

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Fourteenth Meeting of the Executive Council

May 13-14, 2008

Ottawa, Canada

Summary Record of Proceedings



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
June 9, 2008*

Acronyms Used

AE	Alliance Executive of CGIAR Centers
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ARI	Advanced Research Institute
CAC	Sustainable Agricultural Development in Central Asia and the Caucasus
CAPRI	Collective Action and Property Rights
CCER	Center Commissioned External Review
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
CPER	Challenge Program External Review
CPWF	Challenge Program on Water and Food
CP	CGIAR Challenge Program
CST	Change Steering Team
CWANA	Central and West Asia and North Africa
DG	Director General
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ExCo	CGIAR Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FORAGRO	Foro de las Américas para la Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Center
IICT	Instituto de InvestigaçãO Científica Tropical
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IP	Intellectual Property
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDTF	World Bank Multi Donor Trust Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTP	Medium-Term Plan
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NRM	Natural Resource Management

OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PM	Performance Measurement
PSC	Private Sector Committee
RWC	Rice and Wheat Consortiun
SC	Science Council
SGRP	Systemwide Genetic Resources Program
SLP	Systemwide Livestock Program
SPIA	SC Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWEP	Systemwide and Ecoregional Program
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
WG	Working Group

Contents

ExCo 14 Conclusions and Recommendations	iv
1. Opening Session.....	1
2. CGIAR Status Report	1
2.a. Report from Director.....	1
2.b. Performance Measurement System: Preliminary 2007 Results.....	3
2.c. Financial Matters.....	5
3. Challenge Programs	6
3.a. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPEP).....	6
4. Independent Review of the CGIAR System	9
5. CGIAR Change Management Process.....	9
6. Science Council and Program Matters.....	13
7. Challenge Programs	15
7.a. Challenge Programs: Governance Guidelines/Principles	15
7.b. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals	16
8. Evaluation	18
8.a. Follow-up to CIAT EPMR.....	18
8.b. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR	19
8.c. SWEPs Meta-Review.....	19
9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee.....	21
10. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers	22
11. Planning ExCo Business	23
12. Other Business	23
13. Closing Session.....	23
Attachments	
List of Participants	24
Agenda	26
Summary: ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 14.....	28

All documents for ExCo 14 are available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/exco14/index.html>

ExCo 14 Conclusions and Recommendations

2.a. Report from Director

Conclusion:

- *The Chair thanked R. Zeigler for his presentation.*
- *The CGIAR must act immediately in response to the current world food crisis. Two messages are necessary:
 - 1) *A CGIAR position on policy messages needed for the medium- and long-term that focuses on existing resources and competencies, and what could be done if they were doubled.*
 - 2) *An action plan that focuses on an immediate response to the crisis.**
- *The Chair requested the Alliance to work with the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat to develop a statement within the next 10 days that responds to the short-term needs, and positions the CGIAR for the medium- and long-terms.*

2.b. Performance Measurement System: Preliminary 2007 Results

Conclusion:

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

2.c. Financial Matters

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *There is an observable trend toward improved financial health of the System.*
- *Monitoring of overall financial health and trends should continue and the possible need for additional indicators on financial health explored.*
- *As in the past, ExCo requested the CGIAR Chair to write to Centers with red-flagged and deep green-flagged indicators requesting a plan of action for redress.*
- *Prior to the next ExCo, the CGIAR Secretariat was requested to work with the World Bank to solve the issue of holding and disbursing contributions in the MDTF in euros.*

- *A clear understanding and established criteria for identifying restricted and unrestricted funding should be used by the Centers.*
- *There should be more thought and clarity sought on the nature of partnerships, ensuring that they are being measured correctly and the extent to which funding reaches partners.*
- *ExCo approved the TORs and composition of the ExCo Ad Hoc committee on Finance through AGM08.*

3.a. Challenge Program External Reviews

Follow-up to CPWF CPER

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *There is a need for a clear up-front discussion and understanding of the time period for CPs. This should consider the possibility that such time scale may differ among CPs. For CPWF, this may be ascertained by the thinking in the original proposal approved by the CGIAR.*
- *A broader discussion on CPs and what the CGIAR seeks to achieve through them will be part of the change management process.*

Generation CPER

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo congratulated Generation CP for a very favorable external review report, and endorsed the Generation CPER recommendations including those from SC and CGIAR Secretariat.*
- *In accordance with the decision at AGM07 regarding the handling of the external review reports— i.e., CGIAR delegated to ExCo decision making authority on external reviews—ExCo will report back to the CGIAR along with an overview of lessons learned from the external reviews of both Centers and CPs.*

4. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the Independent Review Panel for its report and looks forward to the review findings and advice it will offer.*
- *The final report (due September 17, 2008) will be an essential input into the CGIAR Change Management Process.*

5. CGIAR Change Management Process

Conclusion and ExCo Guidance:

- *ExCo thanked WG 1 for its achievement and the leadership of Jean Lebel.*
- *ExCo endorsed the direction of the visioning work, with the following provisos:*
 - 1) *The proposed Mission statement should be shortened and improved.*

- 2) *On external positioning of the CGIAR, an analysis has been undertaken, but it needs to be articulated clearly, i.e. describe the evolution of scientific research organizations and where the CGIAR fits in vis-à-vis other organizations.*
 - 3) *Table 2, which defines strategic objectives, should be refined to indicate where the CGIAR will position itself as a leader, a partner, or a follower.*
 - 4) *Positioning of CGIAR should advocate not only for the CGIAR, but for agricultural research as a whole, including efforts of other organizations.*
- *ExCo expressed support for the progress to date of WGs 2-4, while recognizing the tremendous amount of work that still needs to be done in a short timeframe.*
 - *WGs 2-4 should continue to engage with young people to benefit from their perspective.*
 - *Cultural aspects that will be important to the success of the change management process should be instilled deeper in the organization. The Alliance should discuss this at its upcoming meeting with DGs on how to bring this dimension to their staffs.*
 - *Stakeholder engagement is essential as the process moves forward.*

6. Science Council and Program Matters

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the SC for its report and expressed support for its work and activities.*
- *ExCo requested the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to prepare a short one-page note on the meaning and implications of having SC policy. It is important for ExCo to understand the implications of policy that would determine actions to be taken by the Centers versus issues to be discussed and debated.*
- *ExCo endorsed SC Option 1 on System Priority framework plans, i.e. to map priority areas for research to the strategic objectives identified by the Change Management Process.*
- *ExCo recommended development of appropriate performance indicators suitable for Challenge Programs.*
- *ExCo requested SC to develop a clear plan for mobilizing science that outlines the end goal, the pathways to achieve it, including the role of SC and how to link with GFAR, ARIs and other partners. Metrics on mobilization of science are needed, but within a logical framework.*
- *ExCo requested the SC to work with the CGIAR Secretariat Communications Team to develop a note on recent steps taken to reduce bureaucracy in the System.*

7.a. Challenge Programs: Governance Guidelines/Principles

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked M. Palenberg for his report and presentation.*
- *ExCo endorsed the suggested principles for CP governance. They should be considered for evaluating future CPs, and provide guidance to CPs and their host*

organizations on the principles and practices that ExCo would like to see. If the governance arrangement is outside these principles, proponents will need to give the reasons and the benchmarks indicating that the alternative would be successful.

