

Meeting Report

Full Alliance Meeting (AB and AE)¹ **28-30 November 2008** **Joaquim Chissano International Conference Center** **Maputo, Mozambique**

Summary

The Alliance Executive and Alliance Board met immediately prior to the CGIAR Annual General meeting in Maputo. The agenda of the Alliance meeting largely dealt with the CST proposal, the Alliance response to the CST proposal, the purpose of the Consortium, and the manner in which the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and the mega-programmes needed to be build. The agenda included approval of the Alliance budget.

This report outlines the discussions held and the decisions made in planning the Consortium, the SRF and the mega-programmes including outlining activities in the planning and responsibilities for carrying forward these activities. This report also includes the outcomes of an additional short meeting of the Alliance membership held on Thursday 4 December to wrap things up (see Annex 1). A communiqué outlining the Alliance position and plans is attached as Annex 2. ***Points of general agreement and decisions are marked in bold italics.***

Opening Remarks by the Alliance Board Chair

The Alliance Board Chair welcomed the participants, including new members, and noted the importance of the meeting and the decisions and agreements to be reached over the coming days. The agenda had been structured to allow ample time for discussions. Members were encouraged to share their ideas and engage in the discussions in order to arrive at strong consensus.

The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 1: Status of the Change Process

In opening this session the Alliance was advised that the Business Meeting will be asked to vote on a short document rather than the full CST proposal. The short document outlines the building blocks of the new CGIAR and main principles. The Business meeting will be giving approval to this document and not to the CST document itself.

Responses from donors over the past weeks to the CST proposal were reported by the AE Chair as positive. Questions have arisen and seem to be quite similar to the concerns raised by the centres. Overall though there is willingness to move ahead with the reform as proposed and work out details as the transition unfolds.

Each member of the Alliance provided their expectations in regards to the meeting and concerns regarding the Alliance/Consortium role in the transition. A summary of the key points raised are included as Annex 4.

¹ Participants to the Alliance Meeting 28-30 November are noted in Annex 3

Jonathan Wadsworth provided the Alliance with his own views of the change management process. He advised that the DFID is increasing its unrestricted contribution by 25% per year over the next four years, as long as the reform proceeds satisfactorily. Without a significant reform in place, a donor such as DFID would explore alternative sources of supply. From the European perspective the reform proposal is acceptable with the request that a mechanism (e.g. ExCo) review progress. Overall some concerns but not enough to hold back the proposal.

Donor views on mergers and/or closures are quite varied. Some see it as the 'big test' but reflections from CST indicate that the number of centres is not the issue but a collective approach e.g. Consortium with a single entry point is relevant.

Agenda Item 2: Clarifying the building blocks in the new CGIAR

Each Centre was asked to provide their understanding on key elements of the new CGIAR. Following is the summary of the issues arising from each of the building blocks reviewed.

1. Strategy and Results Framework: conundrum in sequence; no foreseen donor input and donor review every 6 years may not be adequate. Does it make sense to have a Strategy and Results Framework for only the Fund or for the total research agenda (funded by Fund and bilaterally)?
2. Mega-Programmes: still too many unknowns e.g. content, structure, governance, accountability. More critical analysis is needed
3. The Consortium: will be a creation of the Alliance with the Centres being the shareholders. Design, defining roles (e.g. CEO) and the powers of the Consortium still to be discussed.
4. Functions of the Consortium Board: It will need to protect the rights of the Centres; in a sense a Shareholder Board. The level and number of its functions still to be decided (e.g. the Consortium Board's role in managing the research outside the mega-programmes). Whether the Alliance (or a similar body) will still be required is yet to be decided.
5. Consortium Board – selection, accountability: Will need to have the Consortium Constitution well advanced before the Consortium Board is selected. A search for Board members of sufficient stature can be started with the final selection made after the Consortium Constitution is agreed upon
6. Responsibilities of Centre Boards after the Reform: Role of the Centre Boards do not change radically; need to make it clear Centre Boards have primary responsibility for activities outside the Fund and Centre specific.
7. Program Performance Contracts and Center Performance Agreements: issues include change in working with partners and coming up with appropriate incentives and sanctions.
8. Independent Evaluation and Monitoring: No clear agreement on what this function will cover (all mega-programmes or just some parts of these). Critical to reduce layers of evaluation.
9. The Fund: Still needs more dialogue and consultation between the Fund and Consortium regarding how the money is allocated to mega-programmes (evolutionary or all at once and what would be the target over time) and the funding windows themselves. Donors should be included in these discussions.
10. The Fund Council: Primarily donors business but Alliance should follow and question what is going on – make sure it doesn't get too big, costly and go into mission creep. Still a need for donors and centers to have face-to-face dialogue
11. Funders Summit: What it will be and what purpose it will serve is not clear yet.
12. Independent Science and Partnership Council: Remains a contentious element with reservation noted on putting science counselling and partnership under the same hat; it is needed but it is the form that this takes that needs further clarification.
13. Conference for Agricultural Research for Development (CARD): Given that the CARD is a forum for the stakeholders to be heard, is GFAR the most effective or only source of partners in this dialogue?

