

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Fifteenth Meeting of the Executive Council

October 1-2, 2008

Lisbon, Portugal

Summary Record of Proceedings



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
October 27, 2008*

Acronyms Used

ADE	Alliance Deputy Executive of CGIAR Centers
AE	Alliance Executive of CGIAR Centers
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ARI	Advanced Research Institute
AVRDC	The World Vegetable Center
AWARD	African Women in Agriculture Research and Development
CARD	Conference on Agricultural Research for Development
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CFO	Chief Finance Officer
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo
CIP	International Potato Center
CPWF	Challenge Program on Water and Food
CP	CGIAR Challenge Program
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
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
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FORAGRO	Foro de las Américas para la Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
HVC	High-Value Crops
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
ICT-KM	Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management
IICT	Instituto de InvestigaçãO Científica Tropical

IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IPG	International Public Good
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
ISPC	Independent Science and Partnerships Council
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTP	Medium-Term Plan
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PM	Performance Measurement
PRGA	Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
PSC	Private Sector Committee
SC	Science Council
SPIA	SC Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
TOR	Terms of Reference
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WG	Working Group

Contents

ExCo 15 Conclusions and Recommendations	iv
1. Opening Session.....	1
2. CGIAR Status Report	1
2.a. Updates.....	1
3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System	3
4. CGIAR Change Management Process.....	8
5. Performance Measurement System.....	15
6. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan	17
7. Genetic Resources Policy Committee.....	19
8. Challenge Programs	20
8.a. Challenge Programs (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals	20
8.b. Oversight of Challenge Programs	21
9. Other Business	22
10. Closing Session.....	22
Attachments	
List of Participants	23
Agenda	25
Summary: ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 15.....	27

All documents for ExCo 15 are available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/exco15/index.html>

ExCo 15 Conclusions and Recommendations

2.a. Updates

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the CGIAR Director, SC Chair, and Chair of the Alliance of CGIAR Centers for their reports, and requested the CGIAR Director to consider submitting a written report in future meetings.*
- *ExCo agreed on the need for an early external review of Challenge Programs.*
- *The “Best Bets” paper by IFPRI should be taken to the next step. The information contained in the paper should be used now and targeted to external audiences, including policy makers to show what returns will be as a result of investments in the CGIAR.*
- *Recruitment of the new SC member should consider gender balance and diversity (particularly candidates from developing countries), but the nomination process should await the outcome of the Change Management process.*
- *The CGIAR Chair will ask a small team to look at the draft AGM08 agenda and make any needed adjustments to reflect ExCo’s comments, e.g. positioning the CGIAR to respond to the food crisis, needs of Africa, etc.*

3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated and thanked the Independent Review Panel for the report, for its depth, and for the professionalism in conducting the evaluation.*
- *ExCo expressed broad agreement at the highest level with the Panel’s recommendations. There is, however, no total agreement in terms of some of the sub-recommendations. That will have to be fleshed out to see which ones are to be adopted and which ones are to be modified as the CGIAR goes forward. Many of the issues will be discussed in more detail during the CGIAR Change Management Process discussion.*
- *ExCo will prepare a CGIAR response to be submitted for CGIAR approval at AGM08, where the report will be discussed by the full CGIAR.*
- *The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to prepare a draft CGIAR response to the report based on ExCo comments by October 24, 2008, and submit to ExCo for virtual endorsement prior to discussion at AGM08.*
- *The report will also be submitted to the World Bank’s Development Grant Facility.*

4. CGIAR Change Management Process

Conclusions and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo thanked the Change Steering Team (CST) and everyone involved in the Change Management Process for their hard work and dedication to bringing the proposal to ExCo.*

- *ExCo agreed in principle to the direction of the Change Management Process and the “foundation pieces” for a reformed CGIAR identified by the CST, and sees alignment with the broad recommendations of the Independent Review panel (e.g., separate doers from funders, establishment of a legally structured Consortium of Centers that is accountable for the delivery of high quality results and a Fund to support the research of the Consortium and its partners and hold it accountable, development of strategy and results frameworks and a program performance contract scheme that can serve as linkages between the Consortium and the Fund, establishment of independent program evaluation at the System level, building relevant and effective partnerships into all levels of research that brings the best science and advice, and a biennial conference organized by GFAR and the Consortium that creates an enabling environment).*
- *ExCo identified several issues in the proposal that need further work and revision, including amendments to (1) the Fund: revision in principles of membership, e.g. voices from South, membership rotation in the Fund Council, openness to all donors in the Fund Council and Funders Summit as observers; (2) the biennial conference, i.e. the CARD, should be positioned as an international forum and part of the architecture of the multilateral agricultural community to provide guidance to the strategy and results framework of the Consortium with no decision making mandate; (3) Consortium: clarifications are needed in terms of the role of the CEO, accountability and reporting line of the Consortium vis-à-vis the broader stakeholders and Funders Summit, its the link to the Centers, and legalities; (4) Independent Science and Partnership Council: partnership should be included, but it needs to be articulated more clearly. There is also concern about the role of ISPC taking on an evaluation function that may cause conflict of interest as the ISPC should not evaluate the same organization on programs that it advises; (5) a competitive element should be built into the model in the mega-programs.*
- *With the above caveats, ExCo tasked the CST to address key outstanding issues, with stakeholder involvement, and submit a revised proposal by November 1, 2008, for presentation at AGM08. In addition, a separate set of promotional materials (two-page brochure, presentation, and/or video) should be developed as a companion piece to help market the proposal.*
- *ExCo also agreed that it has to move into an advocacy role to help present the proposal to policymakers in order to win approval at AGM08.*
- *The transition strategy should address future meetings (e.g. Funders Summit, CARD) in the reformed CGIAR.*
- *A small transition management team will be established as suggested for implementation. The transition management team will be chaired by Kathy Sierra. Jonathan Wadsworth will also serve on the team and Rodney Cooke will be the convener of CST to help maintain continuity.*

5. Performance Measurement System

Conclusion:

- *ExCo supported the proposed streamlining of the PM System and particularly acknowledged the importance of a capacity building indicator of NARS partners.*
- *ExCo recognized that the current PM system should be predominantly used as a monitoring tool of management in the future Consortium with input from the future Independent Science and Partnership Council.*
- *As the CGIAR moves to a programmatic approach, the PM System will need to develop System-level indicators as part of the overall results-framework that go beyond aggregation of performance results of Centers.*

6. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommended CGIAR approval of the 2009 financing plan.*
- *ExCo commended the Alliance and SC on the progress made in MTPs, but noted the areas of concern raised by SC (e.g. role of IPGs)*
- *CGIAR should think about how to bring non-members (representing \$60 million in financing) into the System.*

7. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked GRPC for the policy proposal and understands it will be submitted to the Alliance of CGIAR Centers for adoption.*
- *In the future, the Fund managers will likely revisit the issue to ensure the policy is working to ensure the public goods nature of CGIAR research.*

8.a. Challenge Program (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

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

8.b. Oversight of Challenge Programs

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the CPs for the annual reports and commended the quality of the reports.*
- *The existing CPs have been successful at conducting research with partners and should continue to be financially supported.*
- *CPs have presented a useful model for the CGIAR going forward, i.e. programmatic approach with successful broad partnerships.*

- *The Alliance (future Consortium) should start thinking about which CPs will likely be transformed into the mega-program portfolio.*

1. Opening Session

CGIAR Chair Kathy Sierra opened the meeting and welcomed ExCo members to ExCo 15. She thanked International Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical (IICT) (English: Tropical Research Institute of Portugal) for hosting the meeting, and all of the support provided. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1.)

