

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

**Annual General Meeting
Business Meeting
December 4-5, 2008
Maputo, Mozambique**

Summary Record of Proceedings



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
January 27, 2009*

Acronyms Used

AE	Alliance Executive of CGIAR Centers
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ARI	Advance Research Institution
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
AWARD	African Women in Agricultural Research and Development
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CORAF/WECARD	Council Ouest et Centre Africain Pour la Recherche et le Developpement Agricole/ West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
CP	CGIAR Challenge Program
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CST	Change Steering Team
EIARD	European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ExCo	CGIAR Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FORAGRO	Forum for the Americas on Agricultural Research and Technology Development
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IP	Intellectual Property
ISNAR	International Service on National Agricultural Research
ISPC	Independent Science and Partnerships Council
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDTF	World Bank Multi Donor Trust Fund
MTP	Medium-Term Plan
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
PMS	Performance Measurement System
PRGA	Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
SC	Science Council
SPIA	SC Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa

TMT	Transition Management Team
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

International Agricultural Research Centers Supported by the CGIAR

The Africa Rice Center (WARDA)

Bioversity International

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)

Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)

International Water Management Institute (IWMI)

World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF)

WorldFish Center

Contents

Agenda	v
AGM08 Conclusions and Decisions	vi
1. Opening Session.....	13
2. CGIAR Status Report	13
2.a. Updates.....	13
3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System	15
4. CGIAR Change Management Process.....	19
4.a. Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal.....	19
4.b. Change Management Transition Arrangements	26
5. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan	29
6. Other Business	31
7. Closing Session.....	31
 Attachments	
Attachment 1: Response to the Findings and Recommendations of the Independent Review of the CGIAR System.....	32
Attachment 2: CGIAR Transition Management Team (TMT).....	39
Attachment 3: Summary: CGIAR Member Feedback on AGM08	42

All documents for AGM08 are available at: http://www.cgiar.org/meetings/agm08/agm08_business.html

Agenda

Thursday, December 4, 2008

1. Opening Session

- Chair's Opening Remarks
- Adoption of Business Meeting Agenda

2. CGIAR Status Report

2.a. Updates

- Report from Director
- Report from SC
- Report from Alliance
- Discussion

3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

- Presentation of Final Report
- Discussion and Decision Making

4. CGIAR Change Management Process

4.a. Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal

- Presentation of Final Report
- Discussion and Decision Making

Friday, December 5, 2008

4. CGIAR Change Management Process (cont'd)

4.b. Change Management Transition Arrangements

- Discussion and Decision making

5. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan

- Introduction
- Discussion and Decision Making

6. Other Business

- Future Meetings

7. Closing Session

AGM08 Conclusions and Decisions

2.a. Updates

Conclusion:

- *K. Sierra thanked the Government of Mozambique for hosting AGM08 and also thanked both Canada (and IDRC) and Portugal for hosting the two ExCo meetings in 2008.*
- *Members expressed appreciation for the three reports received, and acknowledged the significance of the work done over the past year.*
- *The discussion pointed to the need for more vital partnerships with NARS (in particular in Africa), harmonization of donor activities, and more emphasis on impact assessment. There is clearly a need for future Center evaluations, but more discussion is required on how and who would be responsible in the New CGIAR.*

3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The CGIAR accepted the Independent Review Report with great applause and noted the tremendous added value brought by the report and the Panel Members. The report will be an important reference for the Change Management Process as it moves forward. In addition, the report gives Members comfort that the work of the Centers is valued and appreciated, and for framing challenges.*
- *The draft CGIAR management response to the Review Report, endorsed and submitted by ExCo, will be strengthened in two ways: 1) to include an explicit mention of donor commitment to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and noting the need for complementarity to the entire international public goods delivery system, both within and outside the CGIAR; and 2) a few points will be added regarding audit of Challenge Programs. A revised response was presented to Members during the meeting. It was endorsed as amended. (See Attachment 1)*
- *The need for a re-balanced partnership based on trust and a strategy and results framework, with a strong emphasis on strategic partnerships was noted. The recommendation on integrating gender into all programs, monitoring and the results framework was welcomed. The gender dimension will be incorporated into the new strategy and results framework. There was not full agreement on the recommendation to develop a mega-program on gender. A study by IFPRI on gender in the new CGIAR would be valuable input for further consideration of this issue.*
- *The significant commonalities between the recommendations of the Independent Review and Change Management Process were noted. As the change process moves forward, it's important the new System is modeled on new behaviors to build trust and get the new structures right.*

4.a. Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal

Conclusion and Decisions:

Chair's Summary:

The CGIAR endorsed in principle the Integrated Reform Proposal, while highlighting several points, including:

- *There is a sense of urgency and the time to act is now, especially considering the myriad external factors, e.g. continuing widespread hunger, threat of climate change, etc. The System missed previous opportunities and must not miss this one.*
- *Several Members indicated they are ready to increase their funding based on strong implementation of the reforms. Broad support has been expressed from NARS, the South, Foundations, Donors, and the Alliance. There is a strong will and sense of purpose, and commitment to continue building trust via transparency and inclusiveness.*
- *There is recognition that a broad architecture has been outlined guided by clear principles; however there are many details to be worked out as the transition proceeds.*
- *There is a need to speak with a clear System voice and to position the CGIAR as part of the international architecture, and to play a significant leadership role in addressing global challenges such as the food crisis and climate change. The CGIAR must explore ways to establish dynamic relationships with other multilateral actors including FAO, UNDP, World Bank, IFAD and others to carry out this role. Effective communication will be key to garner support needed from policy makers and the public.*
- *Members expressed support to the foundation elements in the proposal with several notations:*
 - *Strategy and Results Framework and mega-programs: All activities should be included in the strategy and results framework to provide a linkage to all funding support, not only to that channeled through the Fund. Science Council input will be key during development of the strategy and results framework, as well as from partners, particularly from the South, and input from the conference on agricultural research for development. The gender dimension will be incorporated into the strategy and results framework. There is a need to develop a sample or “test” mega-program so donors can see how it would look, but not necessarily funded until the strategy and results framework is in place. Donors were requested to not withdraw funding from ongoing research activities.*
 - *Fund: There will be two channels for funds to flow (i.e. through the Fund and bilaterally), however the System should aspire to make the Fund attractive for donors to use and attract more of the funding through this channel. Members also recognized there will always be a need for a bilateral channel, but with full cost recovery. In order for donors not to lose opportunity for interactions with Centers, Members agreed with the*

suggestion to provide a forum to meet in off years between the Funders Summit, which might be linked with a Fund Council meeting. There is a need for the institutional funding window to be clarified. In addition, an effective strategy needs to be put in place as the System moves from bilateral to programmatic funding to not jeopardize the current research programs/projects. Members were encouraged to continue with current funding during the transition to ensure the current System is not damaged. Concerns of potential donors to the Fund will be taken into consideration in the design stage during the transition. On composition of the Fund Council, there should be a balanced representation of members from the North and South. Some Members believe stakeholders should serve only in an advisory capacity, especially to avoid perceived or real conflicts of interest.

- *Consortium: Clarity is needed on accountability and lines of authority between Centers and the Consortium. The need for structural change was emphasized, and it should be a first order of business for the Consortium. Members are looking forward to an early report out in this area. Language should be included in founding documents to reflect potential changes in number of Centers.*
- *Independent Science and Partnership Council: There is a need for strong, forward looking ex ante advice, catalyzing mobilization of science and partnerships to link with the best science. However, it would not do the work of building partnerships which will be done by the Centers.*
- *Partnerships: Members appreciated the various entry points for partnerships, but noted that partnerships should always be for results and not for the sake of partnerships. They should be dynamic and not merely for transferring money. A template for mega-programs should specify results expected on the ground through partnerships and how they will be judged. Partnerships should also be thought of more broadly.*
- *Fiduciary and monitoring and evaluation arrangements: There is a need for strong fiduciary and M&E frameworks to ensure a robust System. It is important to build such a framework and get buy-in as well from donors and challenge donors to live up to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. A link between ex post evaluation and ex ante planning should be maintained.*
- *Dispute resolution: Members expressed a need for a dispute resolution mechanism as part of system governance that will give guidance in the event of disruptions to the System. A proposal for such a mechanism should be developed during transition.*
- *Research vitality and no over centralization: These principles should be maintained to ensure adequate flexibility in mega-programs to give adequate space for innovation to take place, including attracting scientific talent.*
- *Competition: A competitive process in mega-programs should be built in where it makes sense.*

- *Transition: risk management is very important and needs to be taken into consideration. Expertise should be engaged to help address this issue during transition. The System must also protect scientific assets and programs to support these assets. Balance speed with caution going forward.*
- *Members expressed thanks to the entire change team. The CGIAR Chair singled out Rodney Cooke and Jonathan Wadsworth, the Change Steering Team, and chairs of the working groups for their time and dedication to the effort.*

