

**Joint Meeting of the Alliance Board (AB) and the Alliance
Executive (AE) of the Consultative Group on
International Agricultural Research**

December 2, 2005

**Marrakech, Morocco
AGM05**

*Summary Record
of
Proceedings*

*Prepared for the CBC and the AE
by the
Future Harvest Alliance Office (FHAO)
(a Unit of the CGIAR System Office)*

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Attendance	3
Opening Remarks and Welcome	5
Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up.....	6
Agenda Item 2. Alliance Principles and Procedures (AP&P) and Conflict Resolution.	6
Agenda Item 3. SSA MTPs Programs and Governance	8
Agenda Item 4. CGIAR Debate on funding CGIAR Priorities.	9
Agenda Item 5. FHAO Report and Update.....	10
Agenda Item 6. Stripe Review of Boards.	11
Agenda Item 7. Board Orientation Program Update	12
Agenda Item 8. Management and Governance of SO Units.....	12
Agenda Item 9. Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Reporting.	14
Agenda Item 10. Harmonizing Mission and Vision Statements.....	15
Agenda Item 11. Compensation Study Update.....	15
Agenda Item 12. Program Updates.	16
Agenda Item 12a. Science Council Research Priorities.....	16
Agenda Item 12b. GRPC	16
Agenda Item 13. Other Business	17
Agenda Item 13a. CGIAR Debate on Corporate Entity for the System.	17
Agenda Item 13b. Memorial for Bob Havener.	18
Agenda Item 14. Special Meeting with Science Council Chair and Executive Director .	19
Agenda Item 15. Wrap-Up and Future Meetings.....	21
Annex 1. AB-AE Decisions/Actions Table Marrakech, Morocco	22
Annex 2. ExComs Meeting with the CGIAR Chairman and Director	26
Annex 3. ExComs Meeting with the Senior Vice President and Chief Economist for the World Bank.....	29
Annex 4. Final Agenda Joint Meeting	31

Attendance

<i>CIAT</i>	Jim Jones, Board Chair Yves Savidan, Board Chair (designate) Joachim Voss, Director General
<i>CIFOR</i>	David Kaimowitz, Director General
<i>CIMMYT</i>	Lene Lang, Board Chair Masa Iwanaga, Director General
<i>CIP</i>	Jim Godfrey, Board Chair Pamela Anderson, Director General
<i>ICARDA</i>	Margaret Catley-Carlson, Board Chair Guido Gryseels, Board Chair (designate) Adel El-Beltagy, Director General Mahmoud Solh, Director General (designate)
<i>ICRISAT</i>	Uzo Mokwunye, Board Chair and AB Chair William Dar, Director General and AE Chair
<i>IFPRI</i>	Frances Stewart, Acting Board Chair Joachim von Braun, Director General
<i>IITA</i>	Mortimer Neufville, Board Chair Hartmann, Director General
<i>ILRI</i>	Uwe Werblow, Board Chair Carlos Seré, Director General
<i>IPGRI</i>	Tony Gregson, Board Chair Emile Frison, Director General
<i>IRRI</i>	Keiji Otsuka, Board Chair Robert Zeigler, Director General
<i>IWMI</i>	Remo Gautschi, Board Chair Frank Rijsberman, Director General
<i>Africa Rice Center WARDA</i>	Gaston Grenier, Board Chair Kanayo Nwanze, Director General
<i>World Agroforestry Center</i>	Eugene Terry, Board Chair Dennis Garrity, Director General

WorldFish Center Trond Bjorndal, Board Chair
Stephen Hall, Director General

FHAO Geoff Hawtin, Interim Executive Officer
Kerri Wright Platais, Executive Secretary

AB Executive M. Caryl Jones-Swahn
Secretary

Special Guests (in order of appearance)

Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Science Council Chair
Ruben Echeverria, Executive Director Science Council Secretariat
Ian Johnson, CGIAR Chairman
Francisco Reifschneider, CGIAR Director
Francois Bourguignon, Senior Vice President and Chief Economist for the World Bank

Opening Remarks and Welcome

The Alliance Board Chair, Uzo Mokwunye, welcomed several new Center Chairs to the first joint meeting of the Alliance Board and the Alliance Executive. New members included: Lena Lange (CIMMYT), and several incoming Chairs, Yves Savidan (CIAT), Guido Gryseels (ICARDA), and Brian Harvey (IITA). He also welcomed Frances Stewart (acting Chair, IFPRI). This was the last meeting for the AB Chair, as well as several of his colleagues: Jim Jones (CIAT), Margaret Catley-Carlson (ICARDA), and Remo Gautschi (IWMI).

The AB Chair acknowledged this was the first meeting in 18 months without Meryl Williams, who retired from her position in November. He thanked her for her help in forging what was to become the Alliance during its very critical early period. He welcomed Geoff Hawtin as the Interim EO and thanked Kerri Wright Platais and Caryl Jones-Swahn for their help in preparing for the joint meeting.

Having lost two stalwart members of the Alliance Board in recent months, a moment of silence was held in honor of Bob Havener and John Vercoe, with thanks for their service and the important contribution they made to the CGIAR and the world's poor.

Willie Dar, Chair of the Alliance Executive, welcomed the Director General elect of ICARDA, Mahmoud Solh. He noted it was the last Annual General Meeting as Directors General for Adel El-Beltagy (ICARDA), David Kaimowitz (CIFOR) and Kanayo Nwanze (WARDA). He reiterated 2004 was the year the Alliance was conceptualized, and 2005 was the year it became operational. The challenge before the group was to further enhance the ability of the Centers in their work as an Alliance to better serve the farmers in the developing countries through increased collective action.

The meeting's goals would include:

- Endorsement of the Alliance Principles & Procedures (AP&P) document
- Adoption of the conflict resolution document
- Endorsement of the System Research Priorities, before the group at AGM, and how the new priorities would be implemented by the Centers
- Internalize and endorse the process for developing the two SSA-MTPs
- Discussion of funding the System research priorities (once approved)

He thanked the new Alliance Board for the recent decision to transform itself from the Center Board Chairs (CBC) committee to become the Alliance Board (AB), and looked forward to a productive meeting.

Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up.

The Committees took note of the materials prepared by the FHAO highlighting the information topics and progress made on key decisions taken during the WorldFish meeting held in May, and the subsequent meeting of the joint Executive Committee, in early September at ICRISAT.

Agenda Item 2. Alliance Principles and Procedures (AP&P) and Conflict Resolution.

Agenda Item 2a. AP&P Document.

Jim Jones, Chair of the drafting committee, (which also comprised Emile Frison, Margaret Catley-Carlson and Pamela Anderson, with Meryl Williams as a resource person) indicated that the Alliance Principles and Procedures (AP&P) document had gone through several iterations since last May. The most recent version, sent out on December 1, was for approval. Special thanks went in memory to John Vercoe, who championed the document from the beginning, and to whom the group was indebted for his time and leadership.