Welcome by Host Country

Jorge Braga de Macedo, President of IICT, welcomed ExCo to Portugal. He highlighted activities of IICT and Portugal's recent re-engagement with the CGIAR. He also noted that a conference on "Committing Science to Global Development" was held at IICT prior to ExCo 15 and was well-attended by members of ExCo and others affiliated with the CGIAR.

K. Sierra thanked Portugal and IICT for their support and hospitality to the CGIAR and welcomed their words of support.

Election of Meeting Co-Chair

Robert Bertram (United States) was nominated and elected Co-chair of the meeting.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted without amendments (see Attachment 2). (Note: An item under "Other Business" was added later during the meeting to thank Emile Frison as outgoing Alliance Executive (AE) Chair and to welcome incoming AE Chair Stephen Hall.

2. CGIAR Status Report

2.a. Updates

K. Sierra introduced the item, noting that the three reports had been combined under a single agenda item in order to allocate more discussion time to other items in the agenda.

Report from Director

CGIAR Director Ren Wang reported that most of the pending ExCo business items have been completed or are on track. There are only delays in finalization of the technical report of the CGIAR Independent Review, the statement/action plan on the world food crisis that responds to the short-term needs and positions the CGIAR for the medium- and long-terms. On the statement/action plan on the food crisis, he noted that IFPRI was commissioned to produce a paper on scaling up CGIAR in lieu of such a plan, and it is included in ExCo 15 documentation, titled *International Agricultural Research for Food*

Security, Poverty Reduction, and the Environment: What to Expect from Scaling Up CGIAR Investments and “Best Bet” Programs.

During a later session, he also presented a draft program of AGM08 and welcomed comments on it.

Report from Science Council

Science Council (SC) Chair Rudy Rabbinge provided an update on the work of the SC in four areas:

- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Impact Assessment
- Strategy and Policy
- Mobilizing Science

He noted that SC is developing a plan on mobilizing science (included in the written report) as agreed with ExCo and invited comments from ExCo members on the plan.

He also reported about changes in SC membership. As of September 2008, Derek Byerlee was appointed the new Chair of SPIA, succeeding Jim Ryan. Mariza Barbosa also departed from the SC and a search to fill the vacancy was initiated in May 2008.

Report from Alliance of CGIAR Centers

Emile Frison, Chair of the Alliance of CGIAR Centers, reported about the work of the Alliance by highlighting a number of activities the Alliance has engaged in:

- Change Management Process and Independent Review
- Strategic Initiative on Climate Change and the Climate Change Challenge Program
- Challenge Program Proposal on High-Value Crops
- Regional Plans for collective action in Sub-Saharan Africa
- Global Food Price Inflation
- Collaboration with FARA and FORAGRO
- CGIAR Performance Measurement and CGMap
- Developing good practices in data management

E. Frison also provided a brief progress report on the implementation of recommendations of the Stripe Review of Corporate Governance of CGIAR Centers. He reported that significant progress has been made by the Centers in implementing the recommendations.

Discussion:

- The IFPRI paper commissioned by the CGIAR on “Best Bets” for CGIAR investments was well received and should be taken forward and made use of by partners. A question was raised on how it will be communicated.
- Support was expressed for early external review of Challenge Programs (CPs).

- SC work on mobilizing science was welcomed and SC was encouraged to move quickly on implementing the plan. R. Rabbinge assured ExCo that firm actions are being taken.
- In the new SC member search the overall balance of gender and diversity in the SC should be closely taken into account.
- The Alliance dialogue with FARA was welcomed, and ExCo looks forward to the outcome of the consultation.
- In future ExCo meetings, it could be useful to receive a written report from the CGIAR Director.
- R. Wang clarified that the IFPRI “Best Bets” document is the initial product of a three-step initiative to develop an action plan to address the food crisis. He also clarified that the search for a new SC Member has been deferred due to the Change Management process, and will resume after AGM08 once there is more clarity about the outcome of the Change Management process.
- The AGM08 agenda should not only be about change in the CGIAR, but challenges in the world at large (e.g., global food crisis), and how the CGIAR is positioning itself to respond to the challenges. It should be forward looking agenda and clearly state how the CGIAR will link with other multilateral institutions and address the special needs of Africa. To that end, it was suggested that presentation and discussion of the IAASTD report should not be included in the plenary at AGM08.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the CGIAR Director, SC Chair, and Chair of the Alliance of CGIAR Centers for their reports, and requested the CGIAR Director to consider submitting a written report in future meetings.*
- *ExCo agreed on the need for an early external review of Challenge Programs.*
- *The “Best Bets” paper by IFPRI should be taken to the next step. The information contained in the paper should be used now and targeted to external audiences, including policy makers to show what returns will be as a result of investments in the CGIAR.*
- *Recruitment of the new SC member should consider gender balance and diversity (particularly candidates from developing countries), but the nomination process should await the outcome of the Change Management process.*
- *The CGIAR Chair will ask a small team to look at the draft AGM08 agenda and make any needed adjustments to reflect ExCo’s comments, e.g. positioning the CGIAR to respond to the food crisis, needs of Africa, etc.*

3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

CGIAR Independent Review Panel Chair Elizabeth McAllister presented the findings and recommendations of the Panel’s report “Bringing Together the Best of Science and the Best of Development.”

The objectives of the review were to:

- Take stock and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the CGIAR partnership and governance;
- Assess the effectiveness of CGIAR research; and
- Recommend changes in the CGIAR System to improve effectiveness in view of emerging challenges for food security, agriculture, and natural resource management for the poor.

Findings

The Panel presented its key findings as follows:

1. The CGIAR-supported Centers contribute substantially to agricultural productivity and natural resource management;
2. The CGIAR and Centers need to take a more strategic approach to partnership;
3. The Centers have made progress in addressing intellectual property protection, but more needs to be done;
4. Gender and diversity is not adequately integrated into Centers' research mandates and outreach;
5. The Centers are in a quiet financial crisis; and
6. Dysfunctional governance and management constrain the System's potential.

