



**Meeting of the Alliance Board
of the
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research**

**Summary Record
of
Proceedings**

**Joachim Chissano International Conference Center
Maputo, Mozambique
29 November 2008**

Confirmed at the May 2009 Rome Meeting

TABLE of CONTENTS

1.	Opening Session	1
	a. Welcome and Introductions	1
	b. Adoption of Agenda	1
	a. Confirmation of Tervuren Meeting Summary Record	1
	b. Review of Decisions and Matters Arising	1
2.	Chair's Report	1
3.	Report of Committees/ Working Groups	2
	a. Board Nominees Committee	2
	b. Performance Measurement Committee	2
	c. Systems Committee	3
	d. Board Orientation Working Group	3
	e. GRPC Working Group	4
4.	DG Remuneration and Evaluation	4
5.	AB 2009 Budget	4
6.	Performance Measurement System	5
7.	Issues Arising from Alliance Meetings	5
8.	Change Management	5
9.	AB 2009 Committees	6
10.	Other Business/ Closing Session	7
	a. Relationship of Center Boards and Challenge Program Boards	7
	b. Closing Session	7
	Decisions and Actions Table	8
	Annex 1 Attendance	10
	Annex 2 Revised Provisional Agenda	11
	Annex 3 AB 2009 Budget (Revised)	12
	Annex 4 AB Concerns re Change Management Process	14

AI1. Opening Session

a. Welcome and Introductions

AB Chair Guido Gryseels warmly welcomed the Board Chairs to the meeting (attendance list is at *Annex 1*) and extended a special welcome to:

- Gordon MacNeil, CIAT Board Chair, who was attending his first AB Meeting,
- Julio Berdégue, CIMMYT Board Chair, also attending his first AB Meeting, and
- Gunnar Sorbo, IFPRI Board Member, representing IFPRI Board Chair Ross Garnaut from whom apologies had been received earlier.

b. Adoption of Agenda

Decision/ Action: With the addition of one item under Other Business, ie, Center Board's relationship with Challenge Programs (CPs), the Revised Provisional Agenda was adopted (see *Annex 2*).

c. Confirmation of the Summary Record of the May 2008 Meeting

Decision/ Action: The Summary Record of the May 2008 Tervuren Meeting, approved virtually on 25 June 2008, was confirmed.

d. Review of Decisions and Matters Arising

The updated Decisions and Actions Table from the May 2008 Meeting was reviewed briefly. It was noted that all action items had been completed except the update of the Board Compensation Survey, due for the AB's Spring Meeting in 2010.

AI2. Chair's Report

The Chair presented an oral report on his activities since the Tervuren Meeting, relating mostly to the ongoing Change Management Process (CMP).

Science Council (SC) Meeting, Tervuren, September 2008

Guido reported on his meeting with the SC Chair on the Harvey Report covering the conduct of recent External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs):

- Rudy Rabbinge largely agreed with the points raised in the Harvey Report. He was very sympathetic, agreed that the EPMP process was too bureaucratic, and said the SC was doing everything it could to make the review process more efficient and less burdensome for the Centers
- Rudy also said that Center-Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs) are no longer formally required for an EPMP, should not be imposed on Centers, and Centers could do what they deem necessary

It was noted that with the reform, monitoring and evaluation will be built into the Strategy and Results Framework which then becomes the responsibility of Centers and the Consortium Board.

Appreciation was conveyed to Bryan Harvey for the Report which had a beneficial effect on the highly constructive IRRR EPMP currently underway.

Update on Stripe Review Recommendations

The AB reported to ExCo 15 on Centers' progress with the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 Stripe Review of Corporate Governance. The Report, which was well received, noted that the Centers had implemented most of the recommendations and were making good progress on others.

ExCo 15, Lisbon

AB Vice Chair Andrew Bennett, representing the AB Chair, reported on ExCo 15 which was thought to have been a great meeting overall with updates received from the Independent Review and the Change Management Process. The meeting atmosphere was positive: participants went away feeling that it had been a good exercise and were realistic about the issues.