The Alliance now needs to a) arrive at a consensus on the AP&P and b) recommend to all Boards that they review and endorse the AP&P.

Emile Frison gave a brief history of the Alliance concept and listed several examples of areas in which the Alliance could make a difference:

- Work on sub-regional and other joint MTPs
- Stronger collective interactions with the private sector, e.g. via SKEP
- More rapid adoption of common policies (e.g. GMOs document)
- Stronger collective input to SC priorities
- Board leadership in the Orientation program

Jim Jones reminded the group that the Alliance now needs mechanisms such as the AP&P to help it succeed. Consensus was important to the ability to move forward and demonstrate that the concept of an Alliance could work. He emphasized that:

- No Center would cede its independence.
- The document has changed from a 'charter' to the AP&P to reflect the intent of not creating a new entity, but rather laying the framework for working collectively.
- The CGIAR Chair and Director who have worked with us throughout the development phase of the AP&P are expected to support the Alliance concept providing there is buy-in from all Centers and consensus that this is the best way forward. Mechanisms must be in place for making binding decisions.
- Through help of the Secretariat, the World Bank legal team had advised on legal issues, and their feedback was incorporated in the final draft.

With regard to the Future Harvest Alliance Office, emphasis was given to not creating a new entity, rather building upon the existing unit. The largest increase financially would be for moving to a full-time Executive Officer. The ExComs decided to change the title of the position to Chief Alliance Officer (CAO).

Discussion.

- Thanks were expressed to the drafting committee, who demonstrated through their efforts the tremendous pay-off possible from working together. This work is critical to moving forward both in governance and programmatically.
- It is important to be clear as to which activities would be carried out collectively, under the purview of the Alliance, and which would not.
- Members wanted to ensure the individual roles of the AB and AE were well defined and differentiated – with implementation separated from governance.
- The difficulty of changing organizational culture was recognized. It will not occur overnight.
- The fear of costs escalating was expressed, with some stating their Boards still need to be convinced that the “Alliance process” was the optimum way ahead. However it was also pointed out that if the Centers did not come together in this way, they risked having alternative solutions forced on them.
- Concern was expressed by some over the possibility of ‘sanctions’ over-riding Centers’ authority. Others pointed out that such sanctions would only apply to collective, not individual Center, action.
- Several Board Chairs said they had discussed the earlier version with their Boards and were ready to approve.
- The AP&P was seen as a safe ‘first step’ but further explanation and promotion with the membership of the CG was needed. Success stories need to be highlighted. The new Alliance newsletter is a useful tool for this.
- Overall, it was considered essential that the Alliance take this move forward. The drafting committee agreed to incorporate comments and get another – final - version to the members soon, to take to their Boards.

Decision.

- *The meeting adopted the Alliance Principles and Procedures document, with a few amendments. The Alliance Board would request that all Center Boards review and endorse the document in 2006.*

Agenda Item 2b. Conflict Resolution Guidelines

Jim Godfrey introduced the paper and said he was indebted to Meryl Williams and John Herbert for their contribution to this process. He invited the AB and AE to discuss the draft, if possible agree upon amendments and to approve the proposed procedures. He added that there is a very high cost to not having a process in place.

Joachim Voss added that in the past, inter-Center agreements had generally been entered into informally and often without the necessary clarity. The first part of the document dealt with avoiding conflict through transparency, and aimed to help in establishing roles and responsibilities prior to entering into collective action agreements. He gave the example of the SSA MTPs where, through greater clarity and transparency, the Alliance should be able to more easily translate plans into concrete action.

Discussion.

- Members thanked all those involved in the drafting and said the document was very well written. It was acknowledged, however, that it would take time to build and internalize the process proposed.
- The move was made to accept the document as it stood, with one minor edit incorporated. The motion was seconded.

Decision.

- *With one amendment, the Conflict Resolution Guidelines were adopted. They will be posted on the CGIAR and Collaboration websites.*

Agenda Item 3. SSA MTPs Programs and Governance

Carlos Seré and Kanayo Nwanze provided an overview of progress on the Medium Term Plans (MTP) for East and Southern Africa (ESA) and West and Central Africa (WCA). For ESA, Howard Elliott had been hired as a consultant to help in the planning. For WCA, Henning Baur began work in July with IITA and WARDA, in concert with CORAF and ASARECA. Both consultants and the Centers are working together closely to ensure coordination between the regions as the programs develop.

Input from stakeholders and partners via expert consultations held in both regions were acknowledged. The ESA consultation identified four priority themes:

- Integrated natural resource management (approach and policies)
- Information for diagnosis of problems and policy formulation and for sharing of methodology and knowledge
- Management of agrobiodiversity: improvement of germplasm
- Post-conflict reconstruction and recovery of national research systems (as a regional and international public good)

The WCA process identified priorities based on the new CGIAR priorities, including:

- Sustaining biodiversity for current and future generations
- Maintaining and enhancing yields and yield potential of food staples
- Increasing income
- Integrated land, water and forest management at landscape level
- Science and technology policies and institutions

Carlos Seré informed the group that ILRI and ICRAF had developed TORs for a management consulting firm to advise on the rationalization of corporate services.

Note: A preliminary budget for 2006 was included in the summary note. In the final 2006 budget adopted by the AE, each MTP will be budgeted at 100K.

Discussion.

- Speakers thanked the organizing Centers for the excellent work and progress.
- Governance issues are very important. Some felt the implementation of the MTPs should be governed by the AB and AE, to ensure the work remained an initiative of the Alliance. There was a general consensus in favor of a Steering Committee rather than a Board and that the governance should be light and inclusive of partners. Further work is needed on governance.
- A broader set of partners should be considered, beyond NARS and SROs, e.g. to include international and local NGOs.
- Programs need to fit with, and build on what currently exists.
- Some concern was expressed about a perceived narrow focus (mostly crop and livestock) and whether this reflected the long-term vision for Africa. Others stressed that it is important not to try to be “all things to all people”, but to identify early on where the MTPs would focus.
- Some felt the budget for the proposed management consultancy was high and suggested that the IWMI-WorldFish arrangements for sharing corporate services could be looked at as a possible model.

Decision.

- *Every effort should be made to maintain the timeline for developing the MTPs, i.e. they should be completed and forwarded to the Science Council in June, 2006.*

Agenda Item 4. CGIAR Debate on funding CGIAR Priorities.

The AE Chair reminded the group that a CGIAR Task Force, headed by Finn Christiansen of Denmark, was established during AGM04 to review possible methods of funding the new CGIAR Priorities, once approved at AGM05, as well as funding the SC and SC Secretariat. He raised the question of whether or not a Centers' position was needed on the proposals. A number of questions remain, e.g.:

- What criteria would guide allocations and what is their relative weighting?
- How will funds be distributed in the best interests of the poor?
- Who will be responsible for distribution between Centers and priorities?
- How will long-term research be funded, and necessary staff and infrastructure supported?