Discussion:

- ExCo members congratulated the Review Panel on a comprehensive and very useful report that has helped enrich the Change Management process.
- The review was overly negative about CPs, which, in ExCo's view and as supported by each CP's external review, have had positive outcomes in terms of partnerships and in addressing problems through application of new tools of science.
- The report also did not sufficiently address the role of GFAR.
- The review could also have examined the external environment more closely to understand better the changes that have taken place in agricultural research since the founding of the CGIAR, what shifts need to take place, and where the CGIAR fits into the overall picture, e.g. the role of the CGIAR in the multilateral system.
- The review could have benefited from more data/analysis on impact assessment at the System level, and not only at the Center level.
- A question was raised on why there has been success in achieving impact in Asia but not Africa.
- ExCo welcomed the Independent Review's comments on gender issues and was happy to see the importance of partnerships emphasized in the review.
- The findings of the review should be used to carefully consider how the CGIAR can most effectively use its existing funding, and determine how it would use additional funding it may receive in the future.
- The Panel responded to some of the issues raised. It agreed that CPs have positive aspects in terms of scientific achievement, and establishment of useful partnerships. However, the Panel also noted that financial management and governance systems currently in place are problematic and should be audited.

The Panel also believes CPs should strive to diversify its donor funding base. A section on GFAR was included in the report and support to a revitalized GFAR was recommended. The Panel was encouraged by GFAR's new leadership and the potential role it can play. It was clarified that the full technical report examines more fully the external environment and the assessment that needs to be undertaken to determine how and where the CGIAR System fits in the international architecture vis-à-vis FAO, WFP, World Bank and other organizations. This is crucial to future establishment of delivery mechanisms for international public goods in Africa, where impact has lagged due to a lack of such mechanisms. The Panel agreed that more work needs to be done on impact at the System level. However, its TOR were limited to a meta-review of existing materials produced by SC and other studies.

Recommendations

The Review Panel's report made five overarching recommendations for renewing the CGIAR System:

1. Rebalance the Center-donor partnership to sustain the CGIAR's unique contributions:
 - a. The CGIAR System should separate governance and management functions. The roles of donors and management should be separated to avoid conflicts of interest. The management responsibility for operations should be separated from oversight.
 - b. The donors should establish a CGIAR Fund for Agricultural Research as a new channel for predictable, unrestricted funding to Centers and restricted funding to programs. Money should be allocated from the Fund to Centers and to programs in a rules based manner, partly according to performance. In deciding how much grant funding to channel through the pooled Fund, the donors should keep in mind their Paris Declaration commitment to provide two-thirds of their development aid on a program rather than a project grant basis by 2010.
 - c. The Centers should strengthen their institutions for common action by consolidating common services, common policy and strategy, and program administration in a jointly owned Consortium.
 - d. Both donors and Centers should set up decision making procedures based on clear authorities and shared strategic objectives. Nonbinding approaches to decision making are no longer adequate for a collective enterprise that spends half a billion dollars of public money annually, resources set to increase substantially if the foregoing actions are taken.
2. Establish a legally structured Consortium of Centers that should:
 - a. Improve financial management and financial reporting.
 - b. Simplify the Challenge Programs to focus on Center-led consortia.
 - c. Establish common services such as strategic communications, financial and results management systems internal audit, information technology, and properly equipped human resources function.

- d. Centers should develop a common strategy to protect their internally generated intellectual property and know-how, including filing their own patent applications.
3. Establish a CGIAR Fund for Agricultural Research; its functions would include:
 - a. Establishing a multiyear financing mechanism on the lines recommended in this report and based on the Monterrey principles of good donorship (adequacy and predictability of financing and mutual accountability for results).
 - b. Approving transfers from the Fund to the Consortium based on agreed schedules, performance based indicators, targeted milestones and reviews of the specific program proposals that would follow from the agreed strategic framework.
 - c. Ensuring accountability and standards of due diligence over all funds held and assigned to the Consortium.
4. Support the Consortium and CGIAR Fund with a science advisory board and an independent evaluation unit, with at least three common institutions:
 - a. A joint strategy and results framework developed for the inaugural conference and renewed preferably as part of replenishment like negotiations on a triennial basis.
 - b. An independent evaluation unit, reporting to the council of the Fund, but working closely with the board of the Consortium as well.
 - c. A committee of eminent advisors that form a science advisory board. It might be called the Science Council, as at present, or perhaps something broader if the inaugural conference decides to include anti-poverty expertise as well as science expertise.
5. 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. Within the balanced partnership model, the Panel recommends as the highest priority for partnership development in the CGIAR, that partnerships be approached as integral components of a medium-term strategy and results framework.
 - b. The Panel recommends that the CGIAR donor community and the governments of developing countries approach the needs of Africa systemically by assuring adequate provision for institution and capacity building in a CGIAR-NARS-ARIs partnership.
 - c. The Panel also recommends the establishment of a separate financing facility as a contingency fund for partnership opportunities, not envisaged in the strategic framework.
 - d. The Panel recommends a facilitated high-level dialogue with Chatham House rules among representatives of CSOs, the private sector, representatives of Centers and the Consortium, and independent experts on intellectual property rights.

- e. The Panel recommends the CGIAR continue to apply its new policy for building partnerships with NGOs.
- f. The Panel recommends expansion of the Gender and Diversity AWARD Program into a global scientific capacity-building program for women and Group 2 nationals.

On the issues of gender and diversity, the Panel also highlighted the need to move from advocacy to accountability model in tackling gender issues in research. In addition to expansion of the AWARD Program, the Panel suggested that IFPRI, together with the Systemwide program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA), develop a gender policy with a results framework for inclusion in the first Consortium strategy. One of the first mega-programs should also focus on gender to reap productivity gains and increase well-being of families.