CGIAR Decisions

- I. *The CGIAR approved, in principle, the document A Revitalized CGIAR—A New Way Forward: The Integrated Reform Proposal and in particular, the following elements as a way of implementing reform:*
 1. *The CGIAR Vision “to reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition, and enhance ecosystem resilience through high-quality international agricultural research, partnership and leadership,” and Strategic Objectives: (a) Food for People, (b) Environment for People, and (c) Policies for People. The CGIAR is committed to provide public goods especially in support of developing countries in collaboration with NARS and other partners.*
 2. *A Consortium of Centers will be created that is a legal entity with a Board and CEO.*
 3. *A CGIAR Fund will be created that is composed of Fund investors and aims at providing multi-year financing. The Fund will have a Funders Summit and a Fund Council which will be a decision making body. The Fund Council will be chaired by the World Bank. The chair will be non-voting. The Fund Council will be organized such that it includes donors to the Fund from both the South and North with some stakeholders. Satisfactory fiduciary arrangements will be agreed between the parties.*
 4. *CGIAR investments will be results focused and time bound through a Strategy and Results Framework to be developed by the Consortium in consultation with partners and the Independent Science and Partnership Council. The Strategy and Results Framework will encompass all channels of funding, and will define how the CGIAR achieves its three strategic objectives. This Framework will be further expressed through mega-programs, which should be developed with strong participation from the South. Gender considerations will be fully integrated including clear indicators.*
 5. *The Funders Summit will approve the Strategy and Results Framework. It will meet every two years, and provide an opportunity to review performance of the overall System. In off-years all Funders will be invited to have dialogue with the Consortium, which could be linked to the Fund Council timetable.*
 6. *Mutual accountability between funders and the Consortium, under the Strategy and Results Framework with full cost recovery, will be operationalized through performance contracts. As part of the overall governance, a dispute resolution mechanism will be developed in case of Systemwide disruptions.*

7. *Partnerships are essential for designing research programs and delivery of research outcomes and impact. Incentives for partnership through the Centers, including funding of partnerships, will be built into all levels of the System. Processes to introduce competition, where appropriate, will also be built into mega-programs.*
8. *An Independent Science and Partnership Council will support the Fund Council and the Funders Summit and advise the Consortium Board.*
9. *An independent evaluation arrangement will periodically take place at the Program and System levels. An independent evaluation on the reforms of the new CGIAR will be undertaken in three years.*
10. *A final CGIAR Business Meeting will take place in 2009 to sign off on the transition (time and venue to be decided). Thereafter, CGIAR will cease to organize Annual General Meetings. A biennial global conference on agricultural research for development will be organized by GFAR in collaboration with the Consortium and Independent Science and Partnership Council.*

The above reforms will ensure that the strategy and programs will operate in the context of the international agricultural research for development architecture. The arrangements will enable the Consortium of Centers to speak with a single voice and provide leadership in the international arena.

II. The CGIAR decided that during transition changes will be scrutinized and implemented to ensure they pass the following six tests:

1. *Clear strategic focus;*
2. *Increase research output, outcome, and impact;*
3. *Greater efficiency, effectiveness and relevance;*
4. *Simplicity and clarity of governance;*
5. *Enhanced decentralized decision making; and*
6. *Active subsidiarity to capitalize on complementarities of the Centers.*

4.b. Change Management Transition Arrangements

Conclusions and Decisions:

Members agreed with the proposed transition arrangements and would like to help to get them implemented. The TOR of the Transition Management Team (TMT) was broadly endorsed. In approving the transition arrangements the following notations were made:

- *Members approved the delegation of decision-making authority to ExCo during the transition period; it is important to have a clear decision-making framework. ExCo meetings will continue to be open to all CGIAR Members as observers.*
- *TMT will make periodic reports on the progress of implementation of the transition plan; one-page reports will be provided on a regular basis and a Q&A on the CGIAR web site will be posted and updated regularly. Drafts of documents will also be shared as soon as they become available.*

- *TMT will ensure that a communication strategy for the transition process be formulated as soon as possible.*
- *The development of a single unifying charter for the new CGIAR was endorsed to give the System a unified vision, high aspiration and branding strategy.*
- *On the composition and TOR of TMT: FAO will be brought in as an associate member; the CGIAR Chair requested FAO to provide the name of its representative. TMT should make sure that the global positioning of the new CGIAR is considered in going forward and in developing a new charter. (See Attachment 2)*
- *On the Fund: A large number of donors expressed interest in contributing to the Fund. Donors are invited to give an early indication of interest so that they could be included early in the design process. The following are specific actions that need to be undertaken: addressing currency exchange rate fluctuation issues and their management; transitioning of the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), making sure that there is no gap in funding Centers and their programs.*
- *On mega-programs: The terms of reference for the preparation of such programs should include precision on articulating demand for the programs.*
- *There is a need to look at the value-added coming from the reform program. The cost estimates are to be done by the Alliance with a note that costs should consider not only the added cost but all costs (i.e., a broad based cost-benefit analysis).*
- *A plan for revitalization of GFAR should be developed.*
- *The Science Forum which will be held in June 2009 will not be a prototype global conference on agricultural research for development.*
- *The role and place of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee in the System needs to be decided.*
- *Financial contributions of the following donors to the change management initiative were acknowledged and appreciated: Canada, China, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Switzerland, Syngenta Foundation, United Kingdom, and World Bank. USA provided in-kind contribution. A proposal will be prepared quickly for donors to consider contributing to defray the cost of the transition phase. Most of the cost is associated with the setting up of the consortium and building or revitalizing GFAR; the Fund cost will be covered mostly by the World Bank through a specialized fund.*
- *It was decided that a final CGIAR Business Meeting will be held, likely in conjunction with the second meeting of ExCo in late 2009.*
- *The transition plan should include a risk assessment, and the TMT should consider contacting an expert to provide advice on the matter.*

5. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Members thanked the SC Chair for the SC commentary report on MTPs and commended SC for its guidance in improving science of the CGIAR.*
- *Members also thanked the CGIAR Secretariat for its report on the 2009 Financing Plan. The Secretariat was requested to update the draft plan with*

current numbers, including in donation currencies with present exchange rates. A section should also be included with different scenarios based on different exchange rates. The plan should then be circulated to the Membership for virtual approval.

- *The ExCo Ad Hoc Committee on Finance was tasked to virtually review and report to ExCo in May 2009 on the status of finances in the System taking into consideration issues raised at AGM08.*

6. Other Business

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The CGIAR agreed to organize a final Business Meeting in late 2009, likely linked with ExCo 17. Time and venue will be communicated to Members when available.*

1. Opening Session

CGIAR Chair Katherine Sierra formally opened the AGM08 Business Meeting by noting the importance of the meeting. Decisions taken at AGM07 on proceeding with the Change Management Process to revitalize the CGIAR and meet the challenges of the future have guided much of the work during 2008. The discussions and decisions at AGM08 will have a significant impact on the future of the organization.

She thanked the Government of Mozambique for hosting the meeting and in particular the Ministry of Science and Technology for support in organizing the meeting. She also welcomed new and returning Members.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

2. CGIAR Status Report

2.a. Updates

K. Sierra invited Ren Wang (CGIAR Director), Rudy Rabbinge (Science Council Chair) and Emile Frison (Alliance Executive Chair) to give updates on activities in the CGIAR during the past year.

Report from the Director

R. Wang reported on the status of business follow-up activities including the CGIAR Change Management Process, Independent Review of the CGIAR System, Challenge Programs (Cycle 2), CIAT, and the performance measurement system. He reported that all of the activities have been either completed or are on track. He also noted that a written report submitted by the Director provides more detailed information.

Report from the SC

R. Rabbinge provided an update on SC activities related to (i) monitoring and evaluation of relevance and quality of Center and Program research activities, (ii) assessing the long term impacts of CGIAR and partner research, (iii) identifying strategic issues and priorities for research and policy, and (iv) promoting the mobilization of scientific linkages.

He also reported that a Science Forum is being organized by the SC jointly with GFAR, the Alliance of CGIAR Centers and ARIs to be held at Wageningen University, the Netherlands, June 16-17, 2009. It is meant to be a forward-looking event focusing on

exploring new science partnerships. It could serve as an input to the envisioned stakeholder conference on agricultural research for development.

Furthermore, R. Rabbinge reported that three new members joined the SC in 2008: Gebisa Ejeta, Jeff Sayer, and Derek Byerlee (as new Chair of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)). He also acknowledged the contributions of Jim Ryan (former SPIA Chair) and SC member Mariza Barbosa, who completed their terms in 2008.

In relation to the Change Management Process, R. Rabbinge put forward the following proposed roles for an Independent Science and Partnership Council: (i) to help set the CGIAR's strategic direction, (ii) to promote the quality and relevance of science, (iii) to catalyze linkages to global science, (iv) to ensure accountability on overall System impacts, and (v) to assess *ex ante* the quality of science in programs and Centers.

Report from the Alliance

E. Frison reported on the key activities of the Alliance and Centers in 2008. These included:

- Development of an action plan for responding to the global food crisis.
- Compilation of Centers "Best Bets" to boost crop production in Africa.
- Strengthening collective action through joint work such as development of the Climate Change Challenge Program proposal, and the development of regional plans for collective action with CORAF and ASARECA.
- Strengthening partnerships with regional organizations through a consultation meeting with FARA on how to improve collaboration and collective action in sub-Saharan Africa and through a strong CGIAR presence at the fifth international meeting of FORAGRO.
- Enhancement of quality and impact of Centers' work through initiating a collective approach to management of research data.
- Strong and constructive participation of the Alliance in the Change Management Process (i.e. Change Steering Team and the various working groups) demonstrating full engagement and embracement of the principles of the new CGIAR.

