

# CGIAR Performance Measurement System Workshop

July 17-18 2008, Washington DC

## Summary of Proceedings

### Summary of Agreed Changes for Strengthening the CGIAR Performance Measurement System

#### a) Output targets

1. Achievement of output targets will be monitored by Centers and will be made publicly available through linking CGMap with the PM System. Centers will report achievement (full or partial), deferral of target to a further date or cancellation of output target, and give reasons for other than expected achievement.
2. The PM System will not have an overall measure of percentage of output targets achieved, but through linking the PM System with the newly established CGMap it will continue to allow interested CGIAR Members and Partners to track the results (i.e. outputs) for individual projects.
3. Information on previous year's output target achievement will be reported as part of the MTP submission process (in June of each year)

#### Output indicators

1. A composite publications indicator (4a,b,d) with distinct weights will be established.
2. Changes to the denominator for the publication indicator will be further examined (budget vs. full-time equivalent).
3. The sub-indicator 4a will include registered cultivars.
4. A new composite indicator for capacity strengthening will be developed; this indicator will include 4c.
5. A new indicator for data management as IPG will be developed.

Indicators for capacity strengthening and data management will be first piloted with a subset of Centers before they are included in the PM system.

#### b) Outcome indicator

1. The number of required outcome cases will be relative to center budget based on the previous year's CGIAR Financial Report ;4 budget brackets will be established annually.
2. Centers are strongly encouraged to submit outcome cases across the entire project portfolio every 3 years.
3. The annual score will be based on a three year moving average of the assessment.

#### c) Impact Indicator:

1. Rename indicator to "Impact culture".
2. Establish a composite score on Impact culture (3a and 3b to be merged; 3b score remains for 3 years).
3. 3a to be simplified and the weighting of components should be revisited
4. The annual score will be based on a three year moving average of the assessment.
5. Give centers the possibility to improve their Indicator 3b score by allowing submission of one new study within the 3- year time frame to replace a lower score study.
6. SPIA's meeting with center focal points on impacts will aim at designing an indicator of actual impact by AGM 08.
7. Benchmark of one ex-post impact assessment per \$5 million center budget needs to be revisited by SC
8. Impact culture indicator should move to the culture of learning and change component once an indicator of actual impact is introduced to the PM system

d) Governance sub-element

1. Develop a single summary score for the governance checklist
2. Streamline checklist into two tiers, reduce sub-indicators to those meaningful to annual reporting, tie to benchmarks/best practices where possible; introduce weights to the checklist
3. Clarify assessment criteria for Board statements
4. Seek Alliance Board feedback on revisions to checklist and assessment of Board statements
5. Recommend that annual submissions of Board statements be reviewed by board chairs before submission; continue to give greater focus on governance in EPMRs

e) Culture of learning and change sub-element

1. Develop a single summary score for the culture of learning and change checklist
2. Streamline/revise checklist and introduce weights, if possible
3. Eliminate: questions related to data management (covered by output indicator), Partnerships (information to be evident in stakeholder survey, publications, capacity indicator, outcomes, EPMR)
4. Indicators of impact culture should move to this component once a way to measure actual impact is found.

f) Diversity sub-element

1. Drop the indicator “Diversity in recency of PhDs”
2. Consult with G&D program on indicator 5A (explore retrieving data from survey)

Some sub-indicators reflect system-wide goals that are values-based (diversity, investment in staff development) for which there is no established benchmark or that will vary depending on the size and mission of the Center. Measuring performance in these areas remains important. In these cases, the center's scores will be compared to the system-wide average to enable Centers to set internal goals and to place their performance in context.

g) Financial health indicators

1. Retain two indicators: (i) reserves and (ii) cash management; the remaining three indicators are to be removed from the PM system
2. Increase the benchmark for reserves to 90 days (with a transition period of 3 years) – this is subject to ExCo approval
3. Propose to ExCo to eliminate maximum number of days of reserves;
4. Establish benchmark for cash management on restricted operations at less than 1.0
5. Alliance and CGIAR Sec should develop a common and broader set of “dashboard” financial indicators for monitoring financial health outside the PM at Center level (governance checklist may help to verify whether a common system is used by Centers)

h) Stakeholders Perceptions No changes were discussed.