- *There are fundamental questions about CPs that need to be addressed (e.g., what do we want from the CPs? How do we want to position them as an approach to implementing the CGIAR research agenda? Does the CGIAR want further growth in the CPs?).*

7.b. Challenge Programs (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals

Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security Challenge Program

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo expressed appreciation to the Science Council for its assessment of the CP proposal on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security.*
- *ExCo endorsed the proposal for approval by the CGIAR, with the caveat that the proponents would consider the comments and recommendation of the Science Council as well as those expressed by ExCo. The CP proposal will be sent to the CGIAR for virtual approval. The proponents should prepare a revised document and submit to SC prior to its September 2008 meeting that responds to the issues raised by SC and ExCo.*

Oasis Challenge Program to Combat Dryland Degradation Across the Developing World

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo agreed with SC's assessment and did not endorse the Oasis CP proposal.*
- *In accordance with ExCo's previous decision concerning Cycle 2 CP proposals, the proposal will be withdrawn from further consideration.*

8.a. Follow-up to CIAT EPMR

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

While recognizing the efforts of the current CIAT Board Chair and interim Director General to stabilize the Center, ExCo came to the following conclusions:

- *ExCo members unanimously expressed deep concern about the continuing governance problems at CIAT and indicated that a board change is necessary.*
- *ExCo requested the CGIAR Chair to discuss with CIAT leadership a careful and deliberate plan to reconstitute the board and re-launch the search process for a new Director General.*

8.b. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo thanked ICRAF for the report, and expressed support for the programmatic and institutional measures that have been taken.*

- *ExCo agreed that special progress reports from the Center are no longer necessary.*

8.c. SWEPs Meta-Review

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked SC for its assessment of SWEPs and also expressed appreciation to the Alliance for its response.*
- *The SWEP meta-review report will be shared with WG 2 of the change management process as additional reference for its work.*
- *There was agreement on the classification of future systemwide initiatives proposed by SC and the recommendations on current SWEPs.*
- *The Alliance, in consultation with their partners and SWEP donors, will use the information provided by the SC assessment to make decisions on the phasing out of some SWEPs, particularly the eco-regional programs.*

9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo members were requested to submit comments on the current draft on intellectual assets, in the form of text proposals, to the GRPC Secretary (DG of Bioversity) by June 15, 2008.*
- *GRPC will submit by September 17, 2008 a revised version of the document to ExCo for further discussion.*

10. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the Alliance for its report and expressed support for the work of the Alliance.*

1. Opening Session

CGIAR Chair Kathy Sierra opened the meeting and welcomed ExCo members to ExCo 14. She thanked International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the Government of Canada and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for hosting the meeting, and all of the support provided. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1.)

Welcome by Host Country

Diane Jacovella, Vice President, Sectors and Global Partnerships Branch, CIDA welcomed ExCo to Canada. She highlighted Canada's strong support to the CGIAR. She noted that the accomplishments of the CGIAR speak for themselves, but due to changes in the international development landscape, the CGIAR must reinvent itself to meet the needs of the new landscape. She sensed an air of excitement around the change management process and looks forward to the outcome of the new ideas and fresh thinking that are contributing to the process. CIDA is pleased to work with the CGIAR and looks forward to collaborating in the future.

Jean Lebel, Director, Environment and Natural Resources, IDRC, welcomed ExCo on behalf of IDRC President Maureen O'Neil. He highlighted IDRC support to the CGIAR and also noted the support of other foundations to the organization. IDRC looks forward to the long term impact on poverty reduction of the organization, and is supportive of the ongoing change efforts.

K. Sierra thanked Canada and IDRC for their support to the CGIAR and welcomed their words of support.

Election of Meeting Co-Chair

Jonathan Wadsworth (United Kingdom) was nominated and elected Co-chair of the meeting.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted without amendments (see Attachment 2).

2. CGIAR Status Report

2.a. Report from Director

Ren Wang noted that time for the report from the Director had been truncated to accommodate an important discussion on the current world food situation. Hard copies of an update on communications and outreach, and the CGIAR business follow-up

checklist were distributed to members. He briefly highlighted the fact that CGIAR media coverage in the past year has increased substantially. Concerning the CGIAR business follow-up checklist, all items have either been completed or are on track.

World Food Situation

R. Wang introduced IRRI Director General (DG) Robert Zeigler to give a brief presentation on the current world food situation.

R. Zeigler highlighted the relationship between investment in research and development and food production variations. The 20 years from the early 1960s to the early 1980s saw rapid increases in rice and wheat research followed by a decade of stable and adequate funding. This healthy investment led to steady gains in productivity and 30 years of reliable surpluses. As a result, the international community became complacent about food availability and reduced funding to agricultural research. A clear decline in productivity followed the decline in investment after a 10 year time lag.

Zeigler argued that we need to learn from this experience in responding to the current food crisis. It is essential to regain a focus on food productivity, recognizing the close relationship between food security and poverty reduction, and implement strategies to achieve inclusive economic growth. Equally important is to preserve the resource base for present and future generations.

Immediately it is necessary to implement targeted food price subsidies to reduce the pressure on poor consumers and establish food safety nets.

In the medium term it is necessary to ensure appropriate fertilizer use and the availability of healthy, productive seeds to farmers and fully exploit the results of past investments – ensuring that currently available technologies reach farmers' fields. Yield gaps must be closed through increase in adoption of improved seeds, and pest and soil fertility management. Technologies which reduce post harvest losses must be widely available.

Longer term, irrigation systems must be rehabilitated and communication systems improved to ensure that farmers have access to market information and knowledge of improved farming systems. Extension systems need to be reexamined and the potential for increasing participation of the private sector thoroughly investigated. New technologies to increase yield potential, pest resistance and natural resource management must be developed. Investment in the development of the next generation of agricultural scientists is also essential. Finally, a conducive policy environment must be established.

In 2005 IFPRI estimated that a 50 percent increase in agricultural productivity growth is necessary to reach Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1, and that \$16 billion per annum investment in agricultural research, rural roads, irrigation systems from 2005 – 2015 would be necessary to achieve the necessary growth. He argued that in 2008, given the reduced value in the US\$ and changed economic and social circumstances, up to \$30 billion per annum for the next 10 – 15 years may be necessary.

In closing, Zeigler quoted from the New York Times of March 2008: “The Green Revolution is generally believed to have saved over one billion lives over five decades, making it arguably the single most effective philanthropic initiative in human history.” And the Economist of April 2008: “Since the way to feed the world is not to bring more land under cultivation, but to increase yields, science is crucial.”

Discussion:

- The CGIAR should develop a System response to the crisis, including to undertake an analysis to develop short-, medium-, and long-term responses.
- An immediate action plan is necessary in order to get the attention of policy and decision makers while they are focused on the problem.
- The crisis represents an opportunity for the CGIAR to reach out to other communities, e.g. global relief community, that are interested in the technologies the CGIAR has to offer, and vice versa.

Conclusion:

- *The Chair thanked R. Zeigler for his presentation.*
- *The CGIAR must act immediately in response to the current world food crisis. Two messages are necessary:*
 - 1) *A CGIAR position on policy messages needed for the medium- and long-term that focuses on existing resources and competencies, and what could be done if they were doubled.*
 - 2) *An action plan that focuses on an immediate response to the crisis.*
- *The Chair requested the Alliance to work with the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat to develop a statement within the next 10 days that responds to the short-term needs, and positions the CGIAR for the medium- and long-terms.*

2.b. Performance Measurement System: Preliminary 2007 Results

Ruben Echeverria (SC Secretariat) and Maria Lara (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the results of the 2007 Performance Measurement (PM) exercise. The PM System measures Center performance along three major dimensions of performance: 1) Results, 2) Potential to Perform, and 3) Stakeholder Perceptions.