Discussion.

- The success of the System depends on the willingness of donors to move towards less restrictions on funding.
- Care must be taken that the matrix approach not be too top down and donor driven. It is critical that donors have confidence in the SC regarding priorities.
- The matrix, funded at the level of priorities, would provide a form of core but restricted to certain activities. However, some felt that without an effective distribution mechanism, the matrix approach would not work.
- Any new fund allocation processes agreed upon should be transparent and the changes should only come with the knowledge and cooperation of the Alliance.

Decision.

- *It was agreed that this was a very important topic. A Task Force was formed (Joachim Voss, Dennis Garrity, Margaret Catley-Carlson, Gaston Grenier, and Steve Hall) to prepare a statement on funding system priorities for the AB/AE Chairs for the CGIAR Business Meeting – as well as one addressing the issue of where the CGIAR sits within the R&D continuum. The Task Force would continue to give this issue attention after AGM05, operating as a Joint AB/AE Task Force.*

Agenda Item 5. FHAO Report and Update.

Geoff Hawtin drew attention to the draft first Annual Report for the FHAO, produced by Meryl Williams and Kerri Wright Platais, covering the last 18 months. He requested feedback and suggestions for changes before the end of 2005. The content of the report reflected the very considerable amount of work done in a relatively short time. The FHAO currently comprises two part-time staffers - a situation that is clearly not sustainable if this level of work is to be maintained.

The AB Chair thanked the FHAO for their work and asked that all members read the report and provide feedback prior to its release.

Executive Officer (Chief Alliance Officer) Update

The AE Chair reported that the selection process had been delayed slightly. Geoff Hawtin, in his interim capacity as Executive Officer, will work with the head of Human Resources at IPGRI to help coordinate the interviews process. He will also follow-up with IFAD to ensure the space allocated earlier in Rome was still available for the Alliance office.

Interviews will be held on February 3, 2006 at IPGRI in Rome by a Selection Panel comprising: Remo Gautschi, Keijiro Otsuka, Willie Dar (later replaced by Emile Frison), Joachim Voss (Panel Chair), Francisco Reifschneider and Rodney Cooke. The intention is for the Chief Alliance Officer to take up his/her duties no later than May 1, 2006.

Discussion.

- Although the FHAO will continue as a unit of the System Office, the Chief Alliance Officer should report solely to the Chair of the Alliance Executive.
- Requests were made that the nomination for the top candidate be circulated to the DGs for a final 2/3 majority vote for approval.

Decisions.

- *The 2004/05 FHAO Annual Report would be published in January 2006. AB/AE members should send their comments to the Secretariat by the end of December 2005.*
- *Interviews for the ED (to be called the Chief Alliance Officer, CAO) would be held at IPGRI in Rome on 3 February, 2006. The final candidate's name and c.v. would be submitted to the AE, and would require a 2/3 vote for approval.*

Agenda Item 6. Stripe Review of Boards.

The AB Chair reminded the group that at its meeting in Mexico City in 2004, the then CBC decided to work with the CGIAR Secretariat to set up a panel to review governance of Center Boards.

The panel's work was underway and included the following members:

- Mr. Sam Paul (India) Chair of the panel and expert in governance
- Mr. Paul Egger (Switzerland) Expert knowledge of the CGIAR
- Ms. Lili-Ann Foster (Canada) Expert on fiduciary/governance issues

The panel met in Washington, D.C. on September 26th, and held meetings with the AB Chair and Francisco Reifschneider. The ToR were already made available to the AB and AE and have been made available to the Members through the ExCo. The AB Chair requested that members take the time to speak with the members of the Panel during the week.

The remaining review process will include:

- Submission of the Review Report to the AB and CGIAR Secretariat by February 15, 2006. The AB will prepare and its commentary on the report.
- The review report with AB commentary would be shared with ExCo for discussion at the May meeting.
- Review report with AB's written commentary and ExCo's recommendations would be forwarded to the CGIAR for discussion at the AGM06 Business Meeting.

Agenda Item 7. Board Orientation Program Update

Jim Godfrey, serving as the new ‘Dean of Faculty’ for the Board Orientation program gave a brief update and reported that 30 people would be attending the next orientation course in the week following AGM.

He posed several questions to the group:

- Should we continue with the program? The answer was yes.
- Was the duration and content correct? Yes, providing participants have background information before arrival.
- Was one course a year sufficient? Yes
- The courses had been funded to date half by the Centers and half by the CGIAR Secretariat. Should this change or continue? He mentioned the Secretariat was interested in charging for the course. It was hoped that the Secretariat would continue to co-fund.
- Should participation be extended to donors? This was seen as a good idea, as many of the issues were similar for new donors and Board members.
- New faculty members were needed, as several (Uzo Mokwunye, Eugene Terry, and Alex McCalla) had either retired or would soon be retiring from their role as Board Chairs.
- The suggestion was made to put together a booklet (summary of the program, case studies, course evaluation) on the web.

Decision.

- *It was agreed that the Board Orientation Program should continue to offer one three-day course per year. The course content was considered appropriate as was the duration (3 days). In future, individual Centers, in addition to sponsoring their candidates, would cover half the cost of implementing the program, and a request would be made to the CGIAR Secretariat to continue paying the other half.*

Agenda Item 8. Management and Governance of SO Units.

Kanayo Nwanze, Chair of the AE System Office Liaison and Coordination Sub-Committee, reported on a meeting of the Sub-Committee with Program and Unit Heads of the SO Units and Marketing Group, held earlier in the week. The meeting discussed ways in which oversight, governance, strategic guidance and performance management could be improved. Problems created by the different governance mechanisms of the various SO units were discussed. In some cases the establishment of the SO had left the situation confused. Alternatives were discussed as was the role of the CG Director in governance of jointly funded SO units.

Performance management of these units has generally been the responsibility (at least in part) of the DG of the host Center and, when appropriate, the Chair of the Unit’s

Advisory Group. Management of the units was based in part on the goals set in each unit's work plans. Questions were raised as to how well these documents represented the work of the unit and provided a means for monitoring performance? How could the AE better ensure that inputs from clients were taken into account in the evaluation process?

To assist the Alliance Sub-Committee contribute to and improve oversight, the suggestion was made to develop a brief report on how the various Units were organized. The FHAO was asked to compile this information for the Sub-Committee, which would be chaired by Willie Dar in 2006.

In addition, Kanayo Nwanze reported the SO Units would not report to the Alliance Deputy Executive next year with their budget requests, but rather to the AE Sub-Committee, as a means of strengthening the AE's oversight of the SO units.

Discussion.