**Decisions on PM System process and units responsible for implementation**

1. Benchmarks will be established, where possible (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
2. Introduce a feedback mechanism on panel assessments before score is finalized. (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec). This would require setting the deadline for PM data submission earlier, i.e. March 1.
3. Database on proposed indicators (CGIAR Sec and SC Sec) for institutional memory
4. Develop guidelines on the use of the PM results: Definition, access, specifies how it should or should not be used (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec in consultation with Alliance)
5. Produce a package of slide presentation to brief Center Boards about PMS and how it can be a useful tool for their oversight (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
6. Ensure that the annual PM Guidelines consolidate definitions and assessment criteria in one place (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
7. Organize an annual PM workshop (CGIAR Secretariat in collaboration with SC Sec and Alliance)
8. Pilot new indicators on a small scale before fully included in the PMS.
9. Monitor whether EPMR and PM results are coherent (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
10. Make overall PM report available to all Center staff through CGXchange (CGIAR Sec)

**Next steps**

1. Circulate the draft summary proceedings of workshop by end of July 2008 (CGIAR Secretariat)
2. Communicate a revised calendar for the next PM cycle (CGIAR Secretariat)
3. Proposed indicator on (i) capacity building (ii) data management (ADE) to be circulated by Nov. 15, 2008 (ADE)
4. Virtual consultation with the Alliance about the 2009 PM guidelines to be held in November 2008 (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
5. Launch of PM guidelines by Jan.1 2009 (CGIAR Sec and SC Sec)
6. Communicate to Centers that output targets reporting will be requested as part of the MTP submission process (June 2009)
7. Advise ICT-KM of necessary technical changes to EasyMTP and CGMap to accommodate output target reporting (CGIAR Sec and SC Sec)
8. Submit outcome of workshop to ExCo by mid September 2008 (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
9. Use meeting of centers impact focal point in November 2009 to consult on indicator on actual impact (SC Sec)
10. Develop guidelines for use of PM information (including powerpoint slides) by AGM08 (SC Secretariat and CGIAR Secretariat in consultation with Alliance)

## **Background**

At its meeting in May 2008, ExCo, who has oversight responsibility for the CGIAR PM System, made the following decisions :

- *ExCo endorsed the CGIAR Secretariat suggestion to organize a workshop and invite representatives from the SC, CGIAR Membership, Alliance, and M&E experts.*
- *ExCo recognized that there is still a call for output indicators. The workshop should explore ways to improve the PM System, including identifying those indicators that are most useful to the CGIAR System and can act as an early warning system.*
- *A flow chart should be developed to help clarify the link among outputs, outcomes and impact.*
- *The CGIAR Change Management Process has also identified information that needs to be collected and this could be built into the PM System.*

The workshop followed up on the ExCo decision and the SC's and CGIAR Secretariat's common view that further work with the PM System is due.

## **Objectives of the workshop**

The main objectives of the workshop are to review the overall design and indicators of the current PM system, and identify possibilities for simplification while maintaining relevance, accuracy and continuity.

Special focus should be on improving the validity and reliability of

- the output element
- the institutional health element

## **Agenda Item 1: CGIAR Performance Measurement System: Design, Use, Strength and Weaknesses**

R. Wang opened the Workshop and thanked the participants for their collaboration to improve the Performance Measurement System. M Iskandarani briefly presented the background for creating the PM System and briefly described the improvements made during the last four years. She described the challenges to be addressed during the workshop.

### ***Discussion***

- Some donors use the PM System in setting their core contribution to the CGIAR centers.
- An EC survey showed that member states perceived the PM System as a rather complicated tool. The number of indicators should be reduced.
- The System could reduce the number of indicators and use a set of 'super indicators', i.e. those that measure the most important results.

- The System has been useful to collect information otherwise difficult to collect (e.g. publications). Streamlining the use of results allows identifying how the PM creates incentives for improvement.
- If the incentives for improving performance are not correct, there is a risk that emphasis is on improving the indicator value rather on improving the performance.
- There is a need for more transparency about the assessment criteria for qualitative indicators (e.g. board statements).
- There is a need to create a mechanism for allowing Centers to enter into a dialogue with review panels concerning their assessment score.
- Annual impact measurement may not be feasible. There is a need to redefine the impact indicator.
- Performance benchmarks should be determined to ensure a continuous improvement of the Centers; annual results can be used to set benchmarks/new goals for the following year.
- Differentiate the use of the results as a learning tool for both, the system level and the Centers.
- The PM results do not necessarily match with the perception that the system stakeholders have about the performance of a given Center.
- Avoid falling into the trap of “wanting to measure everything” while asking for simplicity; more coherence of the PM system with other M&E instruments is needed.