R. Echeverria reported on the 2007 performance data for the results indicators (Outputs, Outcome and Impact), followed by M. Lara’s presentation on selected indicators of potential to perform (Culture of Learning and Change and Institutional Health).

At AGM07, the CGIAR endorsed ExCo’s recommendation for the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to submit a proposal that “does not devalue but optimizes the utility of the PM System, maintains incentives, and ensures high output goals.” This was in response to the SC suggestion to de-link Medium-Term Plan (MTP) output planning from the PM System. The SC and CGIAR Secretariats prepared think pieces for discussion by ExCo. The SC piece argued that the current system does not provide incentives for Centers to set ambitious output targets, and suggests the indicators to be moved to the new MTP

database, known as CG Map. The CGIAR Secretariat piece argued that, rather than dropping the indicator from the current system, it should be improved to make the system more robust. The CGIAR Secretariat also suggested a workshop with SC, the Alliance and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) experts to further discuss the outputs indicator, and other ways to improve the PM System.

Discussion:

- There is need to simplify the PM System and to determine the most useful indicators.
- It is important to determine useful benchmarks when measuring achievements.
- The PM System seeks to measure the impact at the ground level. Therefore, improved and effective impact indicators are needed.
- The PM System managers should consult with Members to identify their needs and perceptions, and results they would like included in the PM System.
- Centers have been slow to show changes. The PM System should incentivize Centers to improve performance at a faster pace.
- Outputs are easier to measure than outcomes and impacts.
- Having high achievement should not be a reason to drop the output indicators. It could be seen as an advantage as Members may perceive such high achievement positively.
- Politically, dropping the outputs indicator would not look good.
- The link between outputs, outcomes and impacts is not clear.
- There is a need to measure “size of impact” however, the PM System is not the best tool to do this or for the Centers to conduct a meta-analysis of their own impact.
- The PM System could be a good tool to improve the work and communication among national research institutions.

Conclusion:

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

2.c. Financial Matters

K. Sierra introduced the item by noting that the Draft 2007 CGIAR Financial Results was jointly produced by IRRI and the CGIAR Secretariat. Norman MacDonald (IRRI) presented the 2007 outcome.

Total CGIAR System revenues in 2007 were \$520 million, an increase of \$72 million from \$448 million in 2006. The increase in revenue was driven by increases in both contributions (from Members and non-members), and Center-earned income. Expenditure in 2007 was \$506 million, an increase of \$48 million over 2006. The net result was a surplus of \$14 million which was added to reserves. The 2007 outcome was presented in various dimensions.

Overall, there is a trend toward improved financial health across the System, but there are variations among Centers. The trend of increased restricted funding continued in 2007; however, the number of Centers with red-flagged financial indicators continued to decrease.

Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) presented on fiduciary accountability assessments, including on financial peer review, financial administration, and the external environment.

ExCo ad hoc Committee on Finance Terms of Reference and Composition

R. Wang introduced the item noting that at AGM07, the CGIAR Secretariat was requested to develop terms of reference (TOR) for the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Finance and suggested membership. Draft TORs were sent to ExCo for comment/approval in January 2008. Based on comments received, ExCo members preferred to discuss the TORs in a face-to-face meeting; however, the draft TORs (dated January 18, 2008) were used on a provisional basis at the special CGIAR meeting on CIAT, held in February 2008.

Discussion:

- In order to avoid exchange rate fluctuations, is it possible for the World Bank Multi-lateral Development Trust Fund (MDTF) to hold and disburse funds in euros when contributions are received in euros?
- Concern was raised about the level of contributions to Latin America vis-à-vis other regions.
- The financial monitoring plan implemented a few years ago identifies “red flags” in the System. Although it is reassuring that there has been a reduced number of Centers with red flagged financial indicators, are the current indicators adequate?
- There seems to be a discrepancy between the presentation and written report on the amount of funding that goes to partner organizations. Clarification was requested.
- While Sub-Saharan Africa is a priority area, the CGIAR’s global focus is not lost, including the importance of other regions such as Latin America.

- CPs seem to have spent much less than they received during the year.
- There should be a systematic way to deal with exchange rate fluctuations.
- Clarification on levels of restricted versus unrestricted funding for individual Members was requested.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *There is an observable trend toward improved financial health of the System.*
- *Monitoring of overall financial health and trends should continue and the possible need for additional indicators on financial health explored.*
- *As in the past, ExCo requested the CGIAR Chair to write to Centers with red-flagged and deep green-flagged indicators requesting a plan of action for redress.*
- *Prior to the next ExCo, the CGIAR Secretariat was requested to work with the World Bank to solve the issue of holding and disbursing contributions in the MDTF in euros.*
- *A clear understanding and established criteria for identifying restricted and unrestricted funding should be used by the Centers.*
- *There should be more thought and clarity sought on the nature of partnerships, ensuring that they are being measured correctly and the extent to which funding reaches partners.*
- *ExCo approved the TORs and composition of the ExCo Ad Hoc committee on Finance through AGM08.*

3. Challenge Programs

3.a. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPER)

Follow-up to CPWF CPER

Rudy Rabbinge presented the main points in the SC commentary on the Challenge Program on Water and Food (CPWF) Phase 2 plan. SC is pleased with the general direction that CPWF is taking in its research plan. He highlighted several topics including the clearer vision and strategy, and the need to further develop criteria to select research topics, among others.

R. Wang presented comments from the CGIAR Secretariat, focusing on governance and management aspects of the CPWF plan, noting that the CGIAR Secretariat supports the changes to be made in the management structure of the program.

Jonathan Woolley, CPWF Director, raised the question of time scale for the program, and emphasized that the initial plan developed and the phase 2 plan presented to SC and ExCo were based on the idea of a third phase to consolidate beyond the second phase. If the decision is to have only two phases, then changes need to be made in the present plan.

On the need to define clearer output lines, he pointed out that CPWF is trying to work in innovation systems to capture the benefits of partnerships; there is a limit to what could

be defined in terms of outputs that could be obtained at the beginning of the work, and that has to be taken into account in monitoring and evaluation of the program.

Discussion:

- It is important to reduce the size of the steering committee to make it more accountable and efficient.
- The importance of ensuring that CPWF, as well as all other CPs, are time-bound programs was emphasized. The issue should be further discussed in the context of the change management process and findings of the review of the System.
- In response to a question about the partnership with non-agricultural research communities including UN activities on water, the CPWF Director outlined how CPWF is bringing in such organizations/programs into some of their component projects. The CP is also moving to a smaller board in line with the CPER recommendation.
- The CPWF plans to define the extent to which it would interact with the proposed CP on climate change and any other programs that look at aspects of global change.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *There is a need for a clear up-front discussion and understanding of the time period for CPs. This should consider the possibility that such time scale may differ among CPs. For CPWF, this may be ascertained by the thinking in the original proposal approved by the CGIAR.*
- *A broader discussion on CPs and what the CGIAR seeks to achieve through them will be part of the change management process.*

Generation CPER

R. Rabbinge presented SC comments on the external review of the Generation CP. Based on the findings of the external review, he cited the Generation CP as an example of a good CP. SC endorsed all of the program-related recommendations of the review panel, and is pleased that the CP steering committee and management have agreed to implement them.

R. Wang presented the CGIAR Secretariat comments on the governance, management and finance aspects of the external review. The CGIAR Secretariat agreed with the Panel on the merits of an independent governance body for Generation CP and compliments the CP Program Steering Committee for having undertaken steps to implement a governance reform process. The CGIAR Secretariat also concurred with the panel's overall assessment of the Generation CP's successful fund raising and sound financial management, resulting in good financial health.