Discussion:

- Appreciation was expressed for the efforts of the CGIAR Secretariat in support of the Change Management Process during the past year and for the very good media coverage of the CGIAR generated.
- The SC was also congratulated for the quality and quantity of its work.
- The performance measurement system will be a useful tool in the forthcoming reform; it was noted that performance measurement of Challenge Programs is also expected.
- There is a strong demand for CGIAR capacity building work with developing country partners.
- The Alliance should make more of an effort to engage at a higher policy level.

- EIARD informed Members about the finalization of a recent study commissioned by the European Commission on behalf of EIARD, “Towards more common donors’ approaches for M&E of the CGIAR” which was recently circulated by the CGIAR Director to Members.
- Collaboration with strong NARS (e.g. in Brazil, India and China) should be strengthened. It was also proposed that the SC could organize more research workshops with NARS partners, such as the recent workshop on methodologies for impact assessment in agricultural research organized jointly with Embrapa in Brasilia, which can also be considered as a form of capacity strengthening.
- Concern was expressed about the phasing out of EPMRs as part of the new reform program.
- Global challenges related to food security, biofuel production and climate change require more attention by the CGIAR; furthermore, the CGIAR should further strengthen its research engagement in Africa.
- There is a desire to see ISNAR capacity strengthening activities increased. This is an important function of the CGIAR that should not be lost
- E. Frison expressed appreciation for the comments and reiterated the Alliance commitment to the new reform. R. Rabbinge welcomed EIARD’s efforts to streamline and consolidate M&E by the EIARD group. He also pointed out that the evaluation arrangements within the new CGIAR remains to be discussed in more detail. R. Wang thanked Portugal for hosting the last ExCo meeting as well as the science workshop and was pleased to learn that follow-up actions on the workshop are under way.

Conclusion:

- *K. Sierra thanked the Government of Mozambique for hosting AGM08 and also thanked both Canada (and IDRC) and Portugal for hosting the two ExCo meetings in 2008.*
- *Members expressed appreciation for the three reports received, and acknowledged the significance of the work done over the past year.*
- *The discussion pointed to the need for more vital partnerships with NARS (in particular in Africa), harmonization of donor activities, and more emphasis on impact assessment. There is clearly a need for future Center evaluations, but more discussion is required on how and who would be responsible in the New CGIAR.*

3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

Independent Review Panel Chair Elizabeth McAllister presented the Panel’s report, entitled *Bringing Together the Best of Science and the Best of Development*.

As an overall summary, the Panel concluded that the 37 year old partnership of the CGIAR has become fragile with dysfunctional governance and structures that impair its effectiveness. There is no systemwide strategy and past incremental attempts at reform have not worked well. The System should play a prominent role on the world stage on

food security and other issues but is largely absent. However, the partnership is unique and worth saving, but both Centers and donors need to fundamentally change their roles and behaviors.

Six main findings were reported:

Finding 1: The CGIAR-supported Centers contribute substantially to agricultural productivity and natural resource management. Overall, recent impact assessments of CGIAR research reveal very high returns on investment.

Finding 2: The CGIAR and Centers need to take a more strategic approach to partnership. The word partnership is overused, yet the CGIAR System needs robust partnerships to effectively function as part of an international public goods delivery system. Better incentives and arrangements for partnerships are needed, as well as resources. However, Centers cannot do it all, and donors need to also commit resources to improve partnerships.

Finding 3: The Centers have made progress in addressing intellectual property protection, but more needs to be done. Serious investment is needed to manage intellectual property.

Finding 4: Gender is not adequately integrated into Centers' research mandates and outreach. Centers need to move from advocacy to accountability in their programming to remove unintentional discrimination and to provide incentives in all planning and management instruments. IFPRI and the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) program should develop a gender strategy for inclusion in the new Joint Strategy and Results Framework. A mega-program on gender is also explicitly needed, and the Panel recommended that the Africa Women in Agricultural Research for Development (AWARD) program be expanded to other regions.

Finding 5: The Centers are in a quiet (or disguised) financial crisis. Funding has not been growing, but has been stagnant in real terms. Funding is also more restricted than in the past, and there are far too many small grants, with an attendant high administrative cost. Full costing of research should be made mandatory – free-riding is no longer acceptable. The Panel also recommends that crisis intervention methods be improved, that the reserve target be increased to 180 days, and that an annual financial audit of the Challenge Programs be conducted.

Finding 6: Dysfunctional governance and management constrain the System's potential. There is a need to separate governance and management and to move towards mutual accountability where horizontal accountability replaces vertical accountability.

The Panel's Findings point to the need for a renewal of the System, with structural reforms for a rebalanced partnership. Six main recommendations were identified:

Recommendation 1: Rebalance the Center-donor partnership to sustain the CGIAR's unique contributions.

Recommendation 2: Establish a legally structured Consortium of Centers.

Recommendation 3: Establish a CGIAR Fund for Agricultural Research.

Recommendation 4: Support the Consortium and CGIAR Fund with a science advisory board and an independent evaluation unit.

Recommendation 5: The Consortium and the Fund adopt a gender strategy based on accountability for integrating gender in the work of partnerships.

Recommendation 6: The Consortium and the CGIAR Fund together take a more strategic approach to partnerships with other actors in the production and delivery of international public goods.

A Joint Strategy and Results Framework would hold the System together. It must combine funding from all sources, as well as the programs. It will include commitments from donors and Centers, with progress markers and milestones. Managing for results would be a guiding principle in the new System.

The Panel stated it believes the System can live up to the present challenges and undertake the reforms needed to operate effectively in the 21st century. The System must move swiftly to implement the needed reforms.

Discussion:

- Members congratulated the Panel Chair and members for their excellent report and noted that the Panel's work has added great value to the change management process. The report will serve as an important reference work in years to come, as well as a baseline for future evaluations.
- The report has highlighted the important need for accelerating the donors' adherence to the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in the CGIAR. It was noted that results-based management is important, and the CGIAR could learn lessons from the UN experience. Donors also need to invest in the larger agricultural research system in developing countries beyond the CGIAR in response to commitments made in response to the food crisis, and to coordinate those investments with their CGIAR investment.
- Members expressed support for the recommendations on gender in the Panel's report, noting that what does not get measured does not get done.
- There was agreement on the need for a results framework, as research on successful organizations shows that aligning on a strategy is critical to success.
- Questions raised by Members included:
 - What advice can the Panel provide on transferring authority from the Centers to the Consortium Board?

- How will the work of an independent evaluation unit differ from impact assessment studies?
- Is it fundamentally important that a special program on gender be embraced, or should gender be embraced across the Results Framework?
- What are the differences between the Panel’s recommendations and those of the Integrated Reform Proposal?
- The Panel responded to the questions raised during the discussion. Keith Bezanson responded to the question on advice for the Consortium by reminding Members that details will come from the transition process over the coming year. However, Centers will need to show what sovereignties they are giving up, to dissect services and decide which can be made common, and to cede a large degree of strategic authority. The results framework and managing for results with indicators, milestones, and assessment must be designed correctly. The Consortium Board must also be identified and appointed correctly to build confidence.
- On impact assessment, Panel member Jeff Waage offered that most impact assessment is done by Centers, but the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) has focused on Systemwide impact and improving tools and methods. This should continue to reside in the future Science Council.
- On the gender question, the Panel Chair stated that successful approaches to gender need senior leadership and must not rely on gender specialists below the managerial level. Women are a huge resource that has been wasted, both within the System and in programs, and the situation must not continue. A special program is needed at the mega-program level, and that would be a huge win for the CGIAR with tremendous opportunity. There must be accountability throughout – it is not an either or.
- In terms of how the Panel’s reform proposal differs from that of the Change Steering Team (CST), the Panel feels that the reform is about “lifting the game” while the CST proposal is more focused on cost savings and reducing bureaucracy. The Panel believes that the Consortium must appoint its Board, while the CST proposed a tri-partite nominating committee. The Panel did not recommend that partnership be included in the Science Council, but rather that the Consortium Board can seek advice on this. The independent evaluation arrangement is vague in the CST report. The Panel feels strongly that audits of Challenge Programs are needed. The CST proposal recommends a competitive process for funding partners, but the Panel believes that Centers should not be burdened with competitive processes because they do not build sustainable partnerships. Other means can be found to hold Centers accountable for partnerships. However, overall, the Panel believes that the commonalities between the Panel’s report and the CST proposal are over 90 percent, but clarity is needed on the meaning and understanding of recommendations in the proposals.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The CGIAR accepted the Independent Review Report with great applause and noted the tremendous added value brought by the report and the Panel Members.*

The report will be an important reference for the Change Management Process as it moves forward. In addition, the report gives Members comfort that the work of the Centers is valued and appreciated, and for framing challenges.

- *The draft CGIAR management response to the Review Report, endorsed and submitted by ExCo, will be strengthened in two ways: 1) to include an explicit mention of donor commitment to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and noting the need for complementarity to the entire international public goods delivery system, both within and outside the CGIAR; and 2) a few points will be added regarding audit of Challenge Programs. A revised response was presented to Members during the meeting. It was endorsed as amended. (See Attachment 1)*
- *The need for a re-balanced partnership based on trust and a strategy and results framework, with a strong emphasis on strategic partnerships was noted. The recommendation on integrating gender into all programs, monitoring and the results framework was welcomed. The gender dimension will be incorporated into the new strategy and results framework. There was not full agreement on the recommendation to develop a mega-program on gender. A study by IFPRI on gender in the new CGIAR would be valuable input for further consideration of this issue.*
- *The significant commonalities between the recommendations of the Independent Review and Change Management Process were noted. As the change process moves forward, it's important the new System is modeled on new behaviors to build trust and get the new structures right.*

4. CGIAR Change Management Process

4.a. Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal

K. Sierra introduced the item, giving a brief background to the genesis of the CGIAR Change Management Process. She noted the broad consultative nature of the process, highlighting the many change retreats, stakeholder consultation meetings, and input received from all components of the System and partners at all levels.