**Agenda Item 2: What should the CGIAR Performance Measurement System be measuring to meet key stakeholder information, learning and accountability needs?**

Marlene Diekmann (GTZ) and Rodomiro Ortiz (ADE Chair) were invited to make some introductory comments. M. Robinson facilitated the discussion.

M. Diekmann (through VC) explained that 7.5 % of the German contribution to the CGIAR Centers is based on the following six indicators: SC rating on the impact assessment culture, SC rating of two Center Impact Studies, Staff satisfaction survey, average number of training days for IRS and NRS, and women in management. Those indicators were selected for being the most related to the German development policy. GTZ is interested in rewarding the actual impact and not the culture of impact assessment. GTZ is currently reconsidering the selection of PM indicators to ensure that its funds allocation is based on real performance improvement. For that, it would also be very helpful to have a clear link between EPMRs and the PM.

R. Ortiz, described the areas where the Alliance sees the need for improving the PM System. They included the following:

- A request that monitoring of achievement of output targets as currently defined should be moved to the MTP process – for the same reasons as stated by the SC. If kept within the PM System as an indicator, it needs to consider partial achievement of outputs.
- The most important indicator is the outcome indicator.
- The SC suggestion of requesting one ex-post impact assessment per 5 million dollars budget is not considered to be realistic and should be adjusted.
- The governance checklist needs to be reduced and benchmarks should be determined.

- The PM process should allow Centers to comment on panel ratings before the final results are presented to ExCo.

***Discussion:***

- Some centers have their own monitoring and evaluation tool. It is important to find overlaps and make use of synergies between these tools and the PM System.
- Centers put a lot of time into their strategic plans and their MTP. The indicators in the MTP should somehow feed more into the PM System. Donors are interested in knowing Center outputs; publications are only one type of output.
- The outcome measure could set incentive for Centers to track their own portfolio, make corrections and monitor strategically.
- Use of time series is recommended (average of three years for some indicators). EPMRs could have a more systematic look at the Centers' own PM Systems.
- The quality of Center governance through their Boards is a key prerequisite for good performance
- Considering that the Boards are legally responsible for overseeing a Centers performance, the PM System should cover their needs for specific information to fulfill their oversight role.
- There is a need to clarify the scoring criteria for the answers within the governance checklist.
- It may be useful to array indicators to their intended uses (e.g. accountability, learning and benchmarking, early warning, ) and also aggregate some indicators; monitoring trends for specific indicators is important

**Agenda Item 3: How can we strengthen the PM System in providing useful, valid and reliable data? – Issues on outputs, outcomes, impacts, and publications .**

Ken Fischer (Science Council) presented suggestions for improving the research related indicators. The SC recommendations are: (1) Monitor achievement of output targets internally at Center level to prevent the risk of gaming the output targets, and to detach it from the PM System; (2) use publication as indicator of output, (3) introduce two new output indicators - capacity strengthening and data management, (4) make the number of required outcome cases dependent on Center size (5) develop a composite publication indicator composed of 4A, B, and D.

Ruben Echeverria (SC Secretariat) added that the PM System is part of an overall M&E System and therefore it does not need to measure every single aspect of the center's performance. He suggests that the CGIAR Secretariat, the Alliance and the SC Secretariat should submit an agreed proposal to improve the PM System to next ExCo meeting. He also mentioned that it would be useful to create a database of indicators suggested over the years for institutional memory.