Jean Marcel Ribaut, Director of Generation CP, indicated that the Generation CP steering committee and management were pleased with the very professional manner with which the review was conducted, and with the positive results. He added that the review adds value to the programmatic as well as the governance and management aspects of the CP

operations. The CP also appreciated the fact that the panel chair was from the private sector, who shared his analysis from the program product delivery perspective which the CP found very helpful.

The Generation CP, having learned from experience in Phase 1 and with advice from the review panel and SC, will make adjustments for clearly defined program-level objectives and fewer and more focused projects in Phase 2. It will identify indicators of success, develop an exit strategy and workplan to address sustainability and delivery of products.

The shift in Generation CP governance is very much on track and discussions are ongoing to clearly define the roles of the program steering committee and stakeholder committee including options for alignment.

Discussion:

- Generation CP could serve as a model that can inform the discussion on change in the CGIAR System, especially on how a good proportion of the work of the System may be organized in the future, e.g. the top level work on genomics and bioinformatics, and how knowledge could be transferred to benefit crop breeding work particularly at the NARS level. The program is an excellent case study for the change management working group on partnerships (WG 2).
- GFAR partnership in the Generation CP stakeholder committee is appreciated.
- SC's recommendation concerning stewardship of the CP's reference collections needs to be taken up in the context of the long-term sustainability plan that is currently being drawn up for CGIAR germplasm collections; the reference collections which are part of the gene banks may need some special flagging and given priority for further work. From the Alliance's perspective, what would need more attention now in terms of conservation and stewardship are the genetic stocks developed and handled by individual scientists in the Centers.
- Generation CP provides a lesson on the way future CPs may be considered, i.e. give them an opportunity to create a broad platform for research ideas and for partnership at the beginning and then look towards more precision after having gained some experience.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo congratulated Generation CP for a very favorable external review report, and endorsed the Generation CPER recommendations including those from SC and CGIAR Secretariat.*
- *In accordance with the decision at AGM07 regarding the handling of the external review reports— i.e., CGIAR delegated to ExCo decision making authority on external reviews—ExCo will report back to the CGIAR along with an overview of lessons learned from the external reviews of both Centers and CPs.*

4. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

Independent Review Panel Chair Elizabeth McAllister updated ExCo on progress to date of the Independent Review of the CGIAR System. An interim progress report was submitted in March 2008. The research phase of the review is currently ongoing and a survey of stakeholders has been completed. Some findings of the survey were presented, along with some of the panel's working hypotheses. She concluded by noting some of the next steps in the process. A consultation draft will be available at the end of July 2008, followed by a stakeholder consultation workshop in early September and a final report by September 17, 2008.

Discussion:

- ExCo complimented the independent review panel for the work completed to date, and finds the work very interesting.
- Questions were raised on what advice the review could offer to the change management process, its insights on organization of the CGIAR, and to what extent research organizations are responsible for impacts and results.
- A question was also raised on whether farmers and/or farmers' organizations will be involved in the stakeholder workshop in September.
- E. McAllister responded to issues raised, stating that the change management process presents a tremendous opportunity to the CGIAR to make the organization less complex and more efficient with fewer bureaucratic encumbrances. The panel has examined models and criteria to assess results and impacts. It is clear the CGIAR must have effective partnerships in order to achieve results. The panel is currently identifying groups and individuals who should attend the stakeholder workshop, and requested ExCo for suggestions.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the Independent Review Panel for its report and looks forward to the review findings and advice it will offer.*
- *The final report (due September 17, 2008) will be an essential input into the CGIAR Change Management Process.*

5. CGIAR Change Management Process

Change Steering Team (CST) Chair Rodney Cooke (IFAD) updated ExCo on the CGIAR Change Management Process. He presented a brief background on the process and the case for change, noting several factors in the external environment that have put agriculture for development and food security in the spotlight of international attention. It presents an opportunity for the CGIAR for change. He noted progress to date and highlighted objectives for 2008 that include development of formal change plans, facilitating a cultural transformation in the System, and stakeholder management and communication necessary for implementation of change plans.

Following the kick-off retreat for the process in February 2008, Working Group (WG) 1 (Visioning) began its work, including a visioning retreat in April 2008, culminating in a report titled “Visioning the Future of the CGIAR” presented at the change retreat in Ottawa that preceded ExCo 14.

Progress Update and Recommendations from Working Group 1: Visioning

WG 1 Chair J. Lebel (IDRC) presented on the work of the WG and its report to ExCo. Based on findings of the WG, he outlined the global development goals and challenges identified. These formed the basis of the proposed CGIAR mission, vision and strategic objectives presented at the Ottawa change retreat. These were refined based on feedback received at the retreat:

Mission:

To be the proactive and forward-looking global leader, catalyst and partner of choice in the conduct of international agricultural research for development, harnessing human ingenuity and innovation, leading to the empowerment of the poor, especially women, to overcome poverty, hunger and ill-health and to sustainably manage and enhance natural resources in the face of climatic and socio-economic change.

Global Vision:

A world free of poverty and hunger, supported by healthy and resilient ecosystems.

CGIAR Vision:

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

Strategic Objectives:

Food for People: Mobilize science and technology to accelerate sustainable increases in productivity and production of healthy food by and for the poor.

Environment for People: Mobilize science and technology to conserve, enhance and sustainably use natural resources and biodiversity to improve the livelihoods of the poor, and as a response to climate change.

Innovation for People: Mobilize science and technology to stimulate institutional innovation and enabling policies for pro-poor agricultural growth and gender equity.

To operationalize the vision and objectives, identification of key opportunities and development of an appropriate business model are necessary. WG 1 offered guidance to the other WGs in this area. Based on ExCo and CST feedback, the WG will revise the

document and consult further with stakeholders. The CST will also provide guidance to other WGs to connect their work to the outcome of the visioning exercise.

He concluded by thanking the members of WG 1 for their commitment to the process and all of their hard work over the past few months.

Progress Update from Working Groups 2-4 and the Path Forward in 2008

CST Co-chair J. Wadsworth updated ExCo on progress of WGs 2-4. For each WG, he outlined the target and objectives, progress to date, and project plans for 2008. The products of the WGs will be used as inputs at the next change retreat in September 2008.

Monika Szamko from Trium Group, the consultant firm hired to facilitate the change management process, discussed the three pillars of the change process: 1) formal change plans, 2) strengthening trust and empathy, and 3) strengthening the System mindset.

Concluding the presentation, R. Wang outlined the path forward for the remainder of 2008. Prior to the retreat in September, the CST and WG 1 will refine the visioning work based on stakeholder input, WGs 2-4 will develop change options based on the visioning work, and all teams will incorporate findings of the external review in August. Following the change retreat, the change plans will be finalized for presentation to ExCo in October 2008, and refined again for presentation at AGM08. He also updated ExCo on the funding facility established to help pay for the independent review of the System and the Change Management Process.

Discussion:

- Overall, the process is on track; however, concern was expressed that the process is perhaps too inward looking. Involving partners and others from outside the inner circle is necessary.
- The report should make explicit what specifically will be different for the new CGIAR. The pro-poor focus and goal of poverty reduction should be sharpened in the paper. Additionally, reformed modes of operation are very important, rather than only a change in focus or activities.
- A realistic assessment of the role of the CGIAR in the global agricultural research system, including opinions from other actors, is also important.
- The relationship with GFAR, the role of partnerships, and the inclusion of stakeholders is very important to the change process. These should be further explored and clarified to ensure the focus is correct
- Table 2 on strategic objectives should be elaborated more clearly, including indicating where CGIAR is a leader, a partner, or a follower.
- Effective communication of CGIAR efforts will be essential to the success of the change management process. Wording of the proposed Mission statement may need to be shortened in order to communicate more effectively.
- J. Lebel thanked ExCo for its feedback. He noted the importance of various points raised, especially the positioning of the CGIAR in the global agricultural research system. The process thus far has consulted widely with stakeholders and

several young professionals with fresh perspectives were incorporated into the WG to benefit from their perspective. Further input from various stakeholders will be critical to success in the stakeholder engagement phase of the process, and he agreed with comments on the need for engagement with GFAR, regional fora, NARS, and other stakeholders. He noted that it is still a work in progress and will evolve as the process moves forward.