14. Recasting Key Founding Principles: It remains to be seen how autonomous the centers remain - subsidiarity at appropriate level could be an alternative to 'centre autonomy or independence'; being a coherent system is a better concept than 'collective action'.
15. The Next Steps: Transition at the System Level: how to fund the transition including, development of the strategy and results framework; how to ensure partner (GFAR) input.

Mergers and clusters of Centres: Given that donors may challenge the Centres on mergers and clustering, it was agreed that the decision should come from the Centres and be based on a strategic and programmatic analysis.

Agenda Item 3: The Consortium

In introduction, it was again emphasised that designing the Consortium is the responsibility of the Alliance. It is the Alliance that will shape and define what the Consortium is and what it will do.

A background paper "Provisional Terms of Reference: Consultancy for the creation of the Consortium" had been sent to Alliance members as a basis for discussion. This included an Annex on the objectives of the Consortium which had been prepared based on previous Alliance discussions as well as some of the statements that are in the Alliance principles and procedures.

The discussion highlighted the need to state clearly the higher level goal or purpose for the Consortium. The concepts of efficiency, advocacy, an entry point, greater system coherence were mentioned. It was recognised that during the change management process a great deal of work had already been done on vision, goals and strategic objectives for the CGIAR. The purpose and objectives of the Consortium should link to the CGIAR's goal and strategic objectives.

Proposed higher level purpose: *Harness the synergies and the collective strengths of the Centres and its partners to achieve at scale the strategic objectives of the CGIAR.*

The Consortium has the additional role of facilitating the Strategy and Results Framework and disbursing funds the part of the research agenda that comes through the Fund.

So why a consortium and what is the change from the status quo? The Consortium will provide service delivery to the Centres; to the donors (e.g. single entry point) and be more than the sum of the parts by catalysing impact through more integrative science.

There was general agreement on the role of the Consortium with the need to frame it appropriately.

Noting the need to clearly distinguish between objectives and tasks the following additional items were put forward to be included in regards to what the Consortium should do:

- Clarification of the role of the Consortium in monitoring and evaluation
- What would be the legal aspects e.g. primacy of governance bodies; dispute resolution; decision making; relationship with the Fund
- Single point of contact and representation role
- Making the CG centres more prominent in agricultural development globally
- Stressing the new ways of doing science e.g. engaging in partnership that make research more effective and relevant for development

Concerns still to be addressed:

- How are we going to be a better partner?

- Clarity in specifying the role of donors in the Fund and to whom the Consortium is accountable.
- The need to be specific/explicit about performance contracts noting that they are specific to funds coming from the Fund.
- Mechanisms for adjusting the strategy and results framework if it is a 6-year timeframe or otherwise keep it very general
- Consortium should have a resource mobilization role but clear that it doesn't overlap with centres efforts.

The above notes were circulated for written feedback and served as input to the final session of the Alliance meeting.

Agenda Item 4: Report back on the Strategy and Results Framework discussion between ADE and AE

The AE Chair reported back from the meeting with the ADE Chair regarding the SRF noting the following points:

- There was general agreement that the Consortium strategy would build on the CGIAR vision and strategic objectives. It would articulate what the Consortium does to contribute to these strategic objectives and vision. The Consortium strategy aligns with centre, partner, and regional strategies in a bottom up manner.
- A fully-consultative development with partners of the SRF would be completed by 2010.
- In leading up to the finalized SRF a conceptual approach to moving forward e.g. toolbox; peer review process, and if possible identification of 'labels' (that may form mega-programmes but will need due process to more fully describe or populate) will be completed by the ADE (target date March 2009). The ADE task team will be asked to include two external 'science' participants (possibly by ECART and GFAR) to join their team to plan the planning.
- Consultation process to be further identified and to be further discussed with Alliance Board.
- Propose to the Science Council that the topic of the prototype CARD in June is changed to better reflect a consultation process for the development of the SRF or otherwise postponed.
- The Alliance will prepare TORs for the ADE to move forward on the Strategy and Results Framework.