### *Discussion about output indicator*

- Output target measurement is a matter that center management is responsible for
- Outputs targets are not good for external monitoring as they do not measure the way in which good science operates. Good science has failures and “not achievement” of targets can be very reasonable. Therefore, the most specific way of measuring the production of research is publications – i.e. peer reviewed publications are an indicator of good science.
- Monitoring of output and output target achievement is important and needs to be the responsibility of the Centers with periodic external evaluation, but linking the achievement to an expectation of complete success and mechanistic rewarding for achieving highest number of targets sets a wrong incentive for Centers to announce only the easily achievable targets (from adaptive and applied research rather than basic or strategic research which is riskier)
- Information on achievement of output targets can be still provided to CGIAR Members outside the PM system; Output targets can be still reported and verified, but perhaps should not be linked to fund allocation
- It is critical to strengthen the MTP process to ensure adequate targets are set
- Members may want to know about outputs Centers produced beyond publications/ capacity building/ data management;
- The System needs more clarity about what has been produced; % of output targets achieved is not clear enough.
- a CGIAR Member stated that some Members may not be interested in a publication indicator, but rather want to know about the Centers performance in respect to germplasm development, policy briefs, patents, etc
- Adding capacity building/ data management adds complexity to the output measure
- Outputs are a measure of productivity; the PM system should continue measuring output achievement.
- Centers have more control over outputs than over outcomes and therefore need to be made accountable for the first

### *Discussion about outcome indicator*

- Having research outcomes is “what counts”. Measurement of outcomes need to be linked to the MTP document
- ADE agrees with the suggested normalization of the outcome measurement by size. However, the scoring process of outcomes needs to be more transparent.
- Subjectivity may be a problem in the outcome assessments. There is a need for dialogue with Centers after the outcomes have been assessed and before a final score is set. However, this additional iteration needs to be managed carefully (perhaps only for those Centers with zero score cases);
- The PM System should allow submission of a minimum number of outcomes, but should also encourage more.
- There is a need for using a moving average for determining the score; the benchmark should be the average score of previous year.
- Centers should cover outcome reports of all projects over a period of x years – this allows helping harmonize with M&E needs by EIARD.

- Donors are particularly interested in impact. The PM system should measure outcomes yearly and impacts on a more spaced time frame.

### ***Discussion about publication indicator***

- Indicator 4d should not single out the publication venue of Nature and Science
- Normalization by discipline as suggested is important (will be done in the composite indicator design)
- Stronger definition of “peer-review” is needed
- Publication per US\$ could be an alternative denominator to consider
- Registered cultivar release should be considered within this indicator
- Publication benchmarks from similar research organizations could be considered in assessing performance

### ***Discussion about impact indicator***

Mywish Meredia (SPIA) explained that the Impacts indicator 3A and 3B are not indicators of impact as such, and presented the following recommendations for moving forward in improving this element:

- Rename the indicator to “impact culture”
- The indicators should use a three year moving average to smooth out some of the fluctuations and give more an indicator of how this indicator is changing overtime.
- Shorten the list of subcomponents for indicator 3a.
- Changing the sub indicators and weights of the different sections.
- Creating a measure of actual impact. One idea is to encourage Centers to conduct meta-analyses of their cumulative success stories in an attempt to compile and quantify the size and nature of the economic and non-economic impacts to-date. Also something could be proposed to measure the impact at the system.

## **Summary of decisions and recommendations**

### **a) Outputs targets**

1. Achievement of output targets will be monitored by Centers and will be made publicly available through linking CGMap with the PM System. Centers will report achievement (full or partial), deferral of target to a further date or cancellation of output target, and give reasons for other than expected achievement.
2. The PM System will not have an overall measure of percentage of output targets achieved, but through linking the PM System with the newly established CGMap it will continue to allow interested CGIAR Members and Partners to track the results (i.e. outputs) for individual projects.
3. Information on previous year’s output target achievement will be reported as part of the MTP submission process (in June of each year)

### **Revisions to the output indicator**

1. Establishment of a composite of publications indicator (4a,b,d) with distinct weights
2. Changes to the denominator for the publication indicator will be further examined (budget vs. Full-time Equivalent).
3. The sub-indicator 4A should include registered cultivar
4. A new (composite) indicator for capacity strengthening should be developed (this indicator would include 4c )
5. A new indicator for data management as IPG should be developed

Both the indicator for capacity strengthening and data management should be first piloted with a subset of Centers before they are included in the PM system.

b) Revisions to the outcome indicator:

1. The number of required outcome cases will be relative to Center budget based on the last year CGIAR Financial Report (4 budget brackets will be established annually )
2. Centers are strongly encouraged to submit outcome cases across the entire project portfolio every 3 years
3. The annual score would be based on a three year moving average of the assessment

c) Revisions to the Impact Indicator:

1. Rename indicator to “Impact culture”.
2. Establish a composite score on Impact culture (3a and 3b to be merged; 3b score remains for 3 years).
3. 3a to be simplified and the weighting of components should be revisited
4. The annual score will be based on a three year moving average of the assessment.
5. Give centers the possibility to improve their Indicator 3b score by allowing submission of one new study within the 3- year time frame to replace a lower score study.
6. SPIA’s meeting with center focal points on impacts will aim at designing an indicator of actual impact by AGM 08.
7. Benchmark of one ex-post impact assessment per \$5 million center budget needs to be revisited by SC.
8. Impact culture indicator should move to the culture of learning and change component once an indicator of actual impact is introduced to the PM system.