Discussion:

- How is accountability to the poor achieved, as well as accountability between the Consortium and donors?
- More details on the Fund recommendation are needed. Many of the Panel’s recommendations on the Fund and finance are very similar to those of Working Group 4 of the Change Management process.
- It’s not clear why the Panel believes programmatic funding will be successful now, when it has not been very successful in the past.
- The recommendations in terms of gender issues were highly appreciated.
- Further clarifications were requested on how the Panel sees the role of the System in the debate over upstream science vs. downstream delivery.
- The recommendation on independent evaluation was welcome, but there needs to be a strong link between *ex post* evaluation and *ex ante* planning.
- Establishing a Consortium of Centers seems to go counter to the call to open up the System.
- Advice was also sought from the Review Panel on the critical factors for success in the Change Management process.
- In response to ExCo’s comments, the Panel clarified that the CPs have been successful in science and creating partnerships. The Panel’s criticisms of the CPs were focused on issues of financial management, risk, and organization. The Panel also agreed that GFAR needs to be revitalized. On the upstream/downstream debate, the Panel noted that it is not appropriate to fund Centers to do delivery, since so many other delivery organizations and funders are already doing that. However, there is a need for the CGIAR to work more closely with complementary resources and organizations and for the CGIAR to articulate the line between the upstream and downstream. On the Fund, the Panel believes that it should be a new strategic body to raise funds.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo congratulated and thanked the Independent Review Panel for the report, for its depth, and for the professionalism in conducting the evaluation.*

- *ExCo expressed broad agreement at the highest level with the Panel's recommendations. There is, however, no total agreement in terms of some of the sub-recommendations. That will have to be fleshed out to see which ones are to be adopted and which ones are to be modified as the CGIAR goes forward. Many of the issues will be discussed in more detail during the CGIAR Change Management Process discussion.*
- *ExCo will prepare a CGIAR response to be submitted for CGIAR approval at AGM08, where the report will be discussed by the full CGIAR.*
- *The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to prepare a draft CGIAR response to the report based on ExCo comments by October 24, 2008, and submit to ExCo for virtual endorsement prior to discussion at AGM08.*
- *The report will also be submitted to the World Bank's Development Grant Facility.*

4. CGIAR Change Management Process

Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal

Change Steering Team (CST) Chair, Rodney Cooke and Co-Chair, Jonathan Wadsworth, presented the team's report, the "Integrated CGIAR Reform Proposal" to ExCo. The presentation gave a brief background on the change management initiative and the process to date, including the development of the earlier agreed CGIAR Vision and CGIAR Strategic Objectives which have guided the activities of the change management process:

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

R. Cooke emphasized the window of opportunity available to the CGIAR at this time to make decisions and implement real change. The recommendations of the CST are focused on revitalizing aspects of the System that will enable greater impact. The CST identified nine foundation pieces that will enable delivery of the Strategic Objectives. They are as follows:

1. Create a “Fund” that provides multi-year financing
2. Principally “program financing” with window for “institutional financing”
3. Create a “Consortium” of Centers that is a legal entity with Board & CEO
4. Performance contracting
5. Programs to be defined based on agreed Strategic Framework
6. Effective Partnerships and Positioning
7. Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC)
8. Independent Evaluation Arrangement at System level
9. Recast Key Founding Principles

The proposal builds on and enlarges these foundation pieces. The CST Chair and Co-chair explained the system architecture of the proposed model, including the Fund and fund allocation process, accountability map and performance contracting, the Consortium and the roles and functions of its components, strategy and results framework development, enabling partnerships and the Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (CARD), scientific advice, and monitoring and evaluation aspects of the model.

They concluded the presentation of the proposed model by noting how key founding principles of the CGIAR have been re-casted and how existing bodies in the System will change. The discussion that followed centered on the main aspects of the proposed model: Consortium, Fund, Independent Science and Partnership Council, CARD, and the possibility of adding a competitive funding element. (Note: ExCo discussed the various elements and features of the proposed model first. It was followed by a presentation and discussion on the proposed transition arrangements.)

Discussion:

Consortium:

- General support for the proposal and the direction of the change management process was expressed.
- Support was expressed for creation of a legal entity in the form of a Consortium of Centers and the responsibility of ensuring success being placed on Centers.
- A key test of the reforms will be how it impacts on the work of scientists in Centers, especially in terms of reduced reporting burdens. There is a concern that splitting program and management reviews may not be the most efficient manner of doing this. Would the work of the Consortium and ISPC in this area not be seen as a duplication from a Center perspective?
- The model suggests that some Center responsibilities, e.g. governance by the board and support services, will be transferred to the Consortium. However, if

Centers remain as independent legal entities, how will this be done and what are the legal implications?

- Accountability and the linkages between the Consortium board and Center boards are still a concern, e.g. on matters of responsibility concerning hiring and firing of Center Directors General (DGs), clustering and merging of Centers, etc. Particularly in terms of structural changes, the process should involve other stakeholders to determine criteria on how it should be done.
- A question was also raised on who would pay for the establishment and operation of the Consortium. Will all activities contribute toward the cost of the Consortium?
- The Alliance clarified that legal experts have been consulted on how powers can be transferred to the Consortium, and has been assured that it could be done in a way that would not cause legal problems. It has yet to be decided what powers to transfer. Although the Consortium may not have complete authority over Centers, a key power that it will be vested with is the ability to grant or deny funding.
- R. Cooke clarified that Center boards would still be responsible for hiring of a Center DG. In terms of clustering and merger of Centers, the Consortium will have responsibility for overall success or failure, but partners will be involved at each step along the way. There is also a window for institutional funding in the Fund which will give donors a way to withhold funding if the structural changes are deemed inadequate.
- Kathy Sierra will have special meetings with donors on October 3rd and November 10th to discuss financial support for the proposed model.

Fund:

- Concern was expressed about the structure of the Fund Council and if it sends the right message in terms of harmonization and alignment if most donors are excluded from the Fund Council. There should be a way for donors who do not sit on the Fund Council to participate as observers to ensure inclusiveness, for example.
- Representation on the Fund Council should be balanced and include strengthened voices of partners, donors from the South, and those of small donors. Rotation of membership in a region may help ensure that there is a diversity of voices heard.
- Concern was expressed over the Funders Summit being held only every two years and whether such infrequent meetings would be adequate in terms of oversight and engagement.
- It was suggested that an overarching governance structure is needed between the Fund and the Consortium, and that the relationship between the two would not substitute for overall governance of the CGIAR System. Another view was also expressed that performance contracts between the Fund and the Consortium would ensure mutual accountability, and therefore such a structure would not be necessary. The strategy and results framework will also provide a high level linkage between the Fund and the Consortium.
- A strategic financial perspective for the Fund, fulfilled by a CFO, should be considered. This person could provide technical advice to the Fund on financial

guidelines, strategic investments, etc., and also advise finance directors at Centers and the Consortium.