Further issues identified:

- The issue of compliance still needs to be re-visited
- Whether the SRF should cover the totality of the agenda of the System
- The issue of how the Challenge Programmes would be handled in the SRF but some agreement that, at least conceptually, they should be integrated into the mega-programmes
- Further clarity will be needed on what types of partners will be needed and for what types of activities. There was one suggestion that involvement of political partnerships would be minimal (and where necessary) with a more merit/skill based approach in identifying other partners. Another suggestion was that, where appropriate, it might be possible to sub-contract other bodies to take up consultation with partners
- A special plea was made to try and timetable meetings so that they are connected and take into account major meetings for the Centres.

Discussions and agreement on how to address these issues and the mega-programmes were held on the final day of the Alliance meeting (Agenda Item 7).

Agenda Item 5: Discussion and approval of the Alliance 2009 budget

The CAO gave a presentation reviewing accomplishments in 2008 highlighting the strong growth of the Alliance in making its voice heard in the System. Other achievements included a coordinated Alliance response to USAID (re shortfall in funding); the food crisis; steps to create and implement collective action, an inventory of collective action in best bet technologies for crop production; new budget line for the ESA regional plan. In 2008 there was less success in promoting programmatic collective action.

With clarification on the salary component, overhead, expected expenditure and the modalities of funding the Alliance Office and the System Units, the Chair of the Alliance sub-Committee outlined the recommendations for funding the Alliance Office and the System Office Units.

The Alliance approved the Alliance financial support for 2009 as follows (funded on a user pays basis):

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| CAS-IP | \$150,000 |
| Gender and Diversity | \$100,000 |
| ICT-KM | \$150,000 |

It was noted that 2009 funding from the Alliance to the Communication Unit at the CGIAR Secretariat would be based on the presentation and approval by the Alliance of a revised workplan and budget.

To be funded from the Alliance budget, as per the funding formula used since 2002 (non subscription basis):

| | |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Alliance Office | \$703,000 |
| Contingency | \$100,000 |

The Alliance Board budget was not approved subject to the Alliance Board reviewing further information

Noting that the presentation of the budget information was difficult to follow and understand in its present format ***it was agreed that Gordon McNeill and Getachew Engida will work with the CAO to design the appropriate presentation of the Alliance budget for implementation by AIARC.***

Future approval of the Alliance budget will be done by the Alliance Executive (excluding the Alliance Board budget) once the format is clarified.

As the budgets of the System Office Units are on a subscription basis it was proposed that in the future, the level of Centre subscription be ascertained prior to agreement on SO Unit budgets.

Agenda Item 6: Finalising the Alliance position on agenda items for AGM08

The agenda and programme for the Alliance and Partners session (December 2) was presented to the Alliance for their input and discussion. Suggestions were provided on the presentation that would frame the context for the day.

Agenda Item 7: Creating a Consortium and Developing the Strategy: Key steps and Timeline

Following on from the results of Agenda item 3 (The Consortium) and from the Alliance Board (arising from the AB solo meeting) further discussion was held on different aspects of the Consortium. ***This led to the following agreements and decisions.***

The Consortium:

- It is an instrument to increase the capacity of the Centres to deal with global issues.
- The Consortium will provide a strong system voice in international debates and will be an effective entry point into the System.
- The Consortium adds value to the Centres. It is a mechanism to increase the coherence of the system through an integrated and multidisciplinary approach to complex and large problems. It generates research synergies and greater impacts, at larger scale than would be possible without a consortium approach.
- The higher level purpose of the Consortium will take into account the concepts of efficiency, advocacy, an entry point, greater system coherence. The purpose and objectives of the Consortium will link to the CGIAR's goal and strategic objectives in recognition of the work already accomplished on a vision, goals and strategic objectives for the CGIAR. As such it was agreed that *the purpose of the Consortium will be to increase the capacity of the Centres to deal with global issues, catalysing innovation and harnessing synergies and collective strengths of the centres and partners to achieve at global scale the mission of the CGIAR.*
- The Consortium will lead the development of the strategy and results framework for the whole system, in close collaboration with partners.
- The Centres will be the 'shareholders' of the Consortium and will be accountable and responsible for what the Consortium does. The shareholders will be represented by the Centre Board Chairs. The shareholders responsibilities will include:
 - Appointing the Board of the Consortium following a broad and transparent process
 - Develop a Constitution and approve any changes in the Constitution
 - Approve entry to the Consortium as well as exclusion from the Consortium
 - Assess the collective performance of the Board
- The Consortium will be governed by a Consortium Board. It is a competency based Board, where individuals are members in their personal capacity. The Board is appointed by the Centres, as shareholders.
- The Consortium Board will be accountable and responsible to the shareholders for what the Consortium does. The shareholders are represented by the Centre Board Chairs.
- The responsibilities of the Board will include:
 - Leading a bottom up process to develop the strategy and results framework and revise this when necessary
 - Setting policy, setting standards/best practices and monitoring these
 - Oversight of structure and delivery mechanisms with the authority to make structural adjustments where necessary to improve delivery systems.
 - Appointing the CEO/ED
 - Assessing and managing risk and ensuring compliance with its decisions
 - Assessing centre capacity to perform (due diligence) with a graduated set of responses in the case of non-performance.
- Its activities will be discharged under two principles – subsidiarity and excellence.