**Agenda Item 3: How can we strengthen the PM System in providing useful, valid and reliable data? - Issues on financial and institutional Health**

M. Iskandarani briefly explained the performance dimensions of Institutional and Financial Health and described the CGIAR Secretariat’s suggestions for streamlining the institutional health indicators. Lori Dagdag (CGIAR Secretariat) explained the CGIAR Secretariat’s proposal for improving the financial health indicators.

### ***Discussion about financial health indicators***

- Centers are concerned about the large number of small projects.
- There is a need to move to full cost recovery and it should get reflection in indicators.
- Be explicit about removing the upper benchmark on reserves indicator. The group proposes to have no upper limit.
- Adjustment period is too long and irresponsible – moving from 75 to 90 days should be possible within 1-2 years
- Governance indicators could check whether adequate financial oversight is ensured instead of having stand alone finance indicator at system level
- Benchmarks are needed
- There is a need to have guidelines on how to handle the currency exchange risks; the risk depends on where the expenditure basket is and where the income source is. These can feed into the governance indicators

### ***Discussion about Institutional Health indicators***

#### ***Governance checklist:***

- There is a need for better explaining the logic for identifying the indicators
- The checklist measures compliance to minimum standards adopted by CG through the Board Guidelines
- PM Guidelines/ checklist should be referenced to e.g. Board Guidelines and/ or a standard established
- Need to review the questions regularly and refresh
- Common Board Membership of Board Members with financial and governance expertise is good and should find reflection in the checklist
- Indicators should to be linked to EPMR
- The System could have a system wide single score.

#### ***Assessment of board statements***

- Indicate clear measurement criteria
- Maintain for two more years and evaluate whether this instrument continues to be useful
- Seek feedback from AB on possible improvements to this indicator

#### ***Culture of learning and change***

- In the long-term indicator of impact culture could move to this component
- The current indicator of partnership should be drop. Partnerships are captured in joint publications, capacity building, outcomes, stakeholder perceptions survey and EPMR.
- Use average as benchmark ; perhaps weight by Center size
- Need for more consultation on meaningful benchmarks

#### ***Diversity***

- Differentiate more the assessment of gender goal achievement instead than yes/no. It could also be a statement on what action the Center has taken (e.g. has the Board reviewed and taken action in achieving the G&D goals?)

- There is a need to gain a better understanding from G&D on whether data can come from the planned survey
- Using recency of PhD implies that older scientists are not updated and this should not be concluded
- Indicator of recency of PhD could be dropped.

### **Summary of decisions and recommendations:**

#### Revisions to the governance sub-element

1. Produce single summary score for the governance checklist
2. Streamline checklist into two tiers, reduce sub-indicators to those meaningful to annual reporting, tie to benchmarks/best practices; introduce weights to the checklist
3. Clarify assessment criteria for Board Statements ,
4. Seek Alliance Board feedback on revisions to checklist and Assessment of Board statements
5. Recommend that annual submissions of Board statements be reviewed by board chairs before submission; continue to give greater focus on governance in EPMRs

#### e) Revisions to the culture of learning and change sub-element

1. Produce single summary score for the culture of learning and change checklist
2. Streamline/revise checklist and introduce weights, if possible
3. Eliminate: questions related to data management (covered by output indicator), Partnerships (information to be evident in stakeholder survey, publications, capacity indicator, outcomes, EPMR)
4. In the long run indicators of impact culture should move to this component ( once a way to measure actual impact is found)

#### f) Diversity indicator

1. Drop the indicator “Diversity in recency of PhDs”
2. Consult with G&D program on indicator 5A (explore retrieving data from survey)

Some sub-indicators reflect system-wide goals that are values-based (diversity, investment in staff development) for which there is no established benchmark or that will vary depending on the size and mission of the Center. Measuring performance in these areas remains important. In these cases, the center's scores will be compared to the system-wide average to enable Centers to set internal goals and to place their performance in context.