Independent Review: Panel Chair Elizabeth MacAllister presented the preliminary results of the Review. Key points made were that the CGIAR has done some good things by and large but it could have achieved more if it were better organized. It found that: governance is too burdensome and dysfunctional, the CGIAR needs to have a more strategic approach to partnerships, and Centers need to better integrate gender and diversity into its research. The Review concluded that the CGIAR needs to rebalance the partnership between Centers and donors.

Change Management Process: A series of very good presentations were made on what the Change Steering Team (CST) had done so far and a justification and greater analysis of what roles and responsibilities there might be at different levels. There was a perception, in the end, that most of ExCo were fairly behind the CM agenda. As was seen in subsequent meetings, however, some questions remained unanswered (eg, Will the CMP reduce or magnify bureaucracy? Would donors renounce what they saw as the direct accountability of the Centers? Are CPs good or not so good? What is the motivation for moving forward with the CMP?).

In her closing comments, CGIAR Chair Kathy Sierra said she was reassured that the balanced partnership was the model preferred by all and, although a lot of questions still needed to be worked through, donors felt there was no going back on the CMP.

The two key issues that remained unresolved were:

- How much money should go to the Fund to make the reform work?
- Do the Centers have enough trust and confidence in each other to take risks with the reform? Will Centers want to first see how the reform works before deciding to buy in? Will Centers buy-in even before all the questions are resolved?

AI3. Report of Committees/ Working Groups

- a. Board Nominees Committee Focal Point Guido Gryseels reported that the Committee had no activity since the last AB Meeting.
- b. Performance Measurement Committee Focal Point Lynn Haight presented briefly the key points of the two background documents distributed at the Meeting:
 - Summary of Proceedings of CGIAR Performance Measurement System (PMS) Workshop, July 17-18, 2008; and
 - Excerpt on Evaluation and Monitoring from the CST Paper “New Way Forward,” p12.

AI6, Performance Measurement System, was also discussed under this item.

It was noted that the PMS, which will be turned over to the Consortium, will continue to be implemented during the transition phase in 2009.

Key points made during the discussion include:

- The PMS Workshop had done some commendable streamlining but much more can be done, including reviewing the frequency of M&E exercises

- It was suggested that the Consortium form a Task Force composed of Board Chairs and DGs to prepare a comprehensive M&E proposal that the Consortium would use in future
 - It would be important to propose a unified system, acceptable to both Donors and Centers
 - Comments on the proposed system should be invited from Donors and the Change Management Team to help ensure buy-in
 - The proposed system should build confidence and transparency, and rebuild trust
 - The proposed performance monitoring system should be considered one element of the CMP, thus, should be designed to reduce transaction costs
 - It was suggested that a comparative study be conducted of current standard operating costs and projected steady operating costs of the Consortium, and not just the implementation costs
 - Funds to cover the costs of preparing the M&E proposal need to be identified
 - It was suggested that the AB revisit this issue for a full consideration of what needs to be done by who and by when
- a. Systems Committee represented the AB Chair at a couple of CMP meetings and thanked him for stepping in. The outcomes of these meetings were shared with the Alliance as they became available.
- b. Board Orientation Working Group Lead Chair Andrew Bennett reported that the WG conducted two BOPs in 2008, one at CIMMYT and another at ICARDA. With only 22 participants, the program did not break-even, and the WG is looking at ways to increase attendance and cut costs. The course is rated highly by participants whose feedback is seriously taken into account to make future courses more useful and relevant. A suggestion being considered from the Aleppo BOP is to create either a password-protected website or a blog where participants could continue to exchange views and access BOP course materials. In closing, Andrew thanked Bryan Harvey for his participation in the Aleppo BOP and, through Jo Hernandez, the CGIAR Secretariat for enabling her to assist with the course.