- The Consortium should not be an added layer of bureaucracy and mechanisms will be put in place to limit any such tendencies. Being accountable to the shareholders should prevent bureaucratization, as should be following the principle of subsidiarity and having a forum for the shareholders to discuss any issues of bureaucracy with the Consortium Board (taking necessary action if required).
- It was agreed that there must be a proper costing of establishing this new entity and its operations and these would be benchmarked against the running costs of the system as it is now.

The following next steps were agreed upon:

- Creation of a Consortium Planning Team (made up of three DGs and three Board Chairs).
- Discussion with the Chief Alliance Officer in identifying the need for and subsequent action on contracting a transition project manager (consultancy)
- Additional resources will be required to implement all these steps. Without funds the whole timeline would be pushed out.
- The Consortium Planning Team has full authority on managerial parts of the process. They will not have authority on actual content – the approval of the results of the project will be the responsibility of the full Alliance

| <i>Timeframe</i> | <i>Activities</i> |
|------------------------|---|
| By the end of December | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium Planning Team will have identified the transition project manager and prepare the TORs of the manager. |
| End of January | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First draft on the Consortium architecture |
| Mid-late February | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation period |
| End of March | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on feedback next draft prepared |
| End of May | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alliance meeting to adopt final report |
| Latter half of 2009 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center Board ratification |

- Consortium services and the estimated costs associated with setting up and running the Consortium is required. The Consortium Planning Team will decide the need for a consultancy to have this done.
- Check points (to be determined by the Consortium Planning Team) will be put in place to give time for each Centre to engage. Initial ideas for checkpoints would be: after the draft TORs for the CEO, the draft Consortium Constitution, management of mega-programs, common services and costing

Additional Points:

- No resolution on whether the Consortium Board will finalize the Strategy and Results Framework or if it will be done before they are selected
- May be an interim Board until the legal process is completed
- There is a need to develop a mechanism on how to deal with issues where there isn't consensus

Strategy and Results Framework

- The Alliance agreed that they would co-design with partners the initial Strategy and Results Framework.
- The Consortium Strategy would build on the CGIAR vision and strategic objectives. It would articulate that research that the Consortium is doing that contributes to these strategic

objectives and vision. The Consortium strategy is an articulation of what the Consortium does and will align with the centre, partner, and regional strategies.

- The strategy and results framework will cover essentially the research for development agenda of the whole system. Some activities undertaken by Centres with outside partners will lie outside of the Strategy (e.g., rural electrification). The performance contracts will be related to those monies from the Fund that are disbursed through the Consortium Board.
- A fully-consultative development of the SRF with partners will be completed by 2010. In preparation for this:
 - A group of DGs will develop TORs that define the process and prioritize actions and circulate this to the AE and AB.
 - A task team from the Alliance of Deputy Executives (Science) will be charged with developing a conceptual approach. The ADE task team will be asked to include two external 'science' participants (possibly by ECART and GFAR) to join their team. The product of this process will be prepared for the May 2009 ExCo meeting.
 - The Alliance of Deputy Executives (Finance) will prepare implementation models (including business plans) on the running the mega programmes (including mixed-funded mega programmes)
 - A full consultation process will follow. The first Conference on Agricultural Research for Development, planned for early 2010 in Montpellier will be a finalization of the consultation phase.