- The Fund should be seen as a primary channel of funding and to the extent possible used by donors, rather than bilateral channeling of funds to individual Centers.
- Support was expressed for the Fund being hosted at the World Bank.
- The Funders Summit needs to take place around a discussion on a coherent set of programs. Dialogue between the Fund and the Consortium will be an important aspect of this. How will such a dialogue be facilitated?
- In addition to streamlining within the CGIAR and among donors, the CGIAR also needs to be very much a part of the multilateral system so that it does not work in isolation. How will these links be established?
- On the role of the CGIAR Chair (and CGIAR Secretariat) and co-sponsors in the new CGIAR, it was clarified that these details will have to be worked out as the process moves forward and during the transition phase.
- The CST Chair and Co-chair clarified some of the issues raised. They noted that in the beginning the Fund Council may have to meet more often, but eventually would likely meet two times per year similar to the current ExCo. Although the Funders Summit is scheduled to meet every two years, funders would receive an annual report as well. The suggestion on finance expertise and possibly hiring a CFO was well taken. However, whether that person should be involved on the Fund or Consortium side is not clear. Going forward, channeling bilaterally donated funds through the Consortium CEO as a kind of filter should be considered.
- The issue of adding a competitive element to funding was also raised. It is discussed in the context of the CARD and partnerships below.

Independent Science and Partnership Council:

- Concern was expressed on combining the science and partnerships functions together in the proposed ISPC. Some ExCo members think that these key functions should be separate. Donors may not see the body as truly independent and therefore be unable to fully rely on evaluation of programs carried out by ISPC.
- The CST clarified that the two functions were brought together because an essential element of scientific advice is the network of knowledge both upstream and downstream that is necessary to formulate the advice and it cuts across the entire partnership spectrum. Bringing the two functions together in one body is an efficient way to do this.
- Concern was also expressed about ISPC giving both technical advice and evaluating programs, thereby jeopardizing its independence. As an advisory body, ISPC should not undertake line management responsibilities.
- A view was also expressed concerning the potential for creating contentious relationships and a lack of trust by having the ISPC review/evaluate proposed programs. It would be more efficient if advice is given when programs are being developed and presented jointly to the Fund. However, others felt the extra

assurance of an ISPC review is necessary. Independent technical advice has always been important in the CGIAR.

Conference on Agricultural Research for Development:

- The CARD is seen as a global forum for dialogue and exchange of information and ideas, rather than an institution with decision making mandate. It will bring together stakeholders and partners and is important for strategy formulation. However, the product of the conference should be made clear in the proposal. CARD can be an essential element in bringing the Fund and the Consortium together.
- The conference must give partners a real opportunity to help set the policy agenda for the CGIAR and give guidance on the strategy and results framework.
- It must also play a role in linking the CGIAR to the outside world and other multilateral institutions.
- The CARD will be held every two years. The Funders Summit could possibly held in conjunction or back-to-back with the CARD. It could provide guidance on planning at the strategic level.
- The CST should explore the foregoing element further to ensure the CARD plays a substantive role and is not merely a discussion forum. The issue of a chair for the conference should also be considered.

Competitive funding element:

- It was also suggested that a competitive element for research be added to help foster a dynamic research system, including room for “blue sky” and highly innovative research. This could be done through a special funding window reserved for such research, or through earmarking a certain amount in each mega-program where a competitive element would be included and accessible to those from outside the Centers. The amount would differ according to the type of program.
- Some ExCo members feel that opening a separate window for competition may cause distortions of the System’s focus and strategic research agenda. It would be better to open a certain percentage of funding in each mega-program to competition.
- Engaging partners strategically and more effectively in reaching the System’s objectives is the ultimate goal. Even though CPs have been criticized by some Centers and the Independent Review Panel, they have been successful at opening the System and bringing in very successful partnerships. They should be looked at as an example of best practices when trying to engage further and identify the best partners and access the best science to help achieve objectives.
- Most Centers already have experience working with effective partners. This experience and those of the CPs should not be lost. CST should work on this issue further and consult with the Alliance to identify best practices and build a competitive element into the model.

Transition Strategy

Following discussion of the CST proposal, R. Cooke and J. Wadsworth presented a transition strategy. They first presented several risks regarding funding that need to be managed during the transition:

- Disruption of ongoing programs due to transfer of funds from Centers and CPs to the Fund,
- Premature termination of ongoing programs which do not align with new programmatic areas,
- Low levels of unrestricted Center funding inadequate to adjust to new programmatic and managerial directions,
- Existing donor contracts do not allow full cost recovery as redefined by the Consortium, and
- Loss of scientific talent due to funding uncertainties.

The transition strategy includes steps to be taken for establishment of the Consortium and Fund in the following timeframes:

- October – December 2008
- January – June 2009
- July – October 2009
- October 2009 and beyond

Key CGIAR decisions are necessary at AGM08 in order for the Change Management process to move forward. However, key activities will take place during the period between ExCo 15 and AGM08 as well, including donor meetings with the CGIAR Chair (on October 3rd and November 10th), revision of the CST proposal for presentation at AGM08, and drafting terms of reference (TOR) for designing the Consortium and the Fund.

It is expected that ExCo will meet again in May and October 2009 as the decision making body overseeing the transition and it would report out at the business meeting at AGM09.

In order to drive the process, it is envisioned that a Transition Management Team, acting in a more executive nature, be put in place to give direction and manage the transition process. Expert advice would be commissioned to help design and flesh out necessary details to implement the changes.

Discussion:

- Transition will be crucial for implementation and should move as fast as possible. One ExCo member felt that some of the activities could be done faster in order to take advantage of the window of opportunity available now, especially in the context of the food crisis.
- ExCo should not lose sight of the fact that one of the most important remaining challenges is winning approval of the proposal at AGM08. This should not be taken for granted and sufficient preparation is needed.

- Concern was raised about moving too fast with development of TORs for design of the Fund and Consortium. However, most felt that it was necessary to have as many building blocks in place as possible before AGM08.
- Questions were raised on such issues as transition costs, management of the transition and setting up of the Fund. The role of current board members and existing bodies (e.g. CGIAR Secretariat) was also raised.
- The first CARD is planned for June 2009 in the transition strategy. It may be too soon to undertake such a conference, especially so close to the CGIAR meeting in December 2009. Perhaps the June 2009 meeting could be a pilot. It was pointed out that the December 2009 meeting is likely to be a smaller business-oriented meeting as well.
- There was agreement that the CGIAR meeting in Maputo (AGM08) could be regarded as the last AGM. The proposed configuration of meetings in 2009 should be described in the transition strategy.
- The Alliance should work with Center DGs to disseminate information on the change process widely in order to inform staff.
- Continuous stakeholder engagement needs to continue from now until AGM08 to get buy-in throughout the System.
- Promotional materials that explain the changes, what is being eliminated, potential costs and savings, etc. should be developed to help market the proposal.
- ExCo members need to act as advocates for the proposal and help win approval at AGM08 in order to avoid an impasse.
- We should not lose the social capital and knowledge of the CST and WGs built over the past several months. CST should retain some leadership within the transition team. However, execution is crucial so the team will have to be more executive and directional in nature; the broad consultative nature of the change process to date should be narrowed so that implementation can take place at a swifter pace.