- The CGIAR Chair acknowledged the support from Members and thanked them for their contributions to the change management process and the independent review.
- The Alliance reaffirmed its commitment to the process and noted its input to the work of WG 1 and its active participation in other WGs. It will discuss the process at its upcoming meeting and is confident that the process will be successful.
- The current change management process should benefit from the experience of those who have gone through change exercises in the past, and use lessons from past successes and failures.
- Stakeholder consultations are crucial to the success of the process going forward. However, they can not all be done face to face. A communications strategy that makes use of electronic and other virtual means is essential.

Conclusion and ExCo Guidance:

- *ExCo thanked WG 1 for its achievement and the leadership of J. Lebel.*
- *ExCo endorsed the direction of the visioning work, with the following provisos:*
 - 5) *The proposed Mission statement should be shortened and improved.*
 - 6) *On external positioning of the CGIAR, an analysis has been undertaken, but it needs to be articulated clearly, i.e. describe the evolution of scientific research organizations and where the CGIAR fits in vis-à-vis other organizations.*
 - 7) *Table 2, which defines strategic objectives, should be refined to indicate where the CGIAR will position itself as a leader, a partner, or a follower.*
 - 8) *Positioning of CGIAR should advocate not only for the CGIAR, but for agricultural research as a whole, including efforts of other organizations.*
- *ExCo expressed support for the progress to date of WGs 2-4, while recognizing the tremendous amount of work that still needs to be done in a short timeframe.*
- *WGs 2-4 should continue to engage with young people to benefit from their perspective.*
- *Cultural aspects that will be important to the success of the change management process should be instilled deeper in the organization. The Alliance should discuss this at its upcoming meeting with DGs on how to bring this dimension to their staffs.*
- *Stakeholder engagement is essential as the process moves forward.*

6. Science Council and Program Matters

R. Rabbinge briefed ExCo on the main activities of the SC and the outcome of its meeting held in March/April 2008. The meeting was held in Nairobi, Kenya, jointly hosted by ICRAF and ILRI. It was a good opportunity to discuss agricultural research challenges in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), and other issues of importance to Africa.

The report covered activities on 1) monitoring and evaluation, 2) impact assessment, 3) priorities and strategies, 4) mobilizing global agricultural science, and 5) other ongoing activities, including various studies and participation at events of interest to the CGIAR. He concluded by noting newly appointed SC and standing panel members, and thanked outgoing SC/SPIA Chair Jim Ryan for his service to the SC, and welcoming incoming SC/SPIA Chair Derek Byerlee.

The presentation contained several SC recommendations/proposals of interest to ExCo in its oversight role:

1. SC recommended not enlarging the PM System to include indicators for CPs.
2. SC offered two options for developing the remaining framework plans for the System Priorities. SC expressed a preference for Option 1: map priority areas of research to the strategic objectives as defined by WG 1 (Visioning) of the CGIAR Change Management Process.
3. SC proposed waiting until next year to develop metrics on measuring the role of SC in mobilizing science.
4. SC proposed a policy statement on biofuels.

Metrics on Mainstreaming Mobilization of Science

At AGM07, the CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendation on proposed SC structure changes to mainstream mobilizing science into the work of the entire SC. CGIAR also requested SC to “determine what metrics to use to measure results of mainstreaming mobilization of science, and report back to ExCo on the results.” R. Rabbinge reported that the SC considers that its role for mobilizing science should be more as a catalyst to bring research institutes and others together to mobilize science and strengthen partnerships. The SC believes that it is too early to develop metrics on performance of mobilizing science. SC proposed to present to ExCo next year its suggestions on how to measure the role of the SC in mobilizing science.

Discussion:

- There is a need to determine whether the metrics on mobilizing science should measure the SC performance or the CGIAR performance.
- It was pointed out that one of the responsibilities of SC (as opposed to the previous Technical Advisory Committee) is mobilization of science. However, after five years there has not been much progress in this area and there is need for improvement. The SC chair commented that SC is aware of the challenges in this area and reminded ExCo of the reorganization of SC to mainstream catalyzing science mobilization into the entire SC.

- GFAR could be an important partner in mobilizing science.
- Position papers are extremely useful in the mobilization of global research. They are focused on current themes being discussed in the international arena and help the CGIAR to position itself in these discussions.
- It is important to determine whether the biofuels paper will determine the specific activities of the Centers. Biofuels is a controversial theme; clarification was requested on whether the SC statement should be endorsed by ExCo. The CGIAR Chair pointed out that policy statements have to be handled carefully in terms of what they mean for the System.
- The Alliance welcomed the recommendations on using Center-Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs) in a more targeted way and suggestions for reducing the number of institutional health indicators. Substantial work has gone into development of framework plans, but with the CGIAR Change Management Process, the goal posts have shifted. Guidance from ExCo on which direction to take is necessary.
- A narrative on how the products of the SC are used and their impact on research advancements is needed to help convince donors for more investment in agricultural research.
- R. Rabbinge responded to some of the questions raised during the discussion. He noted that a primary role of the SC is to raise awareness (i.e. politicize) of important issues. When arguments are clear and messages delivered effectively, political decisions by others will follow.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the SC for its report and expressed support for its work and activities.*
- *ExCo requested the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to prepare a short one-page note on the meaning and implications of having SC policy. It is important for ExCo to understand the implications of policy that would determine actions to be taken by the Centers versus issues to be discussed and debated.*
- *ExCo endorsed SC Option 1 on System Priority framework plans, i.e. to map priority areas for research to the strategic objectives identified by the Change Management Process.*
- *ExCo recommended development of appropriate performance indicators suitable for Challenge Programs.*
- *ExCo requested SC to develop a clear plan for mobilizing science that outlines the end goal, the pathways to achieve it, including the role of SC and how to link with GFAR, ARIs and other partners. Metrics on mobilization of science are needed, but within a logical framework.*
- *ExCo requested the SC to work with the CGIAR Secretariat Communications Team to develop a note on recent steps taken to reduce bureaucracy in the System.*

7. Challenge Programs

7.a. Challenge Programs: Governance Guidelines/Principles

During the discussion of CPERs at AGM07, the CGIAR concluded that it must consider a minimum set of standards and principles on governance for CPs. Markus Palenberg (Institute for Development Strategy), who was the governance panel member of the external reviews of three CPs (CPWF, HarvestPlus, and Generation), presented a think piece on CP governance, incorporating experience to date and lessons learned from the CPERs.