Change Steering Team (CST) Chair Rodney Cooke and Co-Chair Jonathan Wadsworth presented the team's report, *A Revitalized CGIAR—A New Way Forward: The Integrated Reform Proposal*. They thanked the many people who have been involved in the process, including Working Group chairs and members, and other CST members.

They noted that the proposal was previously presented at ExCo 15 (October 2008) and ExCo agreed in principle to the direction of the Change Management Process and the foundation pieces identified by the CST for a reformed CGIAR. ExCo requested clarifications and minor amendments to the Fund, Consortium, biennial conference and Independent Science and Partnerships Council (ISPC).

Reviewing the reasons why the world needs a revitalized CGIAR, and drawing on key messages from the Independent Review of the CGIAR System, as well as input from the

four Change Management Working Groups, the proposal focuses on the following revitalizing aspects of the System that will enable greater impact on food security and poverty reduction:

- A focused System with a clear vision and strategic direction;
- An open CGIAR System which values dynamic partnerships;
- A financially strengthened and cost effective CGIAR;
- A results-based culture through performance contracting;
- Simplified governance and clarified accountabilities, with clear and distinct roles for “doers” and “funders”; and
- An exciting research environment, which attracts, develops and supports the best scientists.

The earlier agreed CGIAR Vision and CGIAR Strategic Objectives served as a guidepost during development of the reform proposal:

CGIAR Vision: To reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition, and enhance ecosystem resilience through high quality international agricultural research, partnership and leadership.

CGIAR Strategic Objectives:

Food for People

Create and accelerate sustainable increases in the productivity and production of healthy food by and for the poor

Environment for People

Conserve, enhance and sustainably use natural resources and biodiversity to improve the livelihoods of the poor in response to climate change and other factors

Policies for People

Promote policy and institutional change that will stimulate agricultural growth and equity to benefit the poor, especially rural women and other disadvantaged groups

The CST developed a set of foundation elements that should constitute the “New CGIAR” and are included in the reform proposal:

- A new CGIAR Vision and Strategic Objectives;
- A “Consortium” of Centers: a legal entity with Board & CEO;
- A CGIAR Fund that provides multi-year financing, with a Funders Summit and a Fund Council as the decision making body;
- Output-oriented Strategy and Results Framework;
- Mutual accountability between funders and the Consortium under the Strategy and Results Framework via performance contracts focusing on programmatic financing;
- Processes and incentives to promote partnerships at all levels;

- Independent Science and Partnership Council to *support* the Fund and Funders Summit, and *advise* the Consortium Board;
- Independent evaluation arrangement at the Program and System levels; and
- Biennial conference/congress on agricultural research for development.

The Integrated Reform Proposal containing the above elements was presented, including an explanation of each component that described how each would work in action. The proposal builds partnerships into all levels of the model and seeks an open CGIAR System with dynamic partnerships that is financially strengthened and cost-effective, leading to a recasting of the founding principles of the organization.

The final section of the presentation discussed transition arrangements and the establishment of a Transition Management Team (TMT) that would be chaired by K. Sierra and report to ExCo on key milestones of the implementation. Responsibilities would include managing several risks that have been identified by the CST and scrutiny of changes to ensure they add value to an improved System and pass the following five critical tests:

1. Simplicity and clarity of governance;
2. Greater efficiency and effectiveness;
3. Clear strategic focus;
4. Avoidance of overly centralized decision making; and
5. Active subsidiarity.

J. Wadsworth concluded the presentation by highlighting the unique opportunity the CGIAR has to implement real changes that will revitalize the organization to have a positive impact on food security and poverty reduction. The time to act is now; the organization has missed past opportunities, and must not do so again.

Discussion:

- Members congratulated the Change Teams on all of their hard work and development of the proposal, and expressed gratitude to everyone involved for their time and dedication to the effort over the past year.
- Broad support was expressed for the Integrated Reform Proposal and the foundation elements from all parts of the System, including Members from South/North, Alliance, partners, and SC. Many Members indicated their willingness to increase funding once changes are implemented.
- Members were pleased that many past concerns/issues raised during the process have been incorporated into the model, particularly the emphasis on results-based partnerships.
- Notwithstanding the remaining concerns of some Members, there was a sense of urgency to move swiftly towards implementation. There was understanding that many details will need to be addressed during the transition. While recognizing the need to move swiftly, Members requested to be well informed and involved during the process.
- During transition stage, it is vital that implementation of the reforms not damage the ongoing research agenda and scientific assets of the System. Appropriate

- measures and caution must be put in place to do this. Managing risks during the transition will be paramount. These and other ambiguities must be adequately addressed in order to have a successful implementation.
- The implementation effort needs to also be outward looking and include partners, and seek to strengthen CGIAR linkages with other multilateral agencies. The CGIAR needs to broaden *and* elevate its game to position itself in the international architecture to play a more prominent role in addressing international issues of relevance.
 - Many issues and concerns were raised on various elements of the proposal, including on the Strategy and Results Framework, Fund, Consortium, ISPC, partnerships, fiduciary and evaluation arrangements, dispute resolution mechanism, maintaining research vitality and space for competitiveness and innovation. Details on these issues are included in the Chair's summary below, and will help guide implementation of the reforms.

Conclusion and Decisions:

Chair's Summary:

The CGIAR endorsed in principle the Integrated Reform Proposal, while highlighting several points, including:

- *There is a sense of urgency and the time to act is now, especially considering the myriad external factors, e.g. continuing widespread hunger, threat of climate change, etc. The System missed previous opportunities and must not miss this one.*
- *Several Members indicated they are ready to increase their funding based on strong implementation of the reforms. Broad support has been expressed from NARS, the South, Foundations, Donors, and the Alliance. There is a strong will and sense of purpose, and commitment to continue building trust via transparency and inclusiveness.*
- *There is recognition that a broad architecture has been outlined guided by clear principles; however there are many details to be worked out as the transition proceeds.*
- *There is a need to speak with a clear System voice and to position the CGIAR as part of the international architecture, and to play a significant leadership role in addressing global challenges such as the food crisis and climate change. The CGIAR must explore ways to establish dynamic relationships with other multilateral actors including FAO, UNDP, World Bank, IFAD and others to carry out this role. Effective communication will be key to garner support needed from policy makers and the public.*
- *Members expressed support to the foundation elements in the proposal with several notations:*
 - *Strategy and Results Framework and mega-programs: All activities should be included in the strategy and results framework to provide a linkage to all funding support, not only to that channeled through the Fund. Science Council input will be key during development of the*

strategy and results framework, as well as from partners, particularly from the South, and input from the conference on agricultural research for development. The gender dimension will be incorporated into the strategy and results framework. There is a need to develop a sample or “test” mega-program so donors can see how it would look, but not necessarily funded until the strategy and results framework is in place. Donors were requested to not withdraw funding from ongoing research activities.

- *Fund: There will be two channels for funds to flow (i.e. through the Fund and bilaterally), however the System should aspire to make the Fund attractive for donors to use and attract more of the funding through this channel. Members also recognized there will always be a need for a bilateral channel, but with full cost recovery. In order for donors not to lose opportunity for interactions with Centers, Members agreed with the suggestion to provide a forum to meet in off years between the Funders Summit, which might be linked with a Fund Council meeting. There is a need for the institutional funding window to be clarified. In addition, an effective strategy needs to be put in place as the System moves from bilateral to programmatic funding to not jeopardize the current research programs/projects. Members were encouraged to continue with current funding during the transition to ensure the current System is not damaged. Concerns of potential donors to the Fund will be taken into consideration in the design stage during the transition. On composition of the Fund Council, there should be a balanced representation of members from the North and South. Some Members believe stakeholders should serve only in an advisory capacity, especially to avoid perceived or real conflicts of interest.*
- *Consortium: Clarity is needed on accountability and lines of authority between Centers and the Consortium. The need for structural change was emphasized, and it should be a first order of business for the Consortium. Members are looking forward to an early report out in this area. Language should be included in founding documents to reflect potential changes in number of Centers.*
- *Independent Science and Partnership Council: There is a need for strong, forward looking ex ante advice, catalyzing mobilization of science and partnerships to link with the best science. However, it would not do the work of building partnerships which will be done by the Centers.*
- *Partnerships: Members appreciated the various entry points for partnerships, but noted that partnerships should always be for results and not for the sake of partnerships. They should be dynamic and not merely for transferring money. A template for mega-programs should specify results expected on the ground through partnerships and how they will be judged. Partnerships should also be thought of more broadly.*
- *Fiduciary and monitoring and evaluation arrangements: There is a need for strong fiduciary and M&E frameworks to ensure a robust System. It is important to build such a framework and get buy-in as well from donors and challenge donors to live up to the Paris Declaration on Aid*