- Members asked for clarification as to who made up the System Office Steering Committee. This is the general oversight body for the entire SO and consists of the CG Director, Chair of SC and the past year's AE Chair. The three-member group meets once per year, with additional electronic meetings as necessary. It provides oversight and has ultimate responsibility for the office. In addition, it was proposed that AE Sub-Committee would, together with the CGIAR Director, take a more proactive role for day-to-day oversight.
- In general, members welcomed the idea of a more pro-active oversight group for the SO Units, on behalf of the Alliance, and said that existing tools should be used (such as the IOP) to help clarify the various roles and oversight needs.

Decisions.

During a separate meeting of the AE Sub-Committee for SO Liaison and Oversight the following decisions were taken:

- *The AE Sub-Committee would perform an oversight role providing strategic direction to the SO Units to which they contribute financial support.*
- *The Heads of the SO Units would report to the AE Sub-Committee annually to review the following year's program and budget submissions.*
- *A three year Strategic Plan would be prepared by G&D, CAS-IP, ICT-KM, IAU and FHAO (prepared with the guidance of, and inputs from each Unit's technical advisory group, as appropriate) to be submitted to the Sub-Committee by AGM 06. The exception: The Marketing Group had prepared a three year rolling plan that would be finalized and requested for the April meeting.*
- *The FHAO was asked to provide an inventory of the governance mechanisms, Unit Head's performance evaluations processes, oversight bodies, and summaries of each Units' ToR and funding set up, in relation to the Centers. This information would be made available by the April meetings.*

Agenda Item 9. Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Reporting.

The AE Chair introduced this item, reminding the group that the CGIAR was implementing several key reforms that would greatly affect the Centers' operations. Two documents had been made available prior to the meeting:

- Revised monitoring and evaluation policies that delegate major responsibilities to the Centers and,
- A performance measurement system that has gone through the pilot phase and would be used by the World Bank to make partial allocation decisions.

Both Chairs emphasized the need for the AB and AE to ensure that all Center Boards and management were familiar with the CGIAR requirements. They proposed, for the consideration of the AE and AB:

- *New Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures:* (1) developing a document for Boards and Center staff that highlights the Center responsibilities for evaluation. (2) commission a guide for Centers on conducting CCERs and EPMRs. It was suggested that ILAC might assist this exercise.
- *Annual Performance Assessments:* (1) establish a working party or contract a consultant to identify Centers and/or areas where performance appears to be lower than expected and help develop either a program of remediation with the Center or a program to better project the Center's performance; (2) propose that the SC and CG Secretariat analyze current indicators with a view to improving them and enabling them to be tailored to the work of individual Centers.

Discussion.

- Performance indicators will be changed for the coming year to include a statement of the three most important Board actions taken to improve its effectiveness and how this had improved performance.
- It is important to ensure that the financial indicators do not penalize Centers with diverse funding portfolios.
- Some speakers felt more feedback from the Secretariat on how they had interpreted, weighted and used the indicators would be helpful to enhance the learning process.
- The Internal Audit Unit had provided the Centers with feedback, which helped to level the playing field.
- Overall the system of performance measurement was considered good, with the Centers wanting to engage as partners to improve it further. The Chairs reminded the group that the US\$ 50 million dollars from the Bank had been largely secured because this system was in place.

Decisions.

- *The Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance Measurement systems need to continue to evolve to be ever more useful to the Centers. The AB/AE/ADE Task*

Force should continue to engage with the CGIAR Secretariat and Science Council on these.

Agenda Item 10. Harmonizing Mission and Vision Statements.

Joachim von Braun introduced this item, noting the following materials had been provided by IFPRI prior to the meeting:

1. A summary of the vision and strategy for the CGIAR system
2. Items from the CGIAR charter on the topic and
3. A comparative summary of key aspects of each Center's mission and vision wherever available on Center web sites.

He said it was difficult to use Center visions statements as a basis for identifying potential partners. He asked that each Center ensure its vision statement was correctly stated on its web site. He raised the following questions: 1) How coherent are the strategies across Centers? 2) Do the new Research Priorities suggest we should revisit the CGIAR mission and vision - as well as the Centers' individual statements? 3) Should the CGIAR's central focus continue to be on poor people and poverty reduction, or should it be expanded to include creating value and increasing incomes?

He suggested the Centers update their own statements, and that they eventually be held in a central location. The FHAO was asked to help keep the database updated, once compiled.

Decision.

- *It was agreed the Centers would send any amendments needed to the table provided in attachment 3 to the Agenda Item Summary Note ('Future Harvest Centers Strategies and Visions') to Stacy Roberts of IFPRI. Centers should also review their vision and mission statements in light of the overarching CG System statements. Once finalized, the FHAO would post the collection on the Collaboration site and update as necessary.*

Agenda Item 11. Compensation Study Update.

Uwe Werblow, who serves as the AB representative to the Compensation Study currently underway for the CGIAR, presented an overview of the report from the September meeting of the Steering Group in Washington, D.C. and his synopsis from the ExCo9 discussions. He said there was an obvious need to harmonize employment regulations for Centers based in the same locations, and the general principles for benefit packages across all Centers. He suggested follow-up to the study be done in conjunction with AIARC, to avoid any duplication of effort.

The full Compensation Study will be presented to the AGM05 Business Meeting by Sandra Lawrence, the lead consultant for the study. Ms. Lawrence will join the faculty for the Board Orientation course following AGM.

Discussion.

- Questions were raised regarding the overall cost of the Compensation Study, what the added value would be, and whether or not a Phase IV would be needed.
- It was indicated that the study was initiated to address donors' perceptions that the compensation packages were over inflated and not properly coordinated. The study showed that while salaries are mostly in line with the main comparator organizations, there is a need for harmonization in specific localities. The next step might include looking into the possibility of preparing elements for a forward-looking HR policy for the System as a whole.

Agenda Item 12. Program Updates.

Agenda Item 12a. Science Council Research Priorities

The AE Chair said that the Alliance must be prepared to take an active role in the debate on CGIAR Priorities and Strategies at AGM05. Following the debate to be held during the Business Meeting, the AE should determine its plans for implementation, which would commence in 2006.

He said that the statement drafted for ExCo 9 by the AB and AE on Funding Research Priorities would continue to be very important, as it continued to draw attention to the broader definition of public goods. He emphasized the need to continue to work with the SC as partners, and said the work of the two groups together would ultimately strengthen the position of the Alliance.

Decision.

- *The position of the AB/AE would be communicated to Stakeholder and Business Meetings concerning research for development. Other issues for discussion with the Science Council and at the Business Meeting include broadening the definition of International Public Goods, the performance management system, and how to improve the guidelines for preparing MTPs.*

Agenda Item 12b. GRPC

Tony Gregsen said the minutes of the last meeting of the GRPC held at IPGRI (August 29-31) had been circulated, and he hoped many of the Centers had posted the key decisions on their websites, in follow-up to the decisions taken at WorldFish in May. He provided an overview of where the Centers stood with respect to the draft agreements with the governing body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), which is expected to replace the in-trust agreements with FAO following the first meeting of the Governing Body next June.