Main points/ suggestions made at the discussion following Andrew's report include:

- Market the BOP aggressively: announce the course dates very early, and advertise the course more widely by also offering it to Challenge Program Executive Boards and Deputy Directors General, in addition to its current target audience (Trustees, Directors General, Board Secretaries and Donors)
- It was suggested that the WG look into packaging the BOP to sell as a course as there seems to be a market for it
- It was suggested that the BOP, given the acutely felt need for greater financial literacy on Center Boards, look into presenting its finance module as a travelling road show where a relevant person might attend a Center's Board meeting if there was a demand for special attention or if many of the Trustees were new and felt an urgent need for finance orientation
- BOP participants report back to their Boards that the course is very useful, enabling them to contribute better and sooner to the work of their Boards
- BOP participants also value highly the opportunity to network with other Trustees – forming a buddy system – and to share information on how other Boards operate. This networking also sets the stage for and fosters cooperation among Centers
- ICRISAT has used BOP participation as an incentive for Trustees to take the course early in their term by making it a prerequisite for eligibility to head a Center Board Committee

Decision/ Action:

- i. The BOP WG was requested to continue the excellent work and that, even with the implementation of the CMP, the WG should continue to handle the BOP and not hand it over to the Consortium Board.
 - ii. The BOP WG plans to offer only one course in 2009 to cut costs; however, given the likelihood that another course may be needed in the context of the reform process currently underway, provision is being made in the budget for a second course.
- c. GRPC Working Group Focal Point Tony Gregson reported that the System-wide Policy on Intellectual Assets was to be considered for endorsement by the Alliance Executive at this meeting, for subsequent adoption by Center Boards. The written report provided on the activities of the WG was tabled and considered read.

AI4. DG Remuneration and Evaluation

DG Remuneration

The 2008 DG Remuneration Survey Report was discussed briefly. It was noted that the Survey is for information only and Center Boards independently decide DG compensation policies, even in the context of the CMP.

It was recalled that the AB agreed at the 2007 Beijing Meeting that the survey on DG remuneration would be conducted annually by AIARC using the format redesigned in 2007 by Bioversity which facilitates comparison of Centers' compensation packages.

Appreciation was expressed for the Survey, with a reminder that the figures need to be seen in the context of a DG's specific circumstances.

Decision/ Action: In subsequent surveys, a column reflecting the DG's number of years of service will be added to better put the salary information in context.

Director General Performance Evaluation

A survey of evaluation systems used to assess Director General (DG) performance is underway as requested by the CIMMYT Board Chair.

It was noted that a sample performance evaluation of Directors General and Center Boards are available from the CGIAR-approved Guidelines on Center Governance, updated in 2007.

It was also noted that some Center Boards periodically conduct a 360° evaluation of DGs. Chairs using the 360° exercise find it extremely valuable and illuminating as it provides a report on feedback provided anonymously by direct reports, staff, partners, donors, etc. It is also highly cost effective, and requires minimal input from the DG.

Decision/ Action: Centers' DG performance evaluation systems will be compiled for the AB's 2009 Spring Meeting.

AI5. AB 2009 Budget

Decision/ Action: A revised 2009 budget expenditure level of \$133,000 (see Annex 3) was subsequently approved virtually on 11 January 2009, after clarification was provided that the surplus of \$107,284 from 2007 and prior years (erroneously presented in the original budget proposal as a liability) had actually been returned to the Alliance Reserve.

The revised 2009 budget includes provision for a second BOP and the return to the Alliance Reserve of \$11,040 in *estimated* carryover funds from the 2008 AB budget.

(NB This accounting adjustment was made at the request of the Alliance Office, in compliance with a prior Alliance decision to return surplus funds to the Alliance Reserve; it did not change the 2009 expenditure budget level).

A16. Performance Measurement System

This agenda item was taken up under A13, Committee/ Working Group Reports.

A17. Issues Arising from Alliance Meetings

Since issues arising from the previous day's Alliance Meeting all concerned the CMP, this agenda item was incorporated into A18, Change Management.

A18. Change Management

With the draft terms of reference of the Consortium Board, originally for discussion under this agenda item, having been discussed at the previous day's Joint Meeting, it was agreed to use the time to discuss other CMP issues of particular concern to the Boards and especially where the Boards' views may differ from those of the Directors General.

