its work on vision, mission and goals

CHANGE MANAGEMENT

TRANSFORMATION OF THE CGIAR

Working Group 3 – Governance: Project Plan for 2008

- **Phase 1 (March)** **Review and reflection (relevant materials) – mostly completed**
- **Phase 2 (April)** **Diagnosis and analysis of issues (in consideration)**
- **Phase 3 (May- July)** **Development of options**
- **Phase 4 (August)** **Identification of preferred option**
- **Phase 5 (September)** **Reframe and refine option**
- **Phase 6 (October)** **Finalize recommendations**

WORKING GROUP 4: FUNDING PROGRESS UPDATE

Working Group 4 – Funding: Target and Objectives

TARGET

Define a funding approach and implementation mechanism that meets the requirements of the CGIAR System, i.e. centers and donors

OBJECTIVES

1. A 'Set of Principles for Funding' (formerly called 'Donors Code of Conduct), fairly general
2. 'Good Practices for Funding', the operational part complementing (1) in a specific way
3. ToR for Funding Committee
4. Options for funding mechanisms (e.g. IFAR, etc.) including defining procedures (stepwise process)
5. Analysis of financial data (e.g. unrestricted/restricted funding, full cost recovery , sources of funding – multilateral, bilateral etc.)
6. Study of funding structures from similar international organizations (benchmark study)
7. Proposal for 'Stabilization of Funding' including safety nets

Working Group 4 – Funding: Our Progress to Date

1. We considered full cost-recovery on projects:

- We concluded that IF full cost recovery is achieved, restricted funding is equal to unrestricted funding, even with the added benefit of a long-term commitment
- We discussed the on what There is / was some confusion that full cost recovery just means that overheads are paid. In fact, many direct costs such as experimental stations, genebanks, glasshouses, Office of Dir. for Research are not regularly included in budgets

2. The Set of Principles for Funding was compiled in Ottawa, including ideas on how the principles will be implemented

3. Ideas on ‘Stabilization of Funding’ have been collected

4. We discussed how the PMS data can be used to allocate funding to centers

Working Group 4 – Funding: Project Plan for 2008

- 1. Complete a benchmark study on the funding situation of similar organizations**
- 2. Compile options for funding mechanisms, (e.g. International Fund for Agricultural Research and others)**
- 3. Create a proposal for ‘Stabilization of Funding’**
- 4. Interact with the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Finance to develop the ToRs for a Funding Committee**