He said a few outstanding issues remained with respect to the draft standard material transfer agreements. He asked the Centers to review Appendices 3A and 3B in

the materials distributed electronically prior to the meeting, to ensure they agreed with the revised versions of the generic templates for an IPR policy statement and a standard copyright notice for publications (this was in response to a request from the Centers to make these statements more uniform).

Regarding ethics in agricultural research, he said that private sector collaboration was covered in the revised generic IPR policy statement and modifications suggested to the CGIAR statement on Ethical Principles concerning the use of Traditional Knowledge, had been sent to the ExCo and AGM for adoption.

Emile Frison added that the Boards of seven Centers with PGRFA collections had authorized their DGs to sign the agreement with the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA. It was important that the other four Centers do likewise before June, 2006. If any Center had questions, he asked that they contact him.

The AB and AE were asked to agree on mandating the SGRP to convene a meeting of experts to look into the implementation of the recommendations of GRPC regarding GMO's in collections.

Discussion

- The question was raised as to whether the Centers had any language that could be used with respect to IP on traditional knowledge. The current ethical principles adopted by the Centers in 1998 did not address this issue.
- A question was asked concerning the extent to which acquisition and distribution of PGRFA had declined in recent years and what was driving this. It was pointed out that this was very crop dependent, as different collections had reached different stages of completeness.
- Thanks were extended to IPGRI for representing all the Centers so well in these complex and politically difficult issues.

Decision

- *It was agreed that the SGRP would convene a meeting of experts to look into the implementation of the recommendations of GRPC regarding GMOs in collections.*

Agenda Item 13. Other Business

Agenda Item 13a. CGIAR Debate on Corporate Entity for the System.

The AE Chair said that the restructuring options presented in the Sub-Saharan Task Force recommendations were still under discussion and might be raised during the Business Meeting. The options were distributed in the meeting materials for reference, and included two categories:

- Soft structural alignment: building new structures for program planning and management in SSA, while leaving the 15 Centers intact, and

- Deep-seated structural alignment: a restructuring of the 15 Center System to address the concerns identified for SSA, with possible implications for the CGIAR operations globally.

Discussion.

- Several speakers said there could be serious negative consequences for the System if it was decided to tackle other regions in the same way as for Africa. Reform of the System needed to be looked at as a whole. The Centers were concerned that there not be a “one size fits all” approach.
- There was general agreement that if the topic of restructuring is raised at AGM there should be a strong statement indicating that the Centers were *not* in agreement with the corporate structure option.

Decision.

- *AB/AE does not agree with the idea of a single Corporate Entity for the CGIAR system.*
- *Carlos Seré would work to prepare a statement on the Global Entity for ESA to be used, if appropriate, at the Business Meeting.*

Agenda Item 13b. Memorial for Bob Havener.

Masa Iwanaga and Adel El-Beltagy presented a proposal to institute a special lecture series in memory of Bob Havener, to be hosted on a rotational basis by the Centers he had served during his more than three decades of service to the CGIAR.

ICARDA offered to host the first Robert D. Havener Memorial Lecture, in 2006, with CIMMYT taking leadership for 2007, IRRI for 2008, CIAT for 2009, etc. The selection of the guest lecturer would be carried out by the Alliance through a small sub-committee.

Discussion.

- The AB and AE were in favor of the idea. Discussion focused on whether the lecture should take place on an annual or biennial basis, and how to best link the lecture with other events of the Alliance or CGIAR, to help facilitate full participation. The request was made to keep costs to a realistic minimum.
- The suggestion was made to highlight the work of young, up-and-coming scientists, since Bob had always served as their champion.
- Adel, Masa and Bob Ziegler volunteered to form a committee to begin the planning and selection process for speakers.

Decision.

- *The AB/AE endorsed the idea of a memorial lecture series. Masa Iwanaga (Chair), Adel El-Beltagy and Bob Zeigler would form a Task Force to develop a more detailed plan, taking into account the comments made.*

Agenda Item 13c. AGM05

A brief overview was given of the upcoming events for Centers and Members Day, with the focus on cross-center contributions. The suggestion was made to discuss earlier in the year how the Centers could become more effective in creating the program around a small number of key goals and messages that they wished to share.

Decision.

- *It was agreed to begin planning for Centers and Members Day further in advance for AGM06 (i.e. starting at the April meeting), with greater attention to be paid to the role of the Members.*

Agenda Item 14. Special Meeting with Science Council Chair and Executive Director

Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Science Council (SC) Chair and Ruben Echeverria, Executive Director of the SC joined the Alliance leadership for a one hour meeting. The AB Chair welcomed the two, emphasizing the need for true partnership between the Centers and the Science Council and adding that there was a need to find more opportunities to meet together to ensure the partnership was nurtured.

Per Pinstrup-Andersen agreed and said there was a mutual interest in working together, which did not always mean there would be total agreement, and congratulated the Centers on the establishment of the Alliance.

Item 1. Implementation strategies of the new CGIAR Research Priorities.

The SC representatives said they were ready and prepared to begin implementing the new System Priorities once they were approved at AGM. Per expected that the implementation process would be overseen by a multi-stakeholder task force, preferably one with representatives from the Alliance, donors, and regional organizations, with support from the SC. The process would include:

- Establish a small working group;
- Working with the Centers to develop MTPs along the new priority lines;
- Identifying which output targets fell inside or outside of the new priorities; and
- Looking at the best mechanisms to implement the priorities.

The SC requested the Alliance's thoughts as how to proceed on implementation.

Discussion

- The AE Chair requested the SC Secretariat to provide the guidelines for the MTP 2007/09 as early as possible in 2006, to ensure the Centers would be able to submit their documents in a timely fashion. Ruben Echeverria said that these would be sent to the Centers in early January.
- The Centers requested a calendar of the upcoming SC activities and events in order to engage and plan accordingly. Per and Ruben agreed to this.
- The research to development continuum was discussed as an area for continued dialogue. There was a need to look at plausible impact pathways. Per agreed and said there was a need to discuss where on this continuum the CGIAR should be as a system. The SC thinks in the middle, with close collaboration with development institutions. The SC was created because of concerns that the System was changing its focus from science to development.
- Several Alliance members stressed the importance of the SC being the guardian of both science quality and relevance.
- It was acknowledged that both the SC and the Centers shared the desire to see an increase in the aggregate pool of core unrestricted – or only lightly restricted – funds for the System, in order to give more flexibility to conduct longer-term research.