- Effectiveness. A link between ex post evaluation and ex ante planning should be maintained.*
- *Dispute resolution: Members expressed a need for a dispute resolution mechanism as part of system governance that will give guidance in the event of disruptions to the System. A proposal for such a mechanism should be developed during transition.*
 - *Research vitality and no over centralization: These principles should be maintained to ensure adequate flexibility in mega-programs to give adequate space for innovation to take place, including attracting scientific talent.*
 - *Competition: A competitive process in mega-programs should be built in where it makes sense.*
 - *Transition: risk management is very important and needs to be taken into consideration. Expertise should be engaged to help address this issue during transition. The System must also protect scientific assets and programs to support these assets. Balance speed with caution going forward.*
 - *Members expressed thanks to the entire change team. The CGIAR Chair singled out Rodney Cooke and Jonathan Wadsworth, the Change Steering Team, and chairs of the working groups for their time and dedication to the effort.*

CGIAR Decisions

- I. *The CGIAR approved, in principle, the document A Revitalized CGIAR—A New Way Forward: The Integrated Reform Proposal and in particular, the following elements as a way of implementing reform:*
 1. *The CGIAR Vision “to reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition, and enhance ecosystem resilience through high-quality international agricultural research, partnership and leadership,” and Strategic Objectives: (a) Food for People, (b) Environment for People, and (c) Policies for People. The CGIAR is committed to provide public goods especially in support of developing countries in collaboration with NARS and other partners.*
 2. *A Consortium of Centers will be created that is a legal entity with a Board and CEO.*
 3. *A CGIAR Fund will be created that is composed of Fund investors and aims at providing multi-year financing. The Fund will have a Funders Summit and a Fund Council which will be a decision making body. The Fund Council will be chaired by the World Bank. The chair will be non-voting. The Fund Council will be organized such that it includes donors to the Fund from both the South and North with some stakeholders. Satisfactory fiduciary arrangements will be agreed between the parties.*
 4. *CGIAR investments will be results focused and time bound through a Strategy and Results Framework to be developed by the Consortium in consultation with partners and the Independent Science and Partnership Council. The Strategy and Results Framework will encompass all channels of funding, and will define how the CGIAR achieves its three strategic objectives. This*

Framework will be further expressed through mega-programs, which should be developed with strong participation from the South. Gender considerations will be fully integrated including clear indicators.

5. *The Funders Summit will approve the Strategy and Results Framework. It will meet every two years, and provide an opportunity to review performance of the overall System. In off-years all Funders will be invited to have dialogue with the Consortium, which could be linked to the Fund Council timetable.*
6. *Mutual accountability between funders and the Consortium, under the Strategy and Results Framework with full cost recovery, will be operationalized through performance contracts. As part of the overall governance, a dispute resolution mechanism will be developed in case of Systemwide disruptions.*
7. *Partnerships are essential for designing research programs and delivery of research outcomes and impact. Incentives for partnership through the Centers, including funding of partnerships, will be built into all levels of the System. Processes to introduce competition, where appropriate, will also be built into mega-programs.*
8. *An Independent Science and Partnership Council will support the Fund Council and the Funders Summit and advise the Consortium Board.*
9. *An independent evaluation arrangement will periodically take place at the Program and System levels. An independent evaluation on the reforms of the new CGIAR will be undertaken in three years.*
10. *A final CGIAR Business Meeting will take place in 2009 to sign off on the transition(time and venue to be decided). Thereafter, CGIAR will cease to organize Annual General Meetings. A biennial global conference on agricultural research for development will be organized by GFAR in collaboration with the Consortium and Independent Science and Partnership Council.*

The above reforms will ensure that the strategy and programs will operate in the context of the international agricultural research for development architecture. The arrangements will enable the Consortium of Centers to speak with a single voice and provide leadership in the international arena.

- II. *The CGIAR decided that during transition changes will be scrutinized and implemented to ensure they pass the following six tests:*
 1. *Clear strategic focus;*
 2. *Increase research output, outcome, and impact;*
 3. *Greater efficiency, effectiveness and relevance;*
 4. *Simplicity and clarity of governance;*
 5. *Enhanced decentralized decision making; and*
 6. *Active subsidiarity to capitalize on complementarities of the Centers.*

4.b. Change Management Transition Arrangements

Following approval of *A Revitalized CGIAR—A New Way Forward: The Integrated Reform Proposal*, the CGIAR discussed the transition arrangements described in Section V of the document. The CGIAR Chair pointed out that long discussions on the topic have taken place both at CST and ExCo 15 meetings, on the assumption that the reform proposal would be approved. It was agreed in the meetings that as soon as the proposal is approved the process will move quickly into an executive mode with the establishment of a small transition management team (TMT). The expectation is that the team will interact closely with stakeholders in terms of activities and therefore not operate in a vacuum. The purpose of the transition team is to provide leadership and effective management during the transition process. The team will be composed of the following:

Katherine Sierra – TMT Chair
Stephen Hall (Alliance Chair)
Mark Holderness (Executive Secretary, GFAR)
Jonathan Wadsworth (Co-chair of CST and representative of donors)
Ren Wang (CGIAR Director)

Rudy Rabbinge (Science Council Chair) will serve as adviser to the TMT chair and Ruben Echeverria¹ (Executive Director, SC Secretariat) will be an associate member of the team to help on issues related to the Science Council. The team will be supported by the CGIAR Secretariat with Iftikhar Mostafa serving as secretary to the team and also by independent consultants, including one professional who will specifically look at risk management.

The details of the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) of the TMT were presented by the Chair (see Attachment 2). Key milestones of the process were highlighted.

Discussion:

- Members expressed broad support for the transition arrangements described in the Integrated Reform Proposal, including the TOR and composition of the TMT (Attachment 2).
- Given the fact that FAO is currently hosting three CGIAR-related entities (SC Secretariat, Alliance Office, and GFAR Secretariat), it was suggested that the future relationship with FAO be considered both in the TOR and in the composition of the team.
- Members supported the proposal to delegate decision making authority to ExCo during the transition phase; in this regard, it was suggested that ExCo's role be spelled out more clearly. ExCo should continue to welcome attendance of non-ExCo members of the CGIAR as observers in the meetings.
- Members reiterated their request to be well informed and involved during the transition process. An information and communication system to involve all

¹ Following AGM08, upon the appointment of Ruben Echeverria to the post of CIAT Director General, Derek Byerlee (SPIA Chair, Science Council) has been appointed as associate member of TMT (see Attachment 2).

- concerned should be put in place, and periodic reports to ExCo or more broadly to the stakeholders should be made. Some Members would need help from TMT to answer questions expected to be posed by policy makers and budget agencies about the new CGIAR, e.g. on cost savings and increased level of effectiveness and efficiency.
- Formulation of an overarching and unified charter received strong support from Members; it would give a strong new image for the CGIAR System. As the TMT works to develop a new charter, it is important that the global role of the CGIAR System be emphasized.
 - The notion of simplification in the Integrated Reform Proposal and the possibility of merging of Centers were reiterated; TMT should think about how to formulate the charter in referring to Centers in this context.
 - There is an urgent need to design and get the CGIAR Fund up and running as soon as possible. Some of the Fund-related issues that need to be addressed include: clarity on the institutional investment window of the Fund, currency and sustainable investment policy in the Fund, and a suggestion to explore innovative financing.
 - A plea to consider the realities and economic situation of developing country members in setting the minimum level of contributions to the Fund was made; this was pointed out as a critical issue in the promotion of effective partnerships in the new CGIAR.
 - On the strategy and results framework and mega-programs, articulation of the demand side in the formulation of the research agenda would need further clarification. Documents on the development of the strategy and results framework and on how the Centers are developing the mega-programs should be shared as soon as they are ready.
 - It is crucial to give GFAR the means and capacity to fulfill its important role; it would be necessary to include the fast-track revitalization of GFAR in the transition phase. The first conference on agricultural research for development is suggested to be held in early 2010.
 - There is an urgent need for information on the cost sharing arrangements for the transition phase so that funders could take it into consideration in their own budget plans. Cost should be kept at a minimum and should not take resources away from research.
 - There is a need to specify where the work of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) should be located in the new CGIAR System.

Conclusions and Decisions:

Members agreed with the proposed transition arrangements and would like to help to get them implemented. The TOR of the Transition Management Team (TMT) was broadly endorsed. In approving the transition arrangements the following notations were made:

- *Members approved the delegation of decision-making authority to ExCo during the transition period; it is important to have a clear decision-making framework. ExCo meetings will continue to be open to all CGIAR Members as observers.*

- *TMT will make periodic reports on the progress of implementation of the transition plan; one-page reports will be provided on a regular basis and a Q&A on the CGIAR web site will be posted and updated regularly. Drafts of documents will also be shared as soon as they become available.*
- *TMT will ensure that a communication strategy for the transition process be formulated as soon as possible.*
- *The development of a single unifying charter for the new CGIAR was endorsed to give the System a unified vision, high aspiration and branding strategy.*
- *On the composition and TOR of TMT: FAO will be brought in as an associate member; the CGIAR Chair requested FAO to provide the name of its representative. TMT should make sure that the global positioning of the new CGIAR is considered in going forward and in developing a new charter. (See Attachment 2)*
- *On the Fund: A large number of donors expressed interest in contributing to the Fund. Donors are invited to give an early indication of interest so that they could be included early in the design process. The following are specific actions that need to be undertaken: addressing currency exchange rate fluctuation issues and their management; transitioning of the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), making sure that there is no gap in funding Centers and their programs.*
- *On mega-programs: The terms of reference for the preparation of such programs should include precision on articulating demand for the programs.*
- *There is a need to look at the value-added coming from the reform program. The cost estimates are to be done by the Alliance with a note that costs should consider not only the added cost but all costs (i.e., a broad based cost-benefit analysis).*
- *A plan for revitalization of GFAR should be developed.*
- *The Science Forum which will be held in June 2009 will not be a prototype global conference on agricultural research for development.*
- *The role and place of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee in the System needs to be decided.*
- *Financial contributions of the following donors to the change management initiative were acknowledged and appreciated: Canada, China, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Switzerland, Syngenta Foundation, United Kingdom, and World Bank. USA provided in-kind contribution. A proposal will be prepared quickly for donors to consider contributing to defray the cost of the transition phase. Most of the cost is associated with the setting up of the consortium and building or revitalizing GFAR; the Fund cost will be covered mostly by the World Bank through a specialized fund.*
- *It was decided that a final CGIAR Business Meeting will be held, likely in conjunction with the second meeting of ExCo in late 2009.*
- *The transition plan should include a risk assessment, and the TMT should consider contacting an expert to provide advice on the matter.*

5. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan

R. Rabbinge presented an overview of the SC commentary on 2009-2011 Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) for Centers and Challenge Programs; Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the 2009 Financing Plan.