Conclusions and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo thanked the Change Steering Team (CST) and everyone involved in the Change Management Process for their hard work and dedication to bringing the proposal to ExCo.*
- *ExCo agreed in principle to the direction of the Change Management Process and the “foundation pieces” for a reformed CGIAR identified by the CST, and sees alignment with the broad recommendations of the Independent Review panel (e.g., separate doers from funders, establishment of a legally structured Consortium of Centers that is accountable for the delivery of high quality results and a Fund to support the research of the Consortium and its partners and hold it accountable, development of strategy and results frameworks and a program performance contract scheme that can serve as linkages between the Consortium and the Fund, establishment of independent program evaluation at the System level, building relevant and effective partnerships into all levels of research that brings the best science and advice, and a biennial conference organized by GFAR and the Consortium that creates an enabling environment).*

- *ExCo identified several issues in the proposal that need further work and revision, including amendments to (1) the Fund: revision in principles of membership, e.g. voices from South, membership rotation in the Fund Council, openness to all donors in the Fund Council and Funders Summit as observers; (2) the biennial conference, i.e. the CARD, should be positioned as an international forum and part of the architecture of the multilateral agricultural community to provide guidance to the strategy and results framework of the Consortium with no decision making mandate; (3) Consortium: clarifications are needed in terms of the role of the CEO, accountability and reporting line of the Consortium vis-à-vis the Funders Summit, its link to the Centers, and legalities; (4) Independent Science and Partnership Council: partnership should be included, but it needs to be articulated more clearly. There is also concern about the role of ISPC taking on an evaluation function that may cause conflict of interest as the ISPC should not evaluate the same organization on programs that it advises; (5) a competitive element should be built into the model in the mega-programs.*
- *With the above caveats, ExCo tasked the CST to address key outstanding issues, with stakeholder involvement, and submit a revised proposal by November 1, 2008, for presentation at AGM08. In addition, a separate set of promotional materials (two-page brochure, presentation, and/or video) should be developed as a companion piece to help market the proposal.*
- *ExCo also agreed that it has to move into an advocacy role to help present the proposal to policymakers in order to win approval at AGM08.*
- *The transition strategy should address future meetings (e.g. Funders Summit, CARD) in the reformed CGIAR.*
- *A small transition management team will be established as suggested for implementation. The transition management team will be chaired by Kathy Sierra. Jonathan Wadsworth will also serve on the team and Rodney Cooke will be the convener of CST to help maintain continuity.*

5. Performance Measurement System

Maria Iskandarani (CGIAR Secretariat), reported on the outcome of the CGIAR Performance Measurement workshop, held July 17-18, 2008, in Washington, DC. The workshop brought together representatives from the CGIAR/SC Secretariats, Alliance Deputy Executive, CGIAR Members, and external M&E experts. The main objective was to review the overall design and indicators of the current PM system, and to identify possibilities for simplification while maintaining relevance, accuracy and continuity. Special focus has been on improving the validity and reliability of the (1) output element and (2) institutional health element.

M. Iskandarani reported on the key proposals from the workshop and the planned changes to strengthen the PM system. She noted that the CGIAR and SC Secretariats, in consultation with the Alliance, will develop guidelines for use of PM information by the end of 2008, in time for the next PM cycle.

Discussion:

- Following the Change Management process, the PM System should be the responsibility of the Consortium and not donors. It should be based on a results framework in line with the strategic objectives, the design of which is the responsibility of the Consortium as well.
- Indicators in the PM System should be agreed by the Consortium Board and the Fund Council so that it can be used by the Fund in the future to allocate resources. Indicators should also evolve in order to produce the most relevant and useful information.
- The PM System should also consider assessing Center impact on capacity building of NARS.
- Has the upper benchmark for Center reserves been raised, and what is the transition period for raising reserves to the lower limit of 90 days?
- Does the checklist incorporate more “gradations” in the response options, rather than simple yes/no answers?
- Is full-cost recovery measured by the PM System?
- How is the PM system being utilized?
- Does SPIA have a role in the development of the impact indicators?
- The CGIAR should support NARS in developing performance measurement systems for their own organizations.
- M. Iskandarani clarified that the measurement of capacity building of NARS is one of the new indicators that is being developed by the Alliance and the intention is to pilot the indicator in the 2009 cycle. The checklists for measuring institutional health are being reviewed and will take into account the Centers request for more gradation of the response options. The PM system is currently used as a key accountability tool to CGIAR stakeholders, as a decision-support tool by CGIAR Members (including for funding decisions), and as a learning and internal monitoring tool by Centers.
- Ruben Echeverria (SC Secretariat) explained that SPIA is fully involved in the design and assessment of the impact indicator and the intention is to further work on the development of a suitable indicator of actual impact.
- Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) also clarified that the Alliance Deputy Executive (ADE) sub-committee on Finance and Administration endorsed the recommendation to eliminate the upper limit on the reserves benchmark and that the transition period phasing in the new single point benchmark of 90 days is three years.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo supported the proposed streamlining of the PM System and particularly acknowledged the importance of a capacity building indicator of NARS partners.*
- *ExCo recognized that the current PM system should be predominantly used as a monitoring tool of management in the future Consortium with input from the future Independent Science and Partnership Council.*
- *As the CGIAR moves to a programmatic approach, the PM System will need to develop System-level indicators as part of the overall results-framework that go beyond aggregation of performance results of Centers.*

6. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan

R. Rabbinge presented the overview of the SC commentary on Center and Challenge Program MTPs for 2009-2011; Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) followed with presentation of 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 the Centers and CPs is the CGIAR's principal mechanism for the assessment of the relevance of research. The SC reviews the plans for the following: programmatic content and relevance; significant program changes, usually following EPMRs and changes in strategic plans; opportunities, synergies among Centers and CPs to improve efficiency; and clarity in planning.

The MTPs were submitted this year by Centers using an online software application, EasyMTP, developed by the ICT-KM program in collaboration with the Centers. EasyMTP is linked to a central database (CGMAP) which is being developed.

He reported that there is a broad range of quality among the current MTPs. Some Centers have produced very realistic plans that show a very clear view of their niche/comparative advantage. Others appear to use the MTPs as their main research management tool while others see them simply as a SC requirement for the purpose of research monitoring. Many of the MTPs are far too long (one Center submitted over 350 pages). He suggested that the MTPs could be presented in 20-25 pages.