Item 2. Improve MTP reporting/responses and plans for the SSA regional MTPs

- The SC preferred to have the two commentaries on the MTPs available to the readers and stakeholders (one from SC and one from the Center) to keep the process open and transparent. Only one or two cases of disagreement existed during the past year, and the SC was open to re-examining the differences to see where convergence was possible.
- One AE member said he would like to see the SC's response not become too mechanistic, but rather allow for the richness of continued dialogue.
- The Centers requested that they be granted increased turn-around time when the SC asked for responses to factual errors.
- The regional MTPs are due in June, 2006 along with the other MTPs. The Centers indicated that they were following a 'platform' approach. They also see the SSA CP as a key means of strengthening their work together in the region.

Decision.

- *In a response to a request from the Centers, the SC agreed to aim to send the guidelines for the 2007-9 MTPs by January 7.*
- *The Centers asked for a calendar of upcoming SC activities early in the coming year, so as to be able to better plan for engagements with the SC. The SC will provide this soon after AGM.*
- *The AB and AE Chairs agreed to send their thoughts to the SC Chair and ED on the following items that it had not been possible to cover in the joint meeting:*

1. *Relationships between the SC and the Centers, including past experiences, current Center perspectives, and future relations: What has worked, what is broken and what should we do differently?*
 2. *International Public Goods (IPG)*
 3. *Performance Measurement (PM) and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems.*
- *An invitation was extended to the SC Chair and ED to join the two committees at their next meeting at CIAT in April*

Agenda Item 15. Wrap-Up and Future Meetings.

The AB Chair thanked the group for a productive and excellent meeting. Although the Alliance lived, the challenge before the Centers was to give it room to grow. He thanked ICARDA for their help in serving as host Center, and for assisting in backstopping the meetings. The next time the Alliance met, Joachim Voss and Jim Godfrey would be at the helm. (CIAT, April 26-27, 2006)

The AE Chair closed by thanking the group for what would be considered an historic time for the Alliance. He added two important milestones were accomplished, with the adoption of the AP&P and the conflict resolution process. These would help the Alliance in their continued to work together. He looked forward to the group continuing to make good progress in the year ahead.

Annex 1. AB-AE Decisions/Actions Table Marrakech, Morocco

***Meeting of the Joint AB and AE
Decisions/Actions Table
Morocco, AGM 2005
Version December 6, 2005***

Decision Number	Agenda Item	Subject Matter	Decision/Action
05/AB-AE/Dec/01	AB-AE 2a.	AP&P	<i>The meeting adopted the Alliance Principles and Procedures document, with a few amendments. The Alliance Board will request that all Center Boards now review and endorse the document in 2006.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/02	AB-AE2b.	Conflict Resolution Guidelines	<i>With one amendment, the Conflict Resolution Guidelines were adopted. They will be posted on the CGIAR and Collaboration websites.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/03	AB-AE3	SSA MTPS	<i>Every effort should be made to maintain the timeline for developing the MTPs, i.e. they should be completed and forwarded to the Science Council in June 2006.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/04	AB-AE4	Funding CGIAR System Priorities	<i>It was agreed that this is a very important topic. A Task Force was formed (Joachim Voss, Dennis Garrity, Margaret Catley-Carlson, Gaston Grenier, and Steve Hall) to prepare a statement on funding system priorities for the AB/AE Chairs for the CGIAR Business Meeting – as well as one addressing the issue of where the CGIAR sits within the R&D continuum. The Task Force will continue to give this issue attention after AGM05, operating as a Joint AB/AE Task Force.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/05	AB-AE5	FHAO Report	<i>The 2004/05 FHAO Annual Report will be published in January 2006. AB/AE members should send their comments to the Secretariat by the end of December 2005.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/06	AB-AE5	FHAO ED (CAO) Update	<i>Interviews for the ED (to be called the Chief Alliance Officer, CAO) will be held at IPGRI in Rome on 3 February, 2006.</i>

			<i>The final candidate's name and c.v. will be submitted to the AE, and will require a 2/3 vote for approval.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/07	AB-AE6	Stripe Review of Boards	<i>Information item only.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/08	AB-AE7	Board Orientation Program	<i>It was agreed that the Board Orientation Program should continue to offer one 3-day course per year. The course content is appropriate as is the duration (3 days). In future, individual Centers will, in addition to sponsoring the participants from the Centers, cover half the cost of implementing the Programs and a request will be made to the CGIAR Secretariat to continue paying the other half.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/09	AB-AE8	Management and Governance of SO Units	<i>In a separate meeting of the AE Sub-Committee for SO Liaison and Oversight the following decisions were taken: a) The AE Sub-Committee would perform an oversight role providing strategic direction to the SO Units to which they contribute financial support. b) The Heads of the SO Units would report to the AE Sub-Committee annually to review the following year's program and budget submissions. c) A three year Strategic Plan would be prepared by G&D, CAS-IP, ICT-KM, IAU and FHAO (prepared with the guidance of, and inputs from each Unit's technical advisory group, as appropriate) to be submitted to the Sub-Committee by AGM 06. The exception: The Marketing Group, has prepared a three year rolling plan that will be finalized and requested for the April meeting. d) The FHAO was asked to provide an inventory of the governance mechanisms, Unit Head's performance evaluations processes, oversight bodies, and summaries of each Units' ToR and funding set up, in relation to the Centers. This information will be made available by the April meetings.</i>

05/AB-AE/Dec/10	AB-AE9	Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Reporting	<i>The Monitoring and Evaluation, and Performance Measurement systems need to continue to evolve to be ever more useful to the Centers. The AB/AE/ADE Task Force should continue to engage with the CGIAR Secretariat and Science Council on these.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/11	AB-AE10	Harmonizing Mission and Vision Statements	<i>It was agreed that the Centers would send any amendments needed to the table provided in attachment 3 to the Agenda Item Summary Note ('Future Harvest Centers Strategies and Visions') to Stacy Roberts of IFPRI. Centers should also review their vision and mission statements in light of the overarching CG System statements. Once finalized, the FHAO will post the collection on the Collaboration site and update it as necessary.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/12	AB-AE11	Compensation Study	<i>Information item only.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/13	AB-AE12a.	Science Council Research Priorities	<i>The position of the AB/AE will be communicated to Stakeholder and Business Meetings concerning research for development. Other issues for discussion with the Science Council and at the Business Meeting include broadening the definition of International Public Goods, the performance management system and how to improve the guidelines for preparing MTPs.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/14	AB-AE12b.	GRPC	<i>It was agreed that the SGRP would convene a meeting of experts to look into the implementation of the recommendations of GRPC regarding GMOs in collections.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/15	AB-AE13a.	Debate on Corporate Entity and Global Entity for ESA	<i>a) AB/AE does not agree with the idea of a single Corporate Entity for the CGIAR system. b) Carlos Sere will work to prepare a statement on the Global Entity for ESA to be used, if appropriate, at the Business Meeting.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/16	AB-AE13b.	Memorial for Bob Havener	<i>The AB/AE endorsed the idea of a memorial lecture series. Masa Iwanaga</i>