He suggested and elaborated on the following five principles for CP governance:

- Set up CPs as non-incorporated, hosted organizations
- Clarify responsibilities between CP and host on the governance and on the operational level
- Avoid unnecessary institutional representation in CP governance but respect legitimate host interests
- Establish an effective vertical chain of command
- Allow for the possibility of governance evolution during the CP's lifetime

Discussion:

- The two basic objectives for introducing the CP concept were noted, i.e. 1) to open up the CGIAR System, and 2) to serve as a mechanism that would enable the System to pursue some changes or renewal, i.e. a programmatic approach to implementing the CGIAR's research agenda. The second objective seems to have been lost in any subsequent discussion on CPs.
- While CPs have been successful in achieving the first objective above, they have introduced some cumbersome procedures, additional transaction costs, and elements of competition with Centers. Another important observation is that NARS and civil society organizations have not been given adequate opportunity to participate in competitive grants. The challenge is how to simplify the structures and processes. These are issues that the change management working group on governance and partnerships should look at.
- The Alliance is looking at a range of models for achieving the goal of opening up the System to a diverse range of partners without necessarily going through the CP route.
- The importance of the time-bound feature of CPs was reiterated. In M. Palenberg's view, the time-bound feature of the CPs has consequence for governance. It is linked to principle 1 in his report, i.e. the need for hosting by a Center or partner organization.
- Is a specific model for governance recommended, or will future CPs be allowed flexibility to develop their governance arrangements as long as the proposed principles are followed? M. Palenberg would not prescribe a specific model for CP governance and advised that some flexibility be allowed.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked M. Palenberg for his report and presentation.*
- *ExCo endorsed the suggested principles for CP governance. They should be considered for evaluating future CPs, and provide guidance to CPs and their host organizations on the principles and practices that ExCo would like to see. If the governance arrangement is outside these principles, proponents will need to give the reasons and the benchmarks indicating that the alternative would be successful.*
- *There are fundamental questions about CPs that need to be addressed (e.g., what do we want from the CPs? How do we want to position them as an approach to implementing the CGIAR research agenda? Does the CGIAR want further growth in the CPs?).*

7.b. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals

R. Rabbinge introduced the item and gave a summary of SC's comments on each of the two full proposals.

Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security Challenge Program

SC is pleased with the proposal as it stands and recommended its endorsement by ExCo. The proposal has many strengths (hence high potential for success), however, SC also identified some gaps.

Discussion:

- A CP on climate change should define scenarios for adaptation and mitigation and focus on impact on specific agro-ecologies. The CP should be time bound and activities that add value should be mainstreamed in Centers' research.
- The CP is designed to address issues that neither the CGIAR nor the Earth System Science Partnership community alone can address. It should build on the Centers' breeding and natural resource management (NRM) activities, which should continue to receive support from Members.
- SC's comments will be addressed in the initial or inception phase as soon as the implementing team is in place.
- It was clarified that the relationship between CGIAR activities and those to be undertaken under the proposed CP was elaborated in two papers that were made available for consideration in the preparation of the CP proposal.
- Clarification on the 50 percent overhead charge by a potential host organization was made by the Alliance.
- Strong support for approval of the CP was expressed by the European group.
- A fundamental question on the effectiveness of CPs was raised, pointing to the results of a survey conducted by the independent review of the CGIAR System.
- More time is needed to consider the CP proposal and get some of the fundamental questions about CPs addressed. Reservations were expressed on whether the CGIAR should launch a new CP; the change management process is pivotal on this question. It was also observed that the CP seems to compartmentalize climate

change research in the CGIAR. Preference to a System approach discussed at AGM07 and announced in Bali was expressed. A plea was made that the CGIAR should not lose sight of that initiative.

- CGIAR research activities on climate change in agriculture (which should not necessarily be through a CP) should target smallholder farmers and focus more on adaptation.
- The CGIAR Chair commented that our main goal is to make the climate change issue the heartland or “bread and butter” of the new CGIAR. There is a need to “jump start” it in terms of building relationships with the large community outside the CGIAR’s normal area of work. A CP on climate change could be an effective means of doing it.
- Noting the divergent views or positions taken by ExCo members, the CGIAR Director mentioned an alternative course that may be considered, i.e. to hold back and perhaps consider a systemwide program on climate change. However, he also pointed out the huge risks that the System is taking if a CGIAR CP on climate change would not go forward.
- On the question of timing, the SC chair indicated that the proposal could be approved earlier, i.e. not wait for the submission of a more detailed proposal incorporating SC’s comments. The recommended next steps could be undertaken at the inception phase as clarified by the Alliance.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo expressed appreciation to the Science Council for its assessment of the CP proposal on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security.*
- *ExCo endorsed the proposal for approval by the CGIAR, with the caveat that the proponents would consider the comments and recommendation of the Science Council as well as those expressed by ExCo. The CP proposal will be sent to the CGIAR for virtual approval. The proponents should prepare a revised document and submit to SC prior to its September 2008 meeting that responds to the issues raised by SC and ExCo.*

Oasis Challenge Program to Combat Dryland Degradation Across the Developing World

SC reaffirmed the importance of drylands and the need for a more ambitious agenda in this area, but found the proposal disappointing in making the case. The proponents have not sufficiently articulated the research challenge that could be best addressed by a CP. R. Rabbinge highlighted a number of gaps in the proposal which are elaborated in SC’s written commentary.

Discussion:

- Three questions should be considered: Is the proposal CP material? Is it crucial to do it now? Are we giving the proponents realistic information on what could be expected in the future?
- ExCo members agreed with the SC assessment of the CP.

- The CGIAR Director reminded ExCo of its decision at its last meeting, i.e. if ExCo does not find the proposal of sufficient quality then it will be withdrawn from further consideration.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo agreed with SC's assessment and did not endorse the Oasis CP proposal.*
- *In accordance with ExCo's previous decision concerning Cycle 2 CP proposals, the proposal will be withdrawn from further consideration.*

8. Evaluation

8.a. Follow-up to CIAT EPMR

As agreed at AGM07, a special meeting on CIAT was held in February 2008 to discuss details of its revised stabilization plan and make recommendations on next steps. The provisional membership of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Finance and other interested CGIAR Members were in attendance. Representatives from the Alliance and SC also attended the meeting. The special meeting concluded that the Center should appoint a new DG to put strong leadership in place, the stabilization plan should be revised to reflect the role and accountability of the board for the crisis, and a stabilization plan should be collectively supported by Members. R. Wang presented the full conclusions from the meeting.

Interim CIAT DG Geoff Hawtin updated ExCo on developments at the Center since the special meeting in February 2008. He stated that the Center has turned the corner on finances, and if there are no further shocks, by the end of the year the Center should break even and reserve levels would remain steady. A new DG was expected to be appointed by now, but this unfortunately did not take place. The CIAT Board has decided to re-open the search process in September 2008, with interviews scheduled for November 2008, at the next board meeting. Development of a new strategic plan is moving forward as planned. It is an open process and has support from the staff. It looks toward two main drivers of change: 1) the prospect of more centralized decision making at the CGIAR level, and 2) a focus on who the Center's major stakeholders are, i.e. a more global mix currently, or more focused regionally in Latin America. The new strategic plan places a focus on Latin America and a range of strategic options to position the Center appropriately, but still projects programs globally where appropriate. Useful discussions with regional partners have taken place and are ongoing to help determine the best way forward.

A paper for discussion on lessons learned was also commissioned by the CGIAR Secretariat following the AGM07 decision on what could have been done to avoid the current situation at CIAT. Liz Field, who served as the governance expert on the CIAT EPMR panel, presented the major findings of the paper via audio conference.

Discussion of this item by ExCo was held in closed session.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

While recognizing the efforts of the current CIAT Board Chair and interim Director General to stabilize the Center, ExCo came to the following conclusions:

- *ExCo members unanimously expressed deep concern about the continuing governance problems at CIAT and indicated that a board change is necessary.*
- *ExCo requested the CGIAR Chair to discuss with CIAT leadership a careful and deliberate plan to reconstitute the board and re-launch the search process for a new Director General.*

8.b. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR

As follow-up to the ICRAF 3rd EPMR, ExCo had requested progress reports from the ICRAF Board at subsequent meetings. ICRAF Board Chair Lynn Haight submitted a report to ExCo on progress on the EPMR recommendations and the current status of the Center in the areas of program, finance, management, and the board.