Among the key points made during the discussion were:

- o The business of the Consortium needs first to be defined before a Constitution can be written
- o It is critically important that Center Boards have the opportunity to review and comment on the Consortium Constitution before it becomes a *fait accompli*, particularly in regard to Host Country Agreements
- o The final stages of negotiating and signing the Consortium Constitution must be done at a face-to-face meeting
- o The distinct roles of the Consortium Board and Center Boards need to be defined clearly and how these are to be discharged
- o The Consortium Board is accountable to the Centers as its shareholders
- o It is critically important, as the transition phase moves forward, to ensure that the Board's perspective is adequately represented (eg, when the Alliance makes nominations for the Consortium Board Selection Committee) since this could sometimes differ from Management's perspective
- o Some Center Board responsibilities concerning the Consortium are to: ensure the Consortium Constitution is respected, hire and fire the Consortium Board, ensure the Consortium Board performs within the limits of the Constitution by putting in place adequate checks and balances, ensure the Consortium Board has all the necessary powers to discharge its duties
- o It is important to ensure that activities that fall outside the mandate of the Consortium (eg, inter-Center business) is managed appropriately
- o Some continuing responsibilities of Center Boards are to: hire and fire the Director General, decide DG remuneration, decide Center board size
- o It is essential that Board Chairs continue to meet and share information on collective issues and concerns even after the Alliance is dissolved
- o Funds to defray the cost of the transition phase must be obtained
- o The case needs to be made that the level of general funding needs to be stabilized and core funding provided at 50% to enable Centers to effectively address poverty alleviation through agricultural research
- o What are the funding prospects in the short, medium and long term? Are Centers better off in competition for scarce funds with the reform or with the status quo?
- o With the reform process, would unrestricted funds all go to the Fund?
- o What would the Consortium's provision of common services entail? How would services be provided, and at what cost? The role of the Consortium in providing

- o common services and the skills needed to provide them needs to be identified, with the option of outsourcing being considered as a possible alternative
- o A uniform System-wide approach to cost recovery needs to be established
- o The current benchmark on Center reserves needs to be adjusted to a realistic level, taking into account the recommendation of the Independent Review and the PMS Workshop
- o A mechanism that alerts the System to a potential financial crisis needs to be put in place
- o To facilitate decision-making on problematic issues, a set of key principles needs to be agreed by all
- o There is an urgent need for a roadmap to “get from the seashore to the island” and a blueprint for our “dream house”
- o The proposals for change raise complex legal issues for many Centers in relation to which funding would need to be provided for legal advice

Decision/ Action:

- i. Following a rich discussion, the AB agreed to table its list of prioritized concerns with the CMP (see *Annex 4*) at the Joint Meeting to help formulate a concrete and detailed action plan on next steps. It was agreed to engage fully in the reform process.
- ii. The AB would meet briefly after the Joint Meeting to allocate responsibilities in moving the transition process forward.

A19. AB 2009 Committees

The AB met briefly to discuss this agenda item after the conclusion of the Joint Meeting when it was anticipated there would be greater clarity on the Alliance position on the CMP.

Main discussion points include:

- o The Alliance needs to appoint a fulltime Transition Manager (TM) to manage the transition process from the Consortium side
- o The TM should have adequate knowledge of the CGIAR, understand the CGIAR vision, enjoy the trust and confidence of the Board Chairs and Directors General, and possess reasonably good interpersonal skills and strong analytical and critical capacity in relation to effective corporate management
- o It is critical to decide early who the TM should report to
- o The TM should update the Alliance weekly with a consolidated message
- o It was noted that the TM does not take away from the Alliance Office; as a consultant, the engagement would terminate upon completion of the contracted task

Decision/ Action: The AB set up its Change Management Task Force composed of Guido Gryseels, Andrew Bennett, and Julio Berdegue; they would be supported by other AB members depending on the expertise required by the issue(s) under consideration. The AB-appointed task force would join with the AE task force to comprise the Alliance Task Force to oversee, facilitate and inspire the Consortium side of the transition process.