The SC is tasked to enhance and promote the quality, relevance and impact of science in the CGIAR. Its independent assessment and advice on the MTPs of Centers and CPs is the CGIAR's principal mechanism for the assessment of the relevance of research. SC reviews the plans for programmatic content and relevance; significant program changes following EPMRs and changes in strategic plans for opportunities for synergies among Centers and CPs to improve efficiency and for clarity in planning.

R. Rabbinge noted that the current MTPs follow a logframe to establish links from output through outcomes to impacts, as opposed to a previous time when MTPs were used only as a means to justify the annual budget. Today, the MTP is an evolving document that serves three main purposes: 1) an internal document linked to internal planning and monitoring of Centers; 2) a tool for Centers to communicate with each other about joint research and planning; and 3) a tool accessible to the outside world presenting the individual Centers' work and the CGIAR's joint research agenda (for donors to get more insight of what is happening and what can be expected from the CGIAR research agenda).

In conclusion, he noted that there has been a great improvement in the focus of the research as seen in the MTPs. Centers have now accepted the MTP as a tool for planning and monitoring progress, internally and externally, with clearly defined aims and objectives.

S. Tata presented a summary of the investment proposals and financing plan for the 2009 CGIAR research agenda.

He gave a progress report on ExCo follow-up on the liquidity and reserve indicators of Centers. He reported that since 2002, Centers that have been flagged for different deficiencies have shown improvement in their financial performance, except CIAT which remains in red-flagged status. However, an update on the CIAT transition plan shows that CIAT's financial health and performance has improved relative to where it was in February 2008, although still significantly below the CGIAR recommended targets.

S. Tata presented the evolving context in which the plans were developed by Centers and CPs in order to assess the risks and opportunities for the realization of the 2009 CGIAR Financing Plan. Internally, CGIAR is undergoing transformational reforms that are expected to affect its research orientation, the way it will be financed (through a central fund) and the way resources will be allocated (programmatically through performance contracts). Externally, the System faces the food price crisis, the ongoing international financial crisis, and the challenge of currency movements. Although Centers and CPs could not take these developments onboard during preparation of their financing plans,

these developments will affect the amount of financial resources that will be available to finance the research agenda for 2009.

He summarized the investment proposal noting that \$576 million to implement the proposed research agenda is needed. Financing of the agenda is estimated to come from \$521 million in investor grants, \$20 million from Center income and \$35 million from Center reserves and other sources (other sources refer to grants still under negotiation that cannot be attributed to specific investors).

Discussion:

- One member expressed appreciation of the proactive manner in which the CGIAR Secretariat finance team had responded to their queries on the Financing Plan.
- The effect of exchange rate fluctuations on projected contributions was raised by several Members. The financing plan presented (which was developed by the Centers in June 2008) was based on numbers that are now likely to be very different given the recent fluctuations.
- One Member noted that, as a result of exchange movements, it can not commit to the contribution indicated in the presented financing plan.
- Given exchange fluctuations and other external factors cited in the presentation, some Members expressed reservations about approving the plan as presented. It was suggested that numbers be updated and include different scenarios based on different exchange rates.
- Quantitative data on CIAT's status and expected time frame to achieve CGIAR recommended financial target was requested.
- S. Tata responded that when the CIAT transition plan was developed at the beginning of 2008 it projected ending 2008 with a 18 days of reserves. As a result of both internal and external measures, CIAT now projects ending 2008 with 30 days of reserves. With respect to when the Center might emerge from its financial difficulties, he indicated that it would be difficult to project with any precision as this will be dependent on a number of internal and external variables. K. Sierra added that after her meeting with the CIAT board a couple of months ago, she is comfortable with progress the Center has made in improving financial health, the appointment of the new board and progress in hiring a new Director General. Lastly, R. Rabbinge also expressed optimism about CIAT's future prospects based on its new strategic directions currently under development.
- There was a suggestion for the ExCo Ad Hoc Committee on Finance to be tasked with reviewing a revised financing plan, to be prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat, and associated risks.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Members thanked the SC Chair for the SC commentary report on MTPs and commended SC for its guidance in improving science of the CGIAR.*
- *Members also thanked the CGIAR Secretariat for its report on the 2009 Financing Plan. The Secretariat was requested to update the draft plan with current numbers, including in donation currencies with present exchange rates. A section should also be included with different scenarios based on different*

exchange rates. The plan should then be circulated to the Membership for virtual approval.

- *The ExCo Ad Hoc Committee on Finance was tasked to virtually review and report to ExCo in May 2009 on the status of finances in the System taking into consideration issues raised at AGM08.*

6. Other Business

Future CGIAR Meetings

R. Wang presented the following proposed dates for upcoming meetings:

1. ExCo 16: Mid-May 2009, venue to be determined
2. ExCo 17: Mid-October 2009, venue to be determined
3. Conference on Agricultural Research for Development/Funders Summit, Early 2010 (tentative), Montpellier, France

As decided during discussion of item 4.b. Change Management Transition Arrangements above, a final Business Meeting will also be organized in late 2009. The first conference on agricultural research for development would be organized in early 2010 in Montpellier, France.

R. Rabbinge also noted that Emile Frison is ending his tenure as AE Chair and thanked and commended him for his service and collaboration with SC. SC looks forward to working with incoming AE Chair Stephen Hall.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The CGIAR agreed to organize a final Business Meeting in late 2009, likely linked with ExCo 17. Time and venue will be communicated to Members when available.*

7. Closing Session

K. Sierra closed the meeting by thanking Members for their active participation and contributions to a very fruitful meeting. She highlighted the achievements of the meeting regarding change management and thanked everyone who contributed to the process.

She concluded by thanking the Government of Mozambique for their warm hospitality, Minister Massinge and the Ministry of Science and Technology, and the support from the Mozambique World Bank office. She acknowledged the tremendous amount of work from colleagues in the CGIAR Secretariat in organizing the meeting, and also from the SC Secretariat and System Office.

The meeting was gaveled to a close.

Response to the Findings and Recommendations of the Independent Review of the CGIAR System

The report of the Independent Review of the CGIAR System, *Bringing together the best of science and the best of development*, was presented and discussed at the 15th meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council (ExCo) held on October 1-2, 2008, in Lisbon, Portugal and at the CGIAR Annual General Meeting held on December 4-5, 2008, in Maputo, Mozambique.

The CGIAR congratulated and thanked the Independent Review Panel for the report, for its depth, and for the professionalism in conducting the evaluation. It expressed broad agreement with the Panel's overall recommendations. It was recognized that the full report included a rich analysis of many key issues pertinent to the topics covered in the evaluation panel's terms of reference, along with suggestions on course of action that the CGIAR could take. The CGIAR-endorsed responses to the overall findings and recommendations of the review are given below.

On Key Findings:

The CGIAR welcomes the Panel's recognition of the System's contributions to international agricultural research and the high rates of return on investment that have been generated. The Panel pointed out that this has been particularly evident from studies on impact of crop genetic improvement research in Asia and biological control research in Sub-Saharan Africa. Along with contributions from research on natural resources management, livestock, fisheries, forest management, and policy, the resulting productivity enhancement and rural livelihood improvement demonstrate the benefits resulting from CGIAR research, both regionally and globally.

The CGIAR recently commissioned the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) for a study on the potential impacts or benefits of scaling up research. The IFPRI paper, *“International Agriculture Research for Food Security, Poverty Reduction and the Environment: What to Expect from Scaling Up CGIAR Investments and “Best Bet” Programs”*, estimates high payoff from increased public investment in agricultural research. If the increased CGIAR investment is targeted at maximizing total agricultural output, the focus of the investment would be placed in East and Southeast Asia, resulting in an increase in output growth coming from research and development from 0.5 to 1.5 percentage points and a reduction of the number of people living under \$1 per day by 204 million by 2020. If, on the other hand, the target is on poverty reduction, the focus of the increased investment would be in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, and the total agricultural output growth would be slightly less and 282 million people would be lifted out of poverty by 2020.