Discussion:

- ICRAF was commended for the achievements and progress made over the past few years; it was suggested that further follow-up reporting would not be necessary.
- Questions on programmatic collaboration and policy setting with CIFOR were raised, as well as issues of a non-programmatic nature.
- L. Haight clarified that programmatic talks with CIFOR have included liaising on strategic planning, joint board appointments, and other joint activities. A new director of strategic partnerships has also been appointed at the Center. Consolidation of non-programmatic services has also taken place with ILRI, also based in Nairobi. Research substations have also been consolidated and reduced in number.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo thanked ICRAF for the report, and expressed support for the programmatic and institutional measures that have been taken.*
- *ExCo agreed that special progress reports from the Center are no longer necessary.*

8.c. SWEPS Meta-Review

R. Rabbinge gave a brief background of the SC assessment of systemwide initiatives, indicating that it was an extension of the analysis made by an SC-commissioned meta-review of SWEPS, completed in 2007. The following were highlighted in the report:

- The assessment was carried out to determine if the current SWEPS are up to standard and serving their purposes and also to provide clear strategic recommendations about systemwide initiatives.
- The assessment found that some of the current SWEPS appear more viable than others in terms of strategy, operations and funding.

- Of the current SWEPs, the following were judged to be effective and recommended for continuation: Rice and Wheat Consortium (RWC), Sustainable Agricultural Development in Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC), Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI), Systemwide Genetic Resources Program (SGRP) and Systemwide Livestock Program (SLP).
- SC suggested three profiles for future systemwide initiatives, namely, coordination programs, systemwide NRM initiatives, and short term systemwide research task forces.
- SC also recommended that program monitoring of systemwide initiatives should be the responsibility of the convening or coordinating Center

E. Frison, highlighted the following points on behalf of the Alliance of CGIAR Centers:

- The Alliance agrees that SWEPs have been a useful instrument to bring the Centers together to address problems of common interest.
- It finds the typology suggested by SC helpful; however, there is a need for further thinking on some aspects.
- On the SWEPs that should be phased out, the Alliance Deputy Executives will discuss the SC recommendation in their June 2008 meeting and report back to the Alliance.
- On funding coordination mechanism, the Alliance still finds the support given by some Members necessary to get the SWEPs activities done.

Discussion:

- ExCo appreciated the SC assessment of SWEPs and its recommendations, not only on the current SWEPs, but also on a new classification or typology for future systemwide initiatives.
- Many of the recommendations in the meta-review are pertinent to and would be useful for the work of WG 2 (partnerships) of the change management process.
- On the suggestion that SWEPs should be time-bound, the Alliance responded that the nature of SWEPs in terms of the issues/problems they are addressing should determine the time frame of their implementation.
- A clarification was made on the Alliance's comment regarding the focus of SWEPs. In specifying some of the generic characteristics of future systemwide initiatives, the SC report indicated that a focus of such initiatives can be on scaling up and out. It was reaffirmed that SWEPs are part of the Centers core research activities and not as mechanisms for scaling up and out.
- Agreement was expressed on SC's recommendation that Centers involved in systemwide initiatives should be willing to provide the necessary funding to support coordination.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked SC for its assessment of SWEPs and also expressed appreciation to the Alliance for its response.*
- *The SWEP meta-review report will be shared with WG 2 of the change management process as additional reference for its work.*

- *There was agreement on the classification of future systemwide initiatives proposed by SC and the recommendations on current SWEPs.*
- *The Alliance, in consultation with their partners and SWEP donors, will use the information provided by the SC assessment to make decisions on the phasing out of some SWEPs, particularly the eco-regional programs.*

9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

Carlos Correa, GRPC Chair, gave a presentation on a draft policy of the Alliance of CGIAR Centers on Intellectual Assets. The draft is a product of an exercise intended to develop a new policy that would replace the 1996 Center statement or guidelines on intellectual property (IP). It embodies a new set of principles referring not only to intellectual property rights (IPR) but also, in a broader way, to intellectual assets. Some of the major reasons why it was necessary to review the earlier guidelines were as follows: technological changes and the need for Centers to obtain access to new technologies; expansion of IPR protection both in scope and geographically; opportunities for partnerships with the private sector; and the possibility of using special conditions for transferring products under development under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Discussion:

- GRPC was commended for its efforts in formulating a draft policy on intellectual assets.
- The Alliance pointed out that a review of past guidelines and policies showed a number of inconsistencies dealing with the same IP-related issues; the Centers need to have clarity on these important issues and have a common policy. With the general principle that Center intellectual assets are in the public domain, the draft policy addressed the following questions: a) in which case do we restrict access? b) in which case do we take out IP? and c) how should the financial component be handled?
- One specific question raised was how to make the policy operational.
- The need for clarity in the meaning of some of the terms used in the draft document was emphasized, e.g. intellectual assets, public NARS, etc. The document would also need to be more precise about “highly exceptional cases.”
- Much of the discussion centered on a question of procedure for moving the document forward, i.e. whether a revised and agreed version of the document would need to be endorsed by ExCo and sent to the CGIAR for formal adoption. It was pointed out that CGIAR formulates and promulgates general guidelines but not formal policies. The 1996 policy statement that the current draft document is meant to replace was issued by the Centers.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo members were requested to submit comments on the current draft on intellectual assets, in the form of text proposals, to the GRPC Secretary (DG of Bioversity) by June 15, 2008.*

- *GRPC will submit by September 17, 2008 a revised version of the document to ExCo for further discussion.*

10. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers

Alliance Executive (AE) Chair Emile Frison presented the report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers. Topics covered included Alliance contributions to the CGIAR Change Management Process, development of framework plans and the ongoing dialogue with SC on the remaining framework plans, its work on climate change in the context of the CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Climate Change launched by the CGIAR Chair in December 2007, and regional plans for collective action in SSA. He also highlighted development of an online tool, known as CG Map, for MTP reporting that is expected to be adopted by all Centers. It will allow users to see what is happening all across the System.

Recognizing the importance of biofuels and relevance to the CGIAR, he noted that nine CGIAR Centers have joined an Alliance Platform on Bioenergy. It seeks to build synergy and coherence between Centers on bioenergy research related to agricultural development. It could be used as an input to the change management process to help determine CGIAR's role and position on bioenergy. There is a similar platform on agriculture and health research to help highlight its position on the CGIAR research agenda.

Discussion:

- Support for the work of the Alliance was expressed, and for its collaborative efforts across the System.
- The issue of how CGIAR will position its work on use of non-food crops for bioenergy was raised. Production of bioenergy requires large economies of scale which poses challenges when working with small-scale poor farmers. The CGIAR must also consider how it will position itself in the context of the current global focus and debate on biofuels in the context of food security.
- The SC has debated this issue and made a position paper available. With the exception of sugar cane, it found that the production of biofuels on a large scale do not contribute significantly to the reduction of greenhouse gases. On a very small scale, production of bioenergy is found to be feasible and profitable to replace energy that is being imported. The CGIAR could make a contribution in such small scale cases, but the SC believes that it is not part of the core business of the CGIAR on a large scale. It is important to have a balanced view. The best way to produce bioenergy is through use of the photo chemical process, i.e. the first step of photosynthesis, which is more efficient.
- The Alliance clarified that the bioenergy platform is to explore what the role of CGIAR could be in this area.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the Alliance for its report and expressed support for the work of the Alliance.*

11. Planning ExCo Business

ExCo Business Agenda

A timetable showing the ExCo business agenda was made available to members for information.