			<i>(Chair), Adel El-Beltagy and Bob Zeigler will form a Task Force to develop a more detailed plan, taking into account the comments made.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/17	AB-AE13c.	AGM05	<i>It was agreed to begin planning for Centers and Members Day further in advance for AGM06 (i.e. starting at the April meeting), with greater attention to be paid to the role of the Members.</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/17	AB-AE14.	Wrap-Up and Future Meetings	<p><i>Time and place of future meetings:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>April 26/27 2006, CIAT, Colombia.</i> • <i>Nov 30/Dec 1 2006 (in conjunction with AGM 06)</i> • <i>April 18 & 19, 2007 (location to be determined)</i>
05/AB-AE/Dec/18	AB-AE 15.	Special Joint Meeting with the Chair and Executive Director of the Science Council	<p><i>a) In a response to a request from the Centers, the SC agreed to aim to send the guidelines for the 2007-9 MTPs by January 7.</i></p> <p><i>b) The Centers asked for a calendar of upcoming SC activities early in the coming year, so as to be able to better plan for engagements with the SC. The SC will provide this soon after AGM.</i></p> <p><i>The AB and AE Chairs agreed to send their thoughts to the SC Chair and ED on the following items that it had not been possible to cover in the joint meeting:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. relationships between the SC and the Centers, including past experiences, current Center perspectives, and future relations: What has worked, what is broken and what should we do differently?</i> <i>2. International Public Goods (IPG)</i> <i>3. Performance Measurement (PM) and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems.</i> <p><i>An invitation was extended to the SC Chair and ED to join the two committees at their next meeting at CIAT in April</i></p>

Annex 2. ExComs Meeting with the CGIAR Chairman and Director

The ExComs extended their one hour meeting with the CGIAR Chairman and Director to include all members of the Alliance Board (AB) and Alliance Executive (AE) who were able to attend. The meeting took place on Sunday morning, December 4th prior to AGM.

Topics for discussion included:

- Update on the Alliance
- Plans for the transition period following Ian Johnson's departure
- Funding the System's priorities
- Upcoming meetings (CIAT, April 26-27, 2006) and planning for Centers and Members Day, 2006

Update on the Alliance.

The AB Chair, Uzo Mokwunye welcomed Ian Johnson (Chairman) and Francisco Reifschneider (Director), reporting that the Center Board Chairs had transformed into the Alliance Board (AB). In addition, he reported the AB had formed five small task teams to:

1. Explore Models for Closer Programmatic and Structural Cooperation: Messrs/Mms: Werblow, Lange, Terry and Bjorndal
2. Encourage the Development of Strategic Programmatic Collaboration: Messrs/Mms: Gryseels, Terry, Neufville, Ahluwalia and Werblow
3. Operationalize the Alliance: Messrs/Mms: Grenier, Otsuka, Jones, Ahluwalia, Enhance the Board Orientation Program: Messrs: Godfrey, Terry, Gregson and Harvey
4. Oversee the Further Development of the Conflict Resolution System: Messrs: Godfrey, Harvey and Gregson

The Alliance Executive (AE) Chair, Willie Dar thanked both the Chair and Director for their help in providing assistance from the World Bank Legal team in the preparation of the Alliance Principles and Procedures document, which was adopted and finalized during the joint meeting. The Chairs reported that the conflict resolution document was also approved and would prove to be another big step in operationalizing the Alliance. They stressed that the Centers could be counted on to enhance the reform process of the System.

Ian Johnson congratulated the Alliance, stating they were very supportive of this effort. He offered three suggested areas to emphasize in the Alliance statement to members:

- Identify where there would be cost savings, through increased efficiencies.
- Be clear on what had been agreed: the binding nature of Alliance decisions, and how the Boards of each Center would abide by decisions taken by the Alliance as a whole

- Report some early wins showing how the Alliance can make a difference

Joachim Voss explained that the binding nature of the decisions would come from the independent Centers agreeing to specific collective action. Once an agreement was made, it would bind the Centers to the agreed action.

The Way Forward.

Ian said that the increased attention to agriculture worldwide was very encouraging. He wanted to leave the Centers with a few thoughts about areas for growth and challenges in the months ahead:

- Keep your eye on the prize of science to stay at the cutting edge
- Be ready to speak out in areas where the Centers have something relevant to say regarding emerging issues, even those outside the ‘normal’ CGIAR territory. These could include trade, communicable diseases, climate change etc. These areas remain critical.
- The issue of adaptation to climate change - not just mitigation - is especially important. The “train has left the station” and we need to respond. Water resources, land management, and forestry all need to be included.
- What is the boundary between research and development and how are the results of the work of the Centers to be made available to their partners? There is a need to think more strategically. The Bank was considering appointing CGIAR liaison officers, to help the CGIAR interface more effectively with development.
- Keeping your eye on the prize of science: thought should be given to preparing a compendium of top-class research carried out by the Centers, to show we are at the cutting edge. Each Center could indicate the three most important research programs developed over the last five years, and plans for future cutting edge research.

Discussion.

- Alliance members provided an update on current plans to expand research on Agriculture and Human Health through the working group. There is a need to hire someone who can effectively connect with the health community and strengthen ties with the World Health Organization (WHO) and colleagues at the Bank working on international health issues.
- The idea was again raised of a two-day issues-based retreat of AB, AE and Bank staff to discuss “Issues that will Define Agriculture in the Next 25 years.”

Funding for the System Priorities.

- The new priorities should result in a mechanism to help reduce funding gaps. We must now consider developing a coherent set of priorities and activities within the priorities, and consider appropriate mechanisms for funding them.

- Jim Godfrey, AB Chair for 2006, thanked Ian and Francisco for the role they and colleagues at the Secretariat played in securing recent funding increases for the System.
- With the new Conflict resolution mechanism, Centers have a great opportunity to provide incentives for good behavior. The new CGXchange program provides an example of the use of incentives to help different groups work together.

Partnerships

- With respect to Centers and Members Day (AGM06), the AE Chair mentioned the need to engage sooner with the Secretariat in the planning phase and to try to increase the involvement of members. The Chairs invited both the Chair and Director to attend the next meeting of the Alliance leadership, at CIAT, April 26-27, 2006, for a chance to partake in more in-depth discussions.

The Next CGIAR Chair.