Mega-programmes

Initial thinking on the issue of mega-programmes noted that mega-programmes could be articulated in terms of global and regional development challenges and includes integrated science for development. Whether Challenge programs and SWEPs are included would be subject to further examination and consultation but two options put forward would be to either absorb them in a mega-programme or suitable centre programme or draw to closure over a reasonable period of time.

Mega-programmes, initially at least, will be funded both through the Fund and bilaterally.

An alternative suggestion on funding windows arose with a proposal discussed on having two funding windows: an institutional window and a programmatic window. With two such windows in place as soon as the Fund becomes operational it would first fill the institutional support window, and then begin filling the program support window. Continuity in topping up the institutional window would enable the Centres to continue their operations while the new programmatic window and mega-programmes evolve.

Also discussed, but with no clear consensus, was the issue of transition management as it applies to the mega-programmes and the operation of the new Fund.

The issue whether the Consortium should have some oversight responsibilities/reporting back on the bilaterally funded part of the mega-programmes was not resolved.

Partnerships

Recognising that partnerships are key to the design and implementation of the Strategy and Results Framework and in how the Consortium operates, the Alliance had discussions on different types of partnership (policy partners, research partners, implementation partners and funding partners) and the sorts of interactions that might be expected between these partners and the Consortium. Another aspect of interactions with partners will be through the performance and evaluation contracts. Issues arising include:

- a. Contracts specify verifiable indicators of progress by actors
- b. Self reporting by agents
- c. Audit function that is independent

- d. Consortium has to be accountable for the funds and deliverables
- e. Watch on multiple evaluations – one donor and one internal audit
- f. Approval for funding contingent also on quality and strategic value of partnerships

A final point on this topic was the rights of partners and the suggestion that the Consortium needs a mechanism to allow partners to express their voice in R&D

Issues outstanding:

- Overall governance relations: Consortium Planning Team, Alliance Executive Chair, Chief Alliance Officer, Transition Manager. Discussion not finalised
- Funding of the change process, for the Consortium side
- Funding of the operating costs of the Consortium

Donor Expectations as noted by the CGIAR Director

The Director of the CGIAR advised the Alliance of some of the concerns arising from the donor community. The donors were seeking clarity on whether the Fund will be privy to the decisions on including new members to the Consortium. It is Consortium business; however it would have an effect on funding.

There are expectations that there will be a reduction of costs in the new CGIAR. However the Alliance was advised to consider this carefully given that the Consortium will require a robust program project team, the ISPC will have its own expanded secretariat to include partnership responsibilities and that GFAR has proposed a budget of \$25 million and \$2.5 million to run the CARD. Even with a reduction in the CGIAR secretariat (from 15 to 12 core positions) this won't cover the increasing costs.

Other issues being raised by donors included questions about (1) the size of Centre Boards, whether they will be reduced and if plans are being developed to effect these changes to Centre Boards; (2) the timely creation of the mega-programmes, and (3) a review of the TORs for the Consortium CEO.

It was reported that the donors are expecting that all consortium activities will fall under the strategy and results framework.

Concluding Discussion and Summary

The meeting concluded with **agreement on further actions** to be taken before the end of AGM

- Consortium Planning Team identified by DGs and Board Chairs
- Development of an Alliance communiqué (writing team of Julio, Emile, Geoff and Anne-Marie)
- Develop TORs for the ADE to move forward in the development of the Strategy and Results Framework (Colin to take the lead)
- Meeting of the Alliance on Thursday 4 December to review progress and agree on next steps

Finally, tribute was paid to the departing Board Chairs (Ruth Egger, Stein Bie, Nobumasa Hatcho) and Emile Frison as AE Chair.

Following the meeting a workshop with GRPS members was held to exchange views and clarify perspectives on the GRPC's proposal for an Alliance policy on IP.

Alliance Board and Alliance Executive Meeting
Maputo, Mozambique
Thursday, 4 December 2008 (7:30 PM-9:15 PM)

| Alliance Executive | Alliance Board | Alliance Office |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Steve Hall | Remo Gautschi | Anne-Marie Izac |
| Geoff Hawtin | Gordon McNeil | Fiona Chandler |
| Bob Zeigler | Beth Woods | |
| Joachim von Braun | Ross Garnaut | |
| Carlos Sere | Uwe Werblow | |
| Willie Dar | Stein Bie | |
| Papa Abdoulaye Seck | Getachew Engida | |
| Thomas Lumpkin | Julio Berdeque | |
| Tony Simons* | Lynn Haight | |
| Emile Frison | Bryan Harvey | |
| Colin Chartres | Andrew Bennett | |
| Mahmoud Solh | | |

Apologies: Pamela Anderson, Ruth Egger, Dennis Garrity, Guido Gryseels, Hartmann, Tony Gregson, Nobumasa Hatcho, Yemi Katerere

The meeting was chaired by Andrew Bennett, in his capacity as Vice-Chair of the Alliance Board.