An important issue singled out by the Review Panel was the inadequate manner by which intellectual property (IP) protection has been handled at the Center level. The CGIAR agrees that intellectual property management needs greater attention as the Centers' external environment is rapidly changing. CGIAR supports the suggestion that the Centers need to better understand and stay up-to-date on the agricultural intellectual property rights environment at the national and international level. It heeds the advice to play a more significant role, for instance, in the ongoing negotiations of the Convention on Biological Diversity on access to genetic resources. CGIAR expects that with the creation of a Centers' Consortium, a more consistent approach to IP management across the System could be adopted, and that there is also sufficient leverage for exploring novel proprietary models to agricultural research.

The greater part of the review was focused on partnerships, governance, and funding mechanisms. These are the same key issues that the Change Management Process has focused on, and the Change Management teams benefited immensely from the studies and analyses conducted by the Independent Review. It took a hard look at the overall findings of the Review, namely: "a) the need for the CGIAR to take a more strategic approach to partnership, b) the Centers being in a quiet financial crisis, and c) dysfunctional governance and management which constrain the System's potential." Responses related to these findings and on the adoption of a gender strategy are included in the responses to the individual recommendations below.

The interactions that took place between the Review Panel and the Change Management Steering Team (CST) and Working Groups enabled an effective cross-fertilization of ideas. The product of such exchanges is a set of recommendations that are elaborated in the Change Steering Team's report, *A Revitalized CGIAR – A New Way Forward: The Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal*. The key elements of the proposal have been endorsed at AGM08. The following responses to the Independent Review's key recommendations are based on the results of the analysis and conclusions elaborated in the proposal.

On Recommendations:

1. Rebalance the Center-donor partnership to sustain the CGIAR's unique contributions.

The CGIAR reaffirms its commitment to the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Monterey Consensus – ownership, alignment, harmonization, mutual accountability, and management for results – which were also confirmed at the Accra High Level Forum in September 2008 and its Accra Agenda for Action.

CGIAR is conscious that positive impact from its change management process can only be sustained if supplementary ambitious investments in agriculture and rural development materialize, particularly in national agricultural research and extension systems. Joining up with the G8 Food Crisis Expert Group and the Global Donor

Platform for Rural Development, CGIAR Members confirm their commitment in supporting the Comprehensive Framework of Action and the Global Partnership on Agriculture and Food.

CGIAR broadly agrees with the recommendation, and recognizes the critical need for rebalancing the partnership not only between Centers and donors but also between Centers/donors and other partners in the production and delivery of international public goods (e.g. NARS, CSOs, ARIs, private sector). The unique contributions of the CGIAR for improving food security and reducing poverty can be sustained in the long term only through such partnerships. The importance of these partnerships was also recognized by the panel in Recommendation 6 below.

The Change Management Process has developed “foundation pieces” for a reformed CGIAR which are aligned with the recommendation of the Independent Review Panel. The changes envision a new partnership compact through a clearer separation of “doers” from the “funders”. It would involve

- (i) the establishment of a legally constituted Consortium of Centers that is accountable for the delivery of high quality results by the Centers and their partners,
- (ii) a new CGIAR Fund to support the research of the Consortium and its partners,
- (iii) the development of a strategy and results frameworks by the Consortium, through an inclusive and consultative process involving the funders and other partners, and
- (iv) designated funding in the programs to encourage the Centers to work with partners to achieve the CGIAR objectives within the results framework.

The CGIAR believes that this will constitute a major step towards more balanced partnership in the conduct of international agricultural research for development. In reaffirming its commitment to the principles of the Paris Declaration, the CGIAR considers that the original founding principles - donor sovereignty, Center’s independence and consensus decision-making - no longer apply.

2. Establish a legally structured Consortium of Centers.

CGIAR agrees with the main thrust of this recommendation, i.e., the establishment of a new legal entity that would serve as an umbrella body for the Centers. Having an authoritative body that is empowered to represent the Centers and act on their behalf on issues of common interest would streamline management and increase efficiency. CGIAR also recognizes that the success of the Consortium would depend on the willingness of the Centers, collectively, to delegate their authority to the Consortium in a number of areas and on whether they each agree to abide by the decisions of the

Consortium on important matters such as mergers or formation of clusters of the Centers. The Alliance has indicated that there is strong collective will among the Centers to make the Consortium concept work. However, it needs to be emphasized that the authority of a central Consortium board has to be balanced with the need for subsidiarity for decisions on scientific matters to ensure that the Centers continue to be empowered for innovation.

The CGIAR would like to stress that one major reason for the creation of a Consortium is to be able to generate structural change in the Centers to optimize the mandates and management efficiency and delivery capacity, including possible consolidation of the Center governance and management units.

The Independent Review conceives the Consortium as an entity that is "owned by the Centers, governed by a Board chosen by them." Some concerns have been expressed that such an arrangement could create a conflict of interest situation. For this reason, a tripartite nominating committee with donor, Center and partner representation was suggested by the CST to ensure that Board members have the confidence of everyone in the partnership. This selection and nomination process is subject to further consideration.

3. Establish a CGIAR Fund for Agricultural Research

CGIAR appreciates the Panel's thorough review of resource mobilization and financial management of the CGIAR. The CGIAR concurs with the Panel's overall assessment of the flat real trend in CGIAR funding, and the decline in unrestricted as a percentage of total funding. It agrees that these trends posed financial management challenges to the Centers, led to dispersion of efforts, and adversely affected the System's programmatic coherence. Changes in the funding practices of CGIAR Members have led to changes in business practices at the Centers as the financial flexibility provided by unrestricted resources decreased. This challenge and the painful consequence of failure to adapt have been observed in several Centers over the last several years.

The CGIAR agrees with the Panel that a new CGIAR Fund should be established as an outcome of the CGIAR reform. As indicated by the Panel, a collectively agreed strategy and results framework should guide the allocation of resources from the new Fund. The overall principles of how the Fund will be structured and operate have been developed through the Change Management Process, taking into account the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel, the report of Change Management Working Group on Funding Mechanisms, and stakeholder consultations.

The Independent Review suggested that the Fund takes a multiyear replenishment approach. While the idea has merits for further deliberation, the CGIAR feels that this approach may be constrained by current policies and procedures of other donors, hence risking the continued support of these donors especially during the transition

phase. The new Fund Council will need to carefully examine the pros and cons of the replenishment model and all options for the most effective strategy for resource mobilization to ensure adequate and stable funding to support the thematic programs, the Centers and their partners.

The CGIAR notes that there is a great deal of similarity between the findings and recommendations of the Independent Review and those of the Working Group on Funding Mechanisms of the Change Management Process. In particular, both reports have noted a need for full cost recovery on all projects, common financial reporting systems across the Centers, transparency regarding financing of all projects, and predictability and harmonization of funding. In addition, the Centers may benefit from placing a minimum size on small grants.

For the past year, the issues of full cost recovery on restricted projects and the increase in the benchmark for reserves have been exhaustively discussed in the System. The recently endorsed new minimum reserves benchmark of 90 days is less than the 180 days recommended by the Panel. This is expected to be reviewed by the Consortium.

On the Challenge Programs (CPs), the overall observation by the Panel that they did not encourage revenue growth for the System is debatable. Previous analysis has shown that some new funds were brought in by traditional donors to support the CPs. Also, the CPs did not just absorb funding that otherwise would have gone to the Centers. Over the past five years, 70 percent of total CP funding has gone to the Centers. The CGIAR notes that many NARS partners have voiced their positive experiences with the CPs as new platforms for partnership and innovation. It is expected that the CPs will be integrated into the “Mega-Programs” under the new CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework, or become the core of new “Mega-Programs”, with streamlined governance mechanisms.

In response to the Review Panel’s recommendation that the CPs be subject to annual financial audits as distinct entities, the CGIAR Secretariat facilitated direct discussions between the CPs and the Review Panel’s finance consultants following the Panel’s release of the draft report. It shared with the Panel its own comments which included feedback from the finance colleagues in Centers and CPs on the report’s analysis. They noted that, in their assessment, all CP expenditures are already subject to annual audit through the audited statements of the relevant Centers and institutions.

The CGIAR endorsed a way forward to address this issue. The Secretariat has initiated discussions with the World Bank’s Operations Services Financial Management unit to include CPs in its upcoming fiduciary accountability assessment of CGIAR Centers receiving World Bank funds. This assessment will assist the design and implementation of the fiduciary accountability framework of the Mega Programs emerging from the CGIAR change process, including appropriate framework for audit, consistent with resolving the concerns by the Review Panel.

4. Support the Consortium and CGIAR Fund with a science advisory board and an independent evaluation unit.

The CGIAR accepts the recommendation to develop a strategy and results framework which will serve as a link between the Fund and the Consortium, two components of the integrated reform proposal that emerged from the Change Management Process. Under the proposal, the development of such a framework is the responsibility of the Consortium with advice from a scientific advisory body. However, this scientific advisory body, called Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC), differs from the Science Advisory Board that the Independent Review panel has recommended to establish in that the body is also expected to provide advice on effective networking and partnerships with development partners and advanced research institutions, in addition to its scientific advisory role.

The CGIAR fully recognizes the need for and the value of independent evaluation in various facets of its work. In order to streamline evaluations and reviews at the System level, especially to avoid individual donors conducting their reviews and evaluation on the programs they each fund, it will be necessary to establish a credible and truly independent evaluation and review mechanism for the thematic programs at the System level. For example, it is envisaged that the “Mega-Programs” will be subject to independent evaluation every 4-5 years. The Fund Council will make arrangements for independent review panels that will conduct the evaluations. External program and management reviews of the Centers are expected to be commissioned by the Consortium.