- Ian said it was important to think carefully about his successor. He believed the job was growing and it was indeed difficult to do it with only 10 percent of a Chairman's time. If he had any regrets from his time as Chair, it was that he could not carve out as much time as he would have liked to spend on CG matters.
- He would propose during the Business meeting that he would stay on as Chair for a few months after retirement to help in the transition. He said the CGIAR was now bigger than the GEF and disbursed more money than one region in the Bank.
- There was agreement that the Alliance would prefer to see a very senior person from the Bank (VP level) remain at the helm of the CGIAR. This gives the CGIAR strong credibility and status within the Bank.
- The Alliance Chairs, in closing, thanked Ian and Francisco for all their efforts and pledged to continue to strengthen their work together. They wished Ian well in his new life, and expressed their gratitude for the time and energy he had given to the CGIAR System during his tenure.

Annex 3. ExComs Meeting with the Senior Vice President and Chief Economist for the World Bank

Members of the Alliance Board (AB) and Alliance Executive (AE) Executive Committee, along with Per Pinstруп-Andersen and Ruben Echeverria, met with Mr. Francois Bourguignon of the World Bank on Wednesday, December 7.

Mr. Bourguignon emphasized the past year had been a tremendous learning opportunity for him, since his first meeting with the CGIAR in Mexico City. Overall, his impressions were extremely positive of the CG. Initially, and as a newcomer to the System, it took some time to understand the mechanisms of the organization. He mentioned being impressed with the cooperation among the Centers to reach some well defined goals. He also observed the donors had a very big role to play. In reading the documents prepared by the SC on the new priorities, and from a World Bank viewpoint, he shared these priorities and said it is exactly where the CG needs to go.

He asked to hear from the Science Council and the Alliance as to what they envisioned as the next steps forward.

Discussion.

- Mr. Bourguignon applauded the System for moving towards a more cohesive program, which in the end would have a greater impact on poverty alleviation. The designated priorities fit very well with the Bank's views, which is important for maintaining unrestricted core.
- Speakers emphasized the need to have other donors, in addition to the World Bank, understand the need to put resources into the matrix (composed of 20 CG Priorities and a number of Center and Challenge Program projects). A key factor in aligning the CG research portfolio to new priorities during the next three years would be the vision and leadership to be taken by donors in funding activities within the System agreed priorities.
- The idea was raised of having a dialogue on funding the new priorities with donors and experts in 2006. The success of the system's reforms would be seen in the buy-in of donors and increased funding with less restrictions.
- It was pointed out that the proposed funding system had certain similarities with the old system when the World Bank served as "donor of last resort" – with the result that the Bank was covering activities considered less "exciting". It is important that this not happen again and that the whole matrix be funded.
- In September, 2005, a new Multi-Donor Trust Fund Administrative Agreement (MDTFAA) was completed within the Bank to harmonize the administration of over \$120 million in CGIAR Member contributions channeled through the World Bank. The Bank's Internal Audit Department, in its report on the Bank's oversight of Bank-administered CGIAR trust funds and DGF grants, commended the successful conclusion of the MDTFAA, the most comprehensive administrative instrument for handling CGIAR Member funds through the Bank since the inception of the CGIAR.

- There was agreement that the new \$120 million multi-donor trust fund at the Bank is a good initiative. There will be a need to develop mechanisms for allocating funds that have not been earmarked, for which it will be important to establish a hierarchy within the priorities.
- Mr. Bourguignon asked if the System would be able to handle a substantial increase in funding, if the opportunity would arise – e.g. if there were a doubling of resources for Africa. The Centers responded that the biggest handicap would be lack of human resources to actually get the job done. However, much could be achieved through working with partners and sharing resources with them.
- There is a need to explain to donors that most agricultural research takes time, and it is not easy to produce substantive results in two or three years. The push by donors for quick results has created problems for the System. The more this trend continues the more difficult it will be to undertake fundamental long-term research of the kind that is unlikely to have an impact in less than, say, 10 years.

Next steps for the CGIAR.

Francois Bourguignon said that from the Bank's point of view the past arrangement of having a Senior Vice President in charge of the CGIAR worked well. His current role was to make sure there was no conflict of interest, and that the mission of the Bank was well reflected in the way the money is being used. At the time of the meeting there was no further information as to who would follow Ian Johnson. He said that he would suggest to the President that the same arrangement continue, but it was likely that there would be some reorganization within the Bank. Agriculture could go to one VP and Environment and Social Issues to another, but this was difficult to predict.

He said he would brief the World Bank President, Paul Wolfowitz, on the issues, emphasizing there was a unique opportunity to keep the CGIAR group strong. He was convinced that agriculture would remain a priority for the Bank, and from this point of view the future was bright. The CGIAR need not fear change.

He thanked the Alliance and Science Council leadership for meeting with him, and looked forward to continuing the dialogue. In return, the Alliance leadership extended the invitation to him to join them in their spring meetings, at CIAT, April 26-27, 2006.

Annex 4. Final Agenda Joint Meeting

***The Center Board Chairs (CBC) and
The Alliance Executive (AE)
Final Timed Agenda
Version 11-1-05
December 2, 2005
Marrakech, Morocco***

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
<i>Friday, December 2, Palais des Congrès, Karam No. 1</i>		
8:30	Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from WorldFish, ICRISAT ExComs, and ExCo 9 meetings	Chairs (U. Mokwunye and W. Dar)
9:00	Agenda Item 2. Alliance Principles and Procedures (AP&P) and Conflict Resolution 2a. AP&P next version	J. Jones and E. Frison
11:00	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
11:15	Agenda Item 2. (cont.) 2b. Conflict Resolution Guidelines	J. Godfrey and J. Voss
12:15	Agenda Item 3. SSA MTPs Program and Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities • Global entities 	K. Nwanze and C. Seré
13:00	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
14:00	Agenda Item 4. CGIAR Debate on funding CGIAR Priorities	Chairs
14:30	Agenda Item 5. FAO Report and Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO Annual Report • Hosting Arrangements and Recruitment of ED 	FAO Chairs
15:00	Agenda Item 6. Stripe Review of Boards	U.Mokwunye
15:15	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
15:30	Agenda Item 7. Board Orientation Program Update	J.Godfrey
15:40	Agenda Item 8. Management and Governance of SO Units funded by Centers	K. Nwanze
15:55	Agenda Item 9. Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Reporting	W. Dar
16:05	Agenda Item 10. Harmonizing Mission and Vision Statements	J. Von Braun
16:20	Agenda Item 11. Compensation Study Update	U. Werblow and K. Nwanze
16:30	Agenda Item 12. Program Updates : 12a. Science Council Research Priorities 12b. GRPC	Chairs T. Gregsen and E. Frison
17:15	Agenda Item 13. Other Business 13a. CGIAR debate on Corporate Entity for the System (30 min.) 13b. Memorial for Bob Havener (10 min.)	Chairs M. Iwanaga and

	13c. AGM05 (20 min.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centers and Members Day • Science Forum • Business Meeting 	A. El-Beltagy D. Garrity Chairs
18:15	Agenda Item 14 : Wrap- Up and Future Meetings	Chairs
<i>19:30 Joint Chairs Dinner (location tbc)</i>		