The SC's review used the same approach that it started last year. MTPs that met certain requirements of quality and completeness did not require a detailed review every year. Last year, the SC identified seven MTPs meeting this standard (CIFOR, CIMMYT, IFPRI, ILRI, IRRI, Generation CP and HarvestPlus CP). This year, four others were added to this list: ICARDA, IWMI, WorldFish Center, and SSA-CP), and hence will not require detailed reviews next year. The remaining MTPs are considered to require in-depth review due to anticipated changes from EPMR or strategic planning or due to deficiencies in the MTP (Africa Rice, Bioversity, CIAT, CIP, ICRISAT, IITA, World Agroforestry, and CPWF). The SC continues to dialogue to help Centers and CPs to upgrade their MTPs.

In SC's view, there has been a positive change in the focus of the research as seen in the current MTPs.

With respect to following through on EPMR recommendations, all the Centers and CPs that have been reviewed during the past two years have reported in their MTPs the progress in implementing recommendations endorsed by the CGIAR. Assessment of the progress reports is given in the commentary on the individual Center/CP.

S. Tata presented a summary of the investment proposals and financing plan of the 2009 CGIAR agenda, prepared this year in collaboration with ICRISAT for the second year.

He first 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, the 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 using performance contracts). Externally, the System faces the food price crisis, the ongoing international financial crisis, and the perennial challenge of exchange movements. Clearly, although Centers and CPs could not take these developments onboard during the preparation of their MTPs, these developments will affect the amount of financial resources that will ultimately be available to finance the System in 2009. What is not clear and cannot be projected with certainty is the direction and magnitude of the impact of these factors.

The proposed research agenda for 2009 requires an investment of US\$576 million, which includes the CPs. This represents an increase of \$70 million (14 percent) over the actual 2007 level. The financing of the proposed research agenda is expected to be provided from \$521 million in investor grants, \$20 million from Center income, and \$35 million from other sources and Center reserves (other sources refer to funding still under negotiation that cannot yet be attributed to specific investors). The projected level of investor grants would represent an increase of \$26 million (five percent) over the actual 2007 level. About one-half of the budget (50 percent) will be spent on research programs for Sub-Saharan Africa.

S. Tata also presented a mechanistic simulation of the proposed \$1 billion CGIAR by 2013, illustrating a possible scenario of 70 percent of these funds being in the central Fund and only 30 percent outside the Fund.

Discussion:

- R. Rabbinge was commended for the clear and comprehensive SC commentaries on the MTPs. The continued improvement of the Center and CP MTPs, which would allow the SC to move in the future to review of strategic plans was welcomed.
- It was recognized that alignment of the research agenda with the System Priorities was still in progress, and requires more time before it will be fully aligned. There was appreciation about the realization of the EasyMTP application as a tool for submitting the MTPs this year.
- Appreciation was expressed about the improved quality of the submission from SSA-CP, and concern about the lack of improvement in those from ICRISAT and IITA, especially since these two Centers focus their work on Africa. As well, the increased complementarity and less duplication at the System level, and devolution of certain activities to NARS were commended.
- A question was raised on whether the System Priorities-based analysis of MTP also considers the international public goods (IPG) nature of networks and knowledge platform.

- There were also some concerns about the low percentage of resources going into new research areas.
- The clarity and analysis of risk and opportunities in the financial presentation was commended.
- The impact of the volatility in the currency markets, the ongoing financial crisis, and the policy environment on the projected 2009 contributions was noted.
- The growing size of non-member funding (representing \$60 million) needs to be taken into account by the System as it carries out strategic planning.
- The significant reduction in the investment at IWMI and CPWF was noted.
- A question was raised about the financial health of CIAT (the only Center currently red flagged on a financial indicator) and CIMMYT. S. Tata indicated that with additional contributions towards CIAT since the extraordinary meeting in February 2008, and the improvement in the exchange rate on the Colombian peso, the financial situation in the Center was beginning to improve. With respect to CIMMYT, he indicated that although the Center was no longer red flagged, its finances would be closely monitored as it was a borderline case. It was expected that with the improved prospects of no significant cuts in unrestricted contribution from USA, this would have a positive impact on the Center, which receives one of the highest unrestricted levels of support from the USA.

Conclusion and ExCo Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommended CGIAR approval of the 2009 financing plan.*
- *ExCo commended the Alliance and SC on the progress made in MTPs, but noted the areas of concern raised by SC (e.g. role of IPGs)*
- *CGIAR should think about how to bring non-members (representing \$60 million in financing) into the System.*

7. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

E. Frison introduced the item by noting that GRPC prepared the proposed policy on intellectual assets for adoption by the Centers. Upon approval by the Alliance, it will replace the *Guiding Principles for the CGIAR Centers on Intellectual Property and Resources*. The objective of the policy is to establish common standards and procedures for CGIAR Centers regarding the acquisition, management and release of intellectual assets. It is expected that the policy would be expanded in the future to include issues on stewardship and liability. The item had been discussed at previous ExCo meetings, and language suggested by ExCo members has been included in the proposed policy.

Discussion:

- How will free riding behavior of some of those in the research and development community be prevented?
- Support was expressed for the proposed policy. It is important to streamline the policy across the System and, as a general rule, keep intellectual assets in the public domain.

- Some ExCo members emphasized that Centers should not use intellectual assets to raise income and results from public goods research should not be privatized.
- The “Public Disclosure” provision of the proposed policy was welcomed by ExCo members.
- In what way might the new policy change current practices in relation to intellectual assets, for example when it comes to CPs, and how will implementation be monitored?
- A question was also raised on whether traditional knowledge as exemplified by farmers’ *in situ* conservation of plant genetic resources is taken into consideration.
- E. Frison noted that free riding is an ongoing challenge and will have to be addressed by making information available to patent offices, for example, and through peer pressure, etc. short of legal action. The policy will replace the 1996 guidelines. Some agreements entered into by some CPs are indeed not consistent with those guidelines. If there is an agreed common policy then it is expected that the CPs will also align their agreements with that policy. The Consortium will have to monitor implementation by Centers and determine what enforcement measures are appropriate. On the question about traditional knowledge, paragraph 8 of the proposed policy is quite clear on how Centers will handle it. The policy is in line with the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked GRPC for the policy proposal and understands it will be submitted to the Alliance of CGIAR Centers for adoption.*
- *In the future, the Fund managers will likely revisit the issue to ensure the policy is working to ensure the public goods nature of CGIAR research.*

8. Challenge Programs

8.a. Challenge Programs (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals

R. Rabbinge presented a summary of SC assessment of the CP proposal on High Value Crops (HVC). The SC did not recommend endorsement of the proposal by ExCo due to concerns over the following: 1) the proposal fell short in clarifying how the CP would add value to work already undertaken; 2) lack of a clearly focused research program; 3) inadequate definition of roles and collaborative arrangements and their synergies; 4) insufficient differentiation between the CP and the core business of one of the centers (AVRDC) from programs implemented by ICARDA, Global Hort and USAID; 5) a failure to explicitly engage the private sector; and 6) the reference to health in the proposal title not reflected in the proposal.