5. The Consortium and the Fund adopt a gender strategy based on accountability for integrating gender in the work of partnerships.

CGIAR welcomes the Panel’s comments on the extent to which the CGIAR has made important progress in addressing gender issues across the System. It agrees with the observation that the CGIAR has not fully integrated gender into its research and outreach mandates. It needs to improve “accountability through more gender analysis and performance measurement and reporting,” and take proactive measures to increase women’s access to farming inputs and to improve the health and nutritional needs of women and girls, as suggested by the Panel.

More specifically, CGIAR agrees with the Panel’s recommendation to develop a gender strategy based on accountability. Rather than approaching gender issues on an *ad hoc* basis, as issues of behavior or perception, the need is for a broader systematic approach that focuses on integrating gender in the work of Centers and their partners. The gender strategy will be useful to the Consortium and its partners as a guiding principle in the development of future "Mega-programs" and as a yardstick in gauging impact.

CGIAR also agrees that internal gender and diversity at the workplace needs stronger commitment by the System, with adequate data collection and analysis, as well as performance monitoring and accountability. At the System level there is already an attempt to demonstrate accountability and set incentives for more diversity in Center staffing through the CGIAR Performance Measurement System (PMS). The PMS monitors four indicators of diversity on an annual basis that are being reported in the CGIAR Annual Report.

6. The Consortium and the CGIAR Fund together take a more strategic approach to partnerships with other actors in the production and delivery of international public goods.

The CGIAR accepts this recommendation and agrees that strategic partnerships at all levels of CGIAR's activities are crucial to achieving maximum impact. It recognizes the need for complementarity to the entire international public goods delivery system, both within and outside the CGIAR. Given the critical importance of the challenges highlighted by the food price crisis and their particular relevance to partner countries, notably in Sub-Saharan Africa, that can only be addressed through full partnerships with other research institutions and in collaboration with development institutions. The formulation of a robust multi-dimensional strategy on partnerships will be one of the major tasks of the new CGIAR. This requires a new understanding or "compact" not only between Centers and donors, but also between Centers/donors and their partners at the regional, sub-regional, and national levels.

The Consortium, the Fund and the ISPC are expected to show greater sensitivity to strengthening and sustaining partnerships, paying particular attention to partners' expectations. There have been many past (and current) successful partnerships at the Center level; the challenge going forward is to leverage these partnerships at the System level to create synergies, reduce overlap, and ensure adoption of scientific technological advances on the ground. One enabling partnership mechanism that can be considered, for example, is the creation of special funding at the "Mega Program" level for partners participation as well as to ensure bringing the best of science to serve the CGIAR's broader goals and objectives.

The CGIAR agrees to the Independent Review's suggestion on the role that the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) is envisaged to play in promoting and enabling effective partnerships and dialogue between the CGIAR and its partners/stakeholders. The CGIAR would like to see a revitalized GFAR as the most appropriate institutional mechanism to facilitate stakeholder engagement. GFAR is expected to organize a biennial global conference on agricultural research for development in collaboration with the Consortium. The conference will provide a platform for interactions among the donors, the Consortium, partners, and other stakeholders on important global and regional issues with implications on agriculture and agricultural research for development. It is a mechanism that will provide input for the System's strategy and results framework.

CGIAR Transition Management Team (TMT)

Introduction

At its Annual General Meeting (AGM) in Mozambique in December 2008, the CGIAR Membership discussed the Integrated Reform Proposal. Following approval of the proposal in principle by the CGIAR members, a Transition Management Team (TMT) led by the CGIAR Chair was established.

Purpose

The purpose of the TMT is to provide leadership to keep the CGIAR transition process on track, which will include the establishment and functioning of the Consortium and the CGIAR Fund (Fund). In implementing the transitional arrangements, the TMT will articulate the next level of detail of the reform and ensure that each proposed change adds value to a new and improved CGIAR that is more effective in delivering positive development outcomes and higher impacts on poverty and hunger.

TMT

The Transition Management Team (TMT) will be led by Katherine Sierra, CGIAR Chair and comprise the following members:

- Stephen Hall
- Mark Holderness
- Jonathan Wadsworth
- Ren Wang

Iftikhar Mostafa will be the secretary to the TMT.

Rudy Rabbinge will be the advisor to the TMT Chair. The following associate members of the TMT will be called upon, as needed, to provide specific advice:

- Isabel Alvarez (FAO), to advise on connecting the new CGIAR with multilateral organizations
- Derek Byerlee (SPIA, Science Council), to advise on scientific issues
- Vicki Wilde (CGIAR Gender & Diversity Program), to advise on gender and diversity issues

Terms of Reference

The TMT will articulate the next level of detail of the CGIAR reform by bringing people together and linking between different groups/task teams during the implementation phase. In particular, the TMT will undertake the following:

Systemwide

1. Lead the establishment of the New CGIAR based on the agreed foundation pieces.
2. Ensure continued effort for building trust and empathy among shareholders, partners, Centers and stakeholders.
3. Ensure that the new CGIAR is more outward looking and connected with multilateral organizations.
4. Facilitate the development of Strategy & Results Framework, which will highlight greater specificity of the three Strategic Objectives of the new CGIAR.
5. Define the independent evaluation process for the new CGIAR.
6. Elaborate on the roles and responsibilities of the ISPC.
7. Develop a third party dispute resolution arrangement, if there is a breakdown in the CGIAR system.
8. Determine the role and place of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee in the System.
9. Ensure the development of a single unifying charter for the new CGIAR covering both the Consortium and the Fund. In formulating the charter, Center mergers should be anticipated.
10. Estimate the cost of the reform effort.
11. Manage overall risk during transition.

Consortium

12. Review of the draft terms of reference (TORs) for the consultancies needed for the creation of the Consortium.
13. Facilitate timely completion of the design and charter of the Consortium.
14. Ensure that the 'candidate' mega-programs are ready by the due date and are aligned with the CGIAR's three Strategic Objectives.
15. Ensure that the mega-programs are developed with strong participation from the South.
16. Ensure that gender considerations are fully integrated in the mega-programs with clear indicators.

Global conference on agriculture research for development

17. Identify the changes needed in skills and behaviors in the CGIAR system for building long-term and mutually beneficial partnerships.
18. Ensure timely preparation and holding of the biennial global conference on agricultural research for development.

CGIAR Fund

19. Ensure the establishment of the CGIAR Fund at the World Bank.
20. Ensure the design of the CGIAR Fund goals.
21. Ensure timely completion of the charters and rules of procedure of the Funders' Summit and the Fund Council.
22. Facilitate the appointment of the inaugural Fund Council.
23. Oversee the development of a prototype performance contract (between the Fund Council and Consortium Board), which will be collectively drawn up by the Consortium Board and the Fund Office.
24. Ensure that the fiduciary goals are achieved by all the parties involved.

Communication

25. Develop a communication strategy on the progress of the transition as soon as possible:
 - Brief ExCo regularly on the progress of the transition process with one-page reports.
 - Communicate regularly the progress on implementation to all the partners.
 - Post and update regularly a Q&A regarding the progress of the transition process on the CGIAR website.

In addition, the TMT will ensure that the CGIAR change process passes the following six critical tests:

1. *Clear strategic focus*
2. *Increased research output, outcome and impact*
3. *Greater efficiency, effectiveness and relevance*
4. *Simplicity and clarity of governance*
5. *Enhanced decentralized decision making; and*
6. *Active subsidiarity to capitalize on complementarities of the Centers*

Summary: CGIAR Member Feedback on AGM08

AGM08 Stakeholders Meeting Assessment	Average
1. The Stakeholders Meeting (Science Forum) was a productive use of my time. (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)	5.075
2. The Stakeholder meeting session I attended and enjoyed the most (i.e., the most productive use of my time) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Opening Ceremony b. Ministerial Roundtable c. Global Challenges—An Evolving Context for Agricultural Research d. Alliance and Partner Roundtable e. Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture f. CGIAR Science Awards g. Field Trip 	1 1 21 7 4 1 2
3. The Stakeholder meeting session I attended and enjoyed the second most (i.e., the most productive use of my time) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Opening Ceremony b. Ministerial Roundtable c. Global Challenges—An Evolving Context for Agricultural Research d. Alliance and Partner Roundtable e. Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture f. CGIAR Science Awards g. Field Trip 	3 1 10 8 4 4 6
4. The Stakeholders Meeting should allocate more, the same, or less time to plenary sessions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less Time b. Same Time c. More Time 	12 13 8
5. The Stakeholders Meeting should allocate more, the same, or less time to interactions at exhibits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less Time b. Same Time c. More Time 	6 16 10
6. The Stakeholders Meeting should allocate more, the same, or less time to break-out sessions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less Time b. Same Time c. More Time 	12 16 3

AGM08 Business Meeting Agenda Items

	Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient. 1=not enough 4=just about right 7=too much	CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item. 1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree nor disagree 7=agree strongly	Outcome as summarized accurately reflects the discussion. 1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree, nor disagree 7=agree strongly
AGM07 Agenda Item	Average	Average	Average
2.a. Updates	4.333	5.578	6.108
3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System	3.944	5.589	6.25
4.a. Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal	4.205	5.567	6.394
4.b. Change Management Transition Arrangements	4.486	6.111	6.424
5. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan	4.181	4.939	5.942

Full AGM08 Feedback Results available at http://www.cgiar.org/meetings/agm08/agm08_business.html