Future Meetings

The next ExCo meeting is scheduled for October 1-2, 2008, in Lisbon, Portugal. Jorge Braga de Macedo (Portugal) informed ExCo that there will be a science conference on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of the Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical (IICT) on September 29-30, 2008, and ExCo is invited to attend. A program for the conference was distributed for information.

12. Other Business

There were no items added to Other Business.

13. Closing Session

Co-chair J. Wadsworth thanked IDRC and Canada for hosting ExCo, and for their hospitality and all of the support provided. In particular, he singled out J. Lebel and Ida St. Martin from IDRC for their help in organizing the meeting. He closed the meeting by thanking members for their participation. R. Wang and ExCo also expressed their appreciation to J. Wadsworth for agreeing to serve as co-chair. The meeting was gaveled to a close.

Attachment 1

List of Participants Thirteenth Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chair:</i>	Kathy Sierra	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Isabel Alvarez	FAO
	Mark Cackler	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>Alliance of CGIAR Centers:</i>	Emile Frison	AE Chair
<i>SC:</i>	Rudy Rabbinge	SC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Adel El-Beltagy	GFAR Chair
<u>OECD/DAC:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Rob Bertram	U.S.A.
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Wan-Soon Kim	Korea
<i>Europe</i>	Ruth Haug	Norway
	Marja-Liisa Tapio-Bistrom	Finland
	Jonathan Wadsworth	United Kingdom
<u>Developing Countries:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Elisio Contini	Brazil
<i>SSA</i>	B.Y. Abubakar	Nigeria (could not attend)
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Mangala Rai	India
<i>CWANA</i>	Jafar Khalghani	Iran (could not attend)
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Mario Allegri	FORAGRO
<u>Foundations:</u>	Marco Ferroni	Syngenta Foundation
<u>Partners:</u>		
<i>Civil Society</i>	TBD	
<i>Private Sector</i>	Bill Niebur	PSC Chair (could not attend)

Observers:

Charles Bailey	Ford Foundation
Keith Bezanson	CGIAR External Review
GK Chadha	CGIAR External Review
Helene Corneau	Canada
Carlos Correa	GRPC
Marlene Diekmann	Germany
Ruben Echeverria	Science Council Secretariat
Pierre Fabre	France
Lynn Haight	World AgroForestry Center
Charles Haines	Canada
Geoffrey Hawtin	CIAT
Mark Holderness	GFAR
Anne-Marie Izac	Alliance Office
Diane Jacovella	Canada
Jean-Luc Khalfaoui	European Commission
Jean Lebel	IDRC
Jorge Braga de Macedo	Portugal
Iain MacGillivray	Canada
Norman MacDonald	IRRI
Elizabeth McAllister	CGIAR External Review
Shantanu Mathur	IFAD
Karin Perkins	CGIAR External Review
Marina Puccioni	Italy
Jean-Marcel Ribaut	Generation Challenge Program
Jim Ryan	SC/SPIA
Ida St. Martin	IDRC
Jimmy Smith	World Bank
Meredith Soule	USA
Monika Szamko	Trium Group
Wijmand Van Ijssel	The Netherlands
Ken Watson	CGIAR External Review
Jonathan Woolley	CPWF
Robert Zeigler	IRRI

Executive Secretary, ExCo: Ren Wang

CGIAR Secretariat Support: Lystra Antoine
Fionna Douglas
Maria Eugenia Herrera Lara
Xiaoyue Hou
Manuel Lantin
Shey Tata
Feroza Vatcha
Jason Yauney

Agenda

1. Opening Session

- Welcome by Host Country
- Election of Meeting Co-Chair
- Adoption of the Agenda

2. CGIAR Status Report

2.a. Report from Director

- World Food Situation
- Discussion

2.b. Performance Measurement System: Preliminary 2007 Results

- SC/CGIAR Secretariat proposal on de-linking MTP output planning from PM System
- Discussion

2.c. Financial Matters

- 2007 Financial Report
- ExCo ad hoc Committee on Finance TOR and Composition
- Discussion and ExCo Decision

3. Challenge Programs

3.a. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPER)

- Follow-up to CPWF CPER
- Generation CPER
- Discussion and ExCo Decision

4. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

- Update
- Discussion

5. CGIAR Change Management Process

- Update
- Update from Working Group 1 on Visioning
- Discussion and ExCo Guidance

6. Science Council and Program Matters

- Report from SC
- Metrics on mainstreaming mobilization of science
- Discussion

7. Challenge Programs (cont'd)

7.a. Challenge Programs: Governance Guidelines/Principles
-- Discussion

7.b. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals
-- Introduction
-- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

8. Evaluation

8.a. Follow-up to CIAT EPMR
-- Introduction
-- Lessons Learned on CIAT
-- Discussion and ExCo Decision (Closed Session)

8.b. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMR
-- Discussion and ExCo Decision

8.c. SWEPs Meta-Review
-- Introduction
-- Discussion

9. Genetic Resource Policy Committee

-- Policy Guidelines on Income from Intellectual Property
-- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

10. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers

-- Discussion

11. Planning ExCo Business

-- ExCo Business Agenda
-- Future Meetings

12. Other Business

13. Closing Session

Summary: ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 14

ExCo 14 Agenda Item	Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.	ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.	Outcome as summarized accurately reflects the discussion.
	1=not enough 4=just about right 7=too much	1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree nor disagree 7=agree strongly	1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree, nor disagree 7=agree strongly
	Average	Average	Average
2.b. Performance Measurement System: Preliminary 2007 Results	4.36	5.43	5.93
2.c. Financial Matters	4.07	4.64	6.21
3.a. Challenge Program External Review	4.14	5.86	6.64
4. Independent Review of the CGIAR System	4.36	5.00	4.86
5. CGIAR Change Management Process	4.36	5.46	6.21
6. Science Council and Program	3.77	5.57	5.92
7.a. Challenge Programs Governance Guidelines/Principles	4.50	4.64	5.93
7.b. CP (Cycle 2) selection of Full Proposals	3.85	5.50	5.38
8.a. Follow-up to CIAT EPMP	4.17	5.85	6.67
8.b. Follow-up to ICRAF EPMP	4.38	5.77	6.15
8.c. SWEPS Meta-Review	4.00	5.14	6.00
9. Genetic Resources Policy Committee	4.40	4.60	5.50
10. Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers	3.89	4.56	5.67

ExCo 14 Feedback

(1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

	Average
1. Overall, the ExCo meeting was a productive use of my time.	5.78
2. Time available for the meeting allowed for an appropriate level of discussion and debate.	6
3. The meeting agenda included the most important issues facing the CGIAR.	6
4. ExCo members are knowledgeable about the CGIAR/ExCo business agenda.	5.56
5. The documentation provided enabled me to discuss and decide matters adequately.	5.89
6. I read all of the relevant documentation.	4.89
7. I have actively participated in ExCo 14 discussions.	6
8. The Chair encouraged full and open discussion and invited questions, including eliciting divergent views, and accurately summarized outcomes.	6
9. Overall, the decision making process at the ExCo meeting was effective.	5.78
10. CGIAR/ExCo recommendations and decisions are adequately followed-up by ExCo.	5.67
11. I find the use of the electronic assessment methodology during the meeting useful.	5.44

Full ExCo 14 Feedback Results available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/meetings.html>