#### g) Financial Health

1. Retain two indicators: reserves and cash management, drop the remaining three indicators from the PM system
2. Reserves: increase benchmark to 90 days (with a transition period of 3 years ) – this is subject to ExCo approval

3. Support proposal to eliminate maximum number of days of reserves
4. Establish benchmark Cash management: less than 1
5. Alliance and CGIAR Sec should develop a common and broader set of “dashboard” financial indicators for monitoring financial health outside the PM at Center level (governance checklist may help to verify whether a common system is used by Centers)

#### **Agenda Item 4: Areas for improvement in the annual performance measurement process**

##### **Discussion:**

- Benchmarks should be established, where possible
- Introduce a feedback mechanism on panel assessments before score is finalized. This will entail that the deadline for PM data submission will need to be changed to March 1.
- Explore the establishment of a database on proposed indicators for institutional memory
- Develop guidelines on the use of the PM results: Definition, access, specifies how it should or should not be used.
- Brief Center Boards about PMS and how it can be a useful tool for their oversight (e.g. prepare power point).
- PM Guidelines should include consolidated definitions and assessment criteria.
- Make overall PM report available to all Center staff through CGXchange; explore options for making results available on the public part of the CGIAR web site
- Use PMS to demonstrate the performance of the CGIAR as a whole ; establish PM for other system units
- Continue to have an annual PM workshop
- Start thinking about how to transform PM to capture the thinking of the Change Management.
- Make it a practice to pilot indicator on a small scale (i.e. with a few centers) before fully including in the PMS.
- Monitor whether EPMR and PM results are coherent.
- Strengthen transparency of allocation by World Bank (while acknowledging that the World Bank is the only member providing such detailed information on their fund allocation decision)

##### **Agenda item 5: Next Steps**

- Circulate draft summary proceedings of meeting by end of July 2008 (CGIAR Secretariat)
- Communicate a revised calendar for the next PM cycle (CGIAR Secretariat)
- Proposed indicator on (i) capacity building (ii) data management to be circulated by Nov 15, 2008 (ADE)
- Virtual consultation about the 2009 PM guidelines to be held with Alliance in November 2008 (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
- Launch of PM guidelines by Jan.1 (CGIAR Sec and SC Sec)

- Communicate to Centers that output targets reporting will be requested as part of the MTP submission process (June 2009)
- Advise ICT-KM of necessary technical changes to EasyMTP and CGMap to accommodate output target reporting (CGIAR Sec and SC Sec)
- Submit outcome of workshop to ExCo by mid September (SC Sec and CGIAR Sec)
- Use meeting of centers impact focal point in November 2009 to consult on indicator on actual impact (SC Sec)
- Develop guidelines for use of PM information (including PowerPoint) by AGM08 (SC Secretariat and CGIAR Secretariat in consultation with Alliance)

## VI. List of Participants

No.	Name	Organization
1	Rob Bertram	USAID
2	Byerlee, Derek	incoming SC Member /SPIA Chair
3	Cackler, Mark	The World Bank
4	Cooksy,Leslie	University of Delaware
5	Dagdag, Lori	CGIAR Secretariat
6	Diekmann, Marlene	GTZ
7	Echeverria, Ruben	Science Council Secretariat
8	Ferretti, Elena	Consultant EC
9	Fischer, Ken	Science Council
10	Immonen, Sirkka	Science Council Secretariat
11	Iskandarani, Maria	CGIAR Secretariat
12	Lantin, Manny	CGIAR Secretariat
13	Lara, Maria Eugenia	CGIAR Secretariat
14	Maredia, Mywish	Standing Panel on Impact Assessment/University of Michigan
15	Roberts, Stacy	IFPRI
16	Robinson, Maureen	Consultant (Governance and Management expert)
17	Oliver, Jaime	WorldFish
18	Ooi, Elaine	IEG, World Bank
19	Ortiz, Rodomiro	CIMMYT
20	Souza, Geraldo	Brazil/Embrapa
21	Tollens, Eric	Catholic University Leuven / Consultant EC
22	Van Weerdenburg, Martin	CIMMYT
23	Wang, Ren	CGIAR Secretariat