AI10. Other Business/ Closing Session

a. Relationship of Center Boards and Challenge Program (CP) Boards

Andrew introduced the item briefly saying that as the CPs have grown in scale over the years they have set up executive boards empowered to make decisions and take on risks and liabilities. These CP Boards are not legally constituted, however, and the liabilities fall to the hosting Center's board. The two main issues arising from this situation are:

- o How should boards address the issue of overlapping responsibilities of CP Boards and Center Boards?
- o What is the future of CPs in the context of the CMP (which appear to have been left out of the reform process for the most part)?

Key discussion points:

- o It was noted that the substantive issue for the CMP is that the CPs, for all practical purposes, have become distinct organizations albeit without legal status
- o If CPs were used as models for mega-programs, the issue of mixed governance would have to be addressed
- o It was noted that if CPs were to serve as models for mega-programs, there could be 20 mega-programs that could become organizations in their own right, regardless of their legal status
- o It was suggested that another possible model for mega-programs is the typical Gates Foundation project: contract-based, extremely well defined, multimillion, multiyear, multi-partner, science-based, development-oriented with clear products and outcomes
- o It was suggested that a proposal be made to channel the CP monies into the Fund

Decision/ Action: Members will keep the above points in mind so as to make the appropriate interventions at the Joint Meeting.

b. Closing Session

The Chair thanked everyone for their active participation and thoughtful contributions to a highly productive meeting that covered a lot of ground and, in particular, Andrew for representing the AB extremely well during the year. He also thanked Jo Hernandez for the meeting documentation and arrangements. He wished all a safe journey home and declared the Meeting closed¹.

On behalf of the AB, Bryan Harvey expressed thanks to Guido and Andrew for their extraordinary efforts in 2008 in representing the Alliance Board.

* * *

¹At the closing session of the Alliance Joint Meeting, the Chair thanked retiring Board Chairs Stein Bie, Ruth Egger, and Nobumasa Hatcho for their dedicated and invaluable contributions to the Alliance Board, presented each a token of appreciation, bid them farewell, and wished them the best with their future endeavors.

Agenda Item #	Agenda Item	Decision/Action	Status
1.b.	Agenda Adoption	The Revised Provisional Agenda was adopted, with the addition of one item under <i>Other Business</i> , Center Board's relationship with Challenge Programs.	<i>For information</i>
1.c.	Tervuren Meeting Summary Record	The Draft Summary Record of the May 2008 Tervuren Meeting, approved virtually on 25 June 2008, was confirmed.	<i>For information</i>
1.d.	Matters Arising from the Summary Record	The AB will undertake a Board Compensation Survey for the 2010 Spring Meeting.	<i>Pending</i>
2.	Chair's Report	<p><i>Meeting on Harvey Report:</i> AB Chair will seek clarification on necessity of CCERs.</p> <p><i>Update to ExCo 15 on Stripe Review recommendations</i></p> <p><i>Report on ExCo 15</i></p>	<p><i>For action</i></p> <p><i>For information</i></p> <p><i>For information</i></p>
3.	Report of Committees/ Working Groups	<p>a. <i>Board Nominees Committee</i></p> <p>b. <i>Performance Measurement</i></p> <p>c. <i>Systems Committee</i></p> <p>d. <i>Board Orientation Working Group:</i> One course will be offered in 2009, with budget provision made for a possible second course.</p> <p>e. <i>GRPC WG:</i> The System-wide policy on intellectual assets was to be considered for endorsement by the AE at this meeting, for subsequent adoption by Center Boards.</p>	<p><i>For information</i></p> <p><i>For information</i></p> <p><i>For information</i></p> <p><i>For information</i></p> <p><i>For information</i></p>
4.	DG Remuneration and Evaluation	<p><i>DG Remuneration:</i> Information on DG's number of years of service will be added to subsequent surveys.</p> <p><i>DG Performance Evaluation:</i> A summary of Centers' DG performance evaluation systems will be prepared for the 2009 Spring Meeting</p>	<p><i>For action in 2009</i></p> <p><i>In progress</i></p>