Discussion:

- ExCo underscored the importance of the CP topic, but agreed that the CP proposal should be withdrawn.

- Given the importance of high value crops development, the CGIAR should assess how to take it onboard in a context other than a CP.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

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

8.b. Oversight of Challenge Programs

K. Sierra introduced the item by noting that ExCo is currently the primary oversight body of CPs. As agreed, the CPs under implementation provided annual reports for ExCo's review and consideration. Reports were received from the following CPs: Water and Food; Generation; HarvestPlus; and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Discussion:

- The importance of CPs was emphasized, but concern was expressed over their narrow donor base.
- The possible need to transition CPs to mega-programs in line with the CGIAR Change Management process was raised along with the need to learn from CPs for transitioning to the Consortium approach.
- The value of the multidisciplinary nature of the CPs and the opportunities they present for capacity building with NARs and dealing with social aspects were noted, along with the suggestion that these elements be reflected in the final analysis.
- CPs are vibrant, innovative programs and some, such as the Climate Change and Water and Food CPs, could possibly feed into mega-programs. The need to continue support to CPs was emphasized.
- The submitted annual reports were well written and focused with quality content.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the CPs for the annual reports and commended the quality of the reports.*
- *The existing CPs have been successful at conducting research with partners and should continue to be financially supported.*
- *CPs have presented a useful model for the CGIAR going forward, i.e. programmatic approach with successful broad partnerships.*
- *The Alliance (future Consortium) should start thinking about which CPs will likely be transformed into the mega-program portfolio.*

9. Other Business

R. Rabbinge asked that a special thanks be given to outgoing AE Chair E. Frison and commended him for his collaboration with SC. SC looks forward to working with incoming AE Chair S. Hall.

10. Closing Session

K. Sierra closed the meeting by thanking the Government of Portugal and IICT for their hospitality and support to the CGIAR. She also thanked ExCo for their participation and a productive meeting.

She noted the tremendous amount of work that has been achieved this year during the Change Management process and commended members of the CST, WGs, and the Trium Group for their dedication and hard work. She asked that ExCo give a special round of applause to the CGIAR Secretariat for their dedication and professional manner in which they have handled the Change Management process.

R. Cooke also thanked K. Sierra on behalf of ExCo and the CGIAR for her leadership and efforts to move the change process forward.

List of Participants
Fifteenth Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chair:</i>	Kathy Sierra	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Alexander Müller	FAO
	Jurgen Voegelé	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>Alliance of CGIAR</i>		
<i>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>	Sae-Jung Suh	Korea
<i>Europe</i>	Marc Debois	European Commission
	Ruth Haug	Norway
	Jonathan Wadsworth	United Kingdom
 <u>Developing Countries:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Elisio Contini	Brazil
<i>SSA</i>	B.Y. Abubakar	Nigeria
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Mangala Rai	India
<i>CWANA</i>	Jafar Khalghani	Iran
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Mario Allegri	FORAGRO
 <u>Foundations:</u>	Marco Ferroni	Syngenta Foundation
 <u>Partners:</u>		
<i>Private Sector</i>	Bill Niebur	PSC Chair

Observers:

Isabel Alvarez	FAO
Paul Avontroodt	Belgium
Joan Barclay	CGIAR Independent Review
Andrew Bennett	CIFOR
Jürg Benz	Switzerland
Keith Bezanson	CGIAR Independent Review
Peter Core	Australia
Ruben Echeverria	Science Council Secretariat
Pierre Fabre	France
Woon-Goo Ha	Korea
Stephen Hall	WorldFish Center
Mark Holderness	GFAR
Anne-Marie Izac	Alliance Office
Wolfgang Kasten	Germany
Ian Kershaw	Australia
Jean-Luc Khalfaoui	European Commission
Jean Lebel	IDRC
Jorge Braga de Macedo	Portugal
Iain MacGillivray	Canada
Elizabeth McAllister	CGIAR Independent Review
Shantanu Mathur	IFAD
Iftikhar Mostafa	Grain Research and Development Corporation
Karin Perkins	CGIAR Independent Review
Martin Pineiro	CGIAR Change Management Working Group 2
Ana Ribeiro	Portugal
Francisco Sagasti	CGIAR Independent Review
Paolo Sarfatti	Italy
Meredith Soule	USA
Monika Szamko	Trium Group
Howard Ting	Trium Group
Wijmand Van Ijssel	The Netherlands
Ken Watson	CGIAR Independent Review

Executive Secretary, ExCo: Ren Wang
CGIAR Secretariat Support: Maria Iskandarani
Laura Ivers
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. Updates

- Report from Director
- Report from SC
 - Mobilization of Science
- Report from Alliance of CGIAR Centers
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System

- Presentation of Final Report
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

4. CGIAR Change Management Process

- Presentation of Final Report
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

5. Performance Measurement System

- Proposal to Improve the PM System
- Discussion

6. Medium Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan

- Introduction
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

7. Genetic Resources Policy Committee

- Draft Policy on Intellectual Assets
- Discussion

8. Challenge Programs

8.a. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals

- Introduction
- Discussion and ExCo Decision

- 8.b. Oversight of CPs
 - CP Annual Reports
 - Discussion

9. Other Business

10. Closing Session

Summary: ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 15

ExCo 15 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.a. Updates	4.71	5.00	5.89
3. Independent Review of the CGIAR System	4.94	4.59	5.29
4. Change Management Process	4.76	5.88	6.35
5. Performance Management System	5.07	5.53	6.00
6. Medium-Term Plans and 2009 Financing Plan	5.07	5.31	5.75
7. Genetic Resources Policy Committee	4.20	5.27	5.75
8.a. CP (Cycle 2) Selection of Full Proposals	4.25	5.19	6.07
8.b. Oversight of CPs	4.13	5.69	6.56

ExCo 15 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.	6.50
2. Time available for the meeting allowed for an appropriate level of discussion and debate.	6.50
3. The meeting agenda included the most important issues facing the CGIAR.	6.81
4. ExCo members are knowledgeable about the CGIAR/ExCo business agenda.	5.81
5. The documentation provided enabled me to discuss and decide matters adequately.	5.56
6. I read all of the relevant documentation.	4.87
7. I have actively participated in ExCo discussions.	6.25
8. The Chair encouraged full and open discussion and invited questions, including eliciting divergent views, and accurately summarized outcomes.	6.56
9. Overall, the decision making process at the ExCo meeting was effective.	6.25
10. CGIAR/ExCo recommendations and decisions are adequately followed-up by ExCo.	5.56
11. I find the use of the electronic assessment methodology during the meeting useful.	5.07

Full ExCo 15 Feedback Results available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/meetings.html>