5.	AB 2009 Budget	A revised 2009 budget of \$133,000 was approved electronically on 11 December 2008.	<i>For information</i>
6.	Performance Measurement System	This agenda item was taken up under Committee Reports, AI3.	-----
7.	Issues Arising from Alliance Meetings	This agenda item was incorporated into AI8, Change Management.	-----
8.	Change Management	The AB will table its list of concerns at the following AB-AE Meeting to help formulate a concrete and detailed action plan on next steps. It was agreed to engage fully in the reform process.	<i>Completed</i>
9.	AB 2009 Committees	An AB Change Management Task Force was set up to oversee, facilitate and inspire the Consortium side of the transition process. TF members Gryseels, Bennett and Berdégue will be supported by AB Members depending on expertise required.	<i>Completed</i>
10.	Any Other Business	<i>Relationship of Center Boards to CP Boards:</i> Members to keep discussion points in mind at the Joint Meeting for appropriate interventions.	<i>Completed</i>

ATTENDANCE

<i>Africa Rice Center</i>	Getachew Engida
<i>Bioversity International</i>	Tony Gregson
<i>CIAT</i>	Gordon MacNeil
<i>CIFOR</i>	Andrew Bennett
<i>CIMMYT</i>	Julio Berdégue
<i>CIP</i>	Ruth Egger
<i>ICARDA</i>	Guido Gryseels
<i>ICRISAT</i>	Stein Bie
<i>IFPRI</i>	Gunnar Sorbo, representing Ross Garnaut
<i>IITA</i>	Bryan Harvey
<i>ILRI</i>	Uwe Werblow
<i>IRRI</i>	Elizabeth Woods
<i>IWMI</i>	Nobumasa Hatcho
<i>World Agroforestry Center</i>	Lynn Haight
<i>WorldFish Center</i>	Remo Gautschi
AB Executive Secretary	Jo Hernandez

Apologies

<i>IFPRI</i>	Ross Garnaut
--------------	--------------



Alliance Board Meeting
 Meeting Room 1
 Joachim Chissano International Conference Center
 Maputo, Mozambique
 Saturday, 29 November 2008, 08:30am – 12:30pm

REVISED PROVISIONAL AGENDA

- | | | |
|---------------|---|----------|
| 08:30 - 08.45 | 1. Opening Session | |
| | 1.a. Welcome and Introductions | |
| | 1.b. Adoption of Agenda | |
| | 1.c. Adoption of Tervuren Meeting Summary Record | |
| | 1.d. Review of Decisions and Actions/ Matters Arising | |
| 08:45 – 09:00 | 2. Chair's Report | |
| 09:00 - 09:15 | 3. Report of Committees/ Working Groups | |
| | 3.a. Board Nominees Committee | Gryseels |
| | 3.b. Performance Measurement Committee | Haight |
| | 3.c. Systems Committee | Gryseels |
| | 3.d. Board Orientation WG | Bennett |
| | 3.e. GRPC WG | Gregson |
| 09.15 - 09.30 | 4. DG Remuneration and Evaluation | |
| 09:30 - 09:35 | 5. 2009 Budget | |
| 09:35 - 10.05 | 6. Performance Measurement System | |
| 10:05 – 10:20 | <i>Coffee/ Tea Break</i> | |
| 10:20 – 10:35 | 7. Issues Arising from Alliance Meetings | |
| 10:35 – 12:05 | 8. Change Management | |
| 12:05 – 12:20 | 9. AB 2009 Committees | |
| 12:20 – 12:30 | 10. Other business/ Closing Session | |
| | Relationship of Center Boards with CP Boards | |

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

WWW.CGIAR.ORG

2009 PROPOSED ALLIANCE BOARD BUDGET (Revised)
Income and Expenditure Account
in US dollars

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
ALLIANCE BOARD ACCOUNT		
Sources		
Carry-over from prior year(s)	0 ¹	11,040
Centers' contribution	<u>95,000</u>	<u>121,960</u>
Total	<u>95,000</u>	<u>133,000</u>
Budgeted Expenses		
ExCo (2 meetings/year)		
May		
Travel	5,000	6,250 ²
Honoraria @ \$350 x 3days	1,050	1,050
Per diem @ \$250 x 3 days	750	750
October		
Travel	5,000	6,250 ²
Honoraria @ \$350 x 3days	1,050	1,050
Per diem @ \$250 x 3 days	750	750
Committee/WG Participation		
GRPC - Feb		
Travel	5,000	6,250 ²
Honoraria @ \$350 x 3days	1,050	1,050
Per Diem @ \$350 x 3days	750	750
GRPC - Sep		
Travel	5,000	6,250 ²
Honoraria @ \$350 x 3days	1,050	1,050
Per Diem @ \$350 x 3days	750	750
SC Participation (2 meetings/yr)		
SC - May		
Travel	5,000	6,250 ²
Honoraria @ \$350 x 3days	1,050	1,050
Per Diem @ \$350 x 3days	750	750
SC - Sep		
Travel	5,000	6,250 ²
Honoraria @ \$350 x 3days	1,050	1,050
Per Diem @ \$350 x 3days	750	750
Underwriting BOP	11,960	50,000 ³

¹ Surplus of \$107,284 from 2007 and prior years returned to Alliance Reserve

² Increase of 25% due to increased airfares

³ Increase in underwriting BOP due to increased airfares and two BOPs a year

AB Committees/WGs		
Board Nominees	0	0
Performance Measurement	0	0
Systems	0	0
GRPC	0	0
Board Orientation	0	0
Contingency	5,000	5,000
Communication (Chair)	5,000	5,000
Honoraria @ \$350 x 20days (Chair)	7,000	n/a
Honoraria @ \$350 x 30days (Chair)	n/a	10,500 ⁴
AIARC administrative fee	1,200	1,200
Meeting costs (2 x per year)	13,000	13,000
Total	83,960	133,000
Funds to return to Alliance Reserve	11,040	0

⁴ AB decision in 2007 to increase maximum number of honoraria days to 30

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
BOP ACCOUNT ⁵		
Sources		
Carryover from 2007 and prior years	30,620	1,925 ⁶
Fees, BOP participants	50,000	60,000 ⁷
AB contribution	11,960	50,000
Total	92,580	111,925
Budgeted Expenses		
2008 BOP Mexico (actual)	40,655	0
2008 BOP Syria (estimate)	50,000	0
2009 BOP Colombia (estimate)	0	50,000
Second BOP in 2009 (estimate)	0	50,000
Total	90,655	100,000
BOP surplus/ (deficit)	1,925	11,925

⁵ AB decision in 2006 to maintain BOP account separately

⁶ AB decision in 2006 to retain BOP surplus in BOP account

⁷ Assuming 30 participants for two courses @ \$2,000 each

**ALLIANCE BOARD CONCERNS
RE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS**

1. Consortium Charter/Constitution
2. Terms of reference of Consortium Board and CEO/ Managing Director
3. Consortium provision of central services
4. Mega-Programs: What, how managed and governed
5. Monitoring and Evaluation – need for a simpler system
6. Costs of transition and operation of Consortium
7. Relationship between the Consortium and the Fund
8. Partnerships and rights of Partners
9. Strategy and Results Framework
10. Nomination of Consortium Board and Appointment by Centers
11. Nomination of Consortium CEO/ Managing Director
12. Relationship between Consortium, Center and bilateral Donors who do not join the Fund
13. Management and governance roles of the Consortium's side of the CMP (role of the Transition Management Team and need for a full-time Transition Process Manager)
14. Mechanism to allow flexibility while learning and managing as the CMP evolves
15. Windows and Mega-Programs
16. Transition roadmap
17. How the AB organizes to provide input into the Process
18. Challenge Programs and how they fit in the CMP
19. Host-Country Agreement (HCA) supremacy
20. Establishment of the Consortium as a legal entity