Introduction:

As discussed in the final session of the Alliance meeting on 30 November 2008, those members of the Alliance Executive and Alliance Board still present at the CGIAR AGM met to go over outstanding issues and actions arising from that last session, namely:

1. Confirmation of the Alliance Board and Alliance Executive members who would compose the Consortium Planning Team and the role of the Transition Manager to work with this team
2. Response to the expectations for mega-programmes or at the very least a prototype mega-programme in the short term
3. Review of an estimated budget for the Consortium planning in 2009
4. Legal conditions imposed by the transition
5. Ongoing communications within the Alliance Board and Alliance Executive regarding the consortium planning and development of the strategy and results framework

Added to this was information regarding the CGIAR Transition Management Team.

Formal recognition was made of the efforts, time and achievements of Guido Gryseels and Emile Frison for serving the common interests of the Centres during the past year. The hard work of the Alliance Office was also appreciatively acknowledged.

CGIAR Transition Management Team

The members of this team are Kathy Sierra as Chair, Steve Hall, Mark Holderness, Ren Wang and Jonathan Wadsworth with support from Mustafa (a new staff in the CGIAR Secretariat in Washington DC). Trium will be engaged to support the TMT. A copy of the agenda for their kickoff meeting 5 December 2008 was circulated. Steve Hall noted his role in feeding the Alliance position into this team and his commitment to keep the Alliance informed of the results of this meeting.

Concern was noted that the Centre Boards were not represented in this team. It was agreed that ***the Alliance Board would not make an application to the TMT to be involved with the express request that the incoming Alliance Executive Chair update the Board Chairs on his interactions with this team.*** The incoming Alliance Executive Chair agreed to this request.

Confirmation of the Alliance Board and Alliance Executive members who would compose the Consortium Planning Team

The Alliance agreed to the term Consortium Planning Team to reflect the group of Board Chairs and DGs that will move forward on tasks associated with the Consortium planning.

The Alliance Board confirmed that they would be represented on the Consortium Planning Team by Guido Gryseels, Andrew Bennett and Julio Berdegue. Other Alliance Board members will provide support when possible.

The Alliance Executive had not reached consensus on who would join the incoming Alliance Executive Chair. Names that had been put forward included Emile Frison, Joachim von Braun, Pamela Anderson, Bob Zeigler, Carlos Sere and Dennis Garrity. The incoming Alliance Chair noted his preference that the DGs themselves would come to him with their choice of two DGs to join the Consortium Planning Team. After discussion it was agreed that the incoming Alliance Executive Chair would decide who, among the nominees, should be involved and advise the rest of the Alliance on Friday 5 December on those that will join the Consortium Planning Team. [Note: the AE members of the Consortium Planning Team were confirmed as Pamela Anderson, Bob Zeigler and Steve Hall]

The *modus operandi* of the Consortium Planning Team was summarized by the incoming Alliance Executive Chair as a team managing the process in ensuring that the right conversations were being had with the right people at the right time and that the CPT's role was to summarize these discussions and report back to the Alliance. Steve in his role would be linking these discussions to the CGIAR Transition Management Team.

Finally it was noted that the text about the foundation blocks of the reform on which CGIAR members are asked to vote, is quite generic, which means that there is room for the Alliance to design the Consortium as they have decided.

Mega-programmes

Noting the pressure coming from the AGM Business Meeting for the full development of mega-programmes, the Alliance agreed to put forward a firm view on this. The Alliance will be driving the process of the development of the strategy and results framework and the mega-programmes. Further more, the Alliance position is that the Science Council's role will be limited to providing advice to the Alliance, upon the Alliance's invitation, to the development of the Strategy and Results Framework and mega-programmes.

A timeline for the development of the Strategy and Results Framework and candidate mega-programmes has been sketched out by Colin and some colleagues and will be further elaborated in the coming weeks in order that the ADE can move forward the task they have agreed to take on.

It was agreed that the Alliance Board will have the opportunity to endorse the Strategy and Results Framework

Review of an estimated budget for the Consortium planning in 2009

The estimated budget was presented with a request for additional items that were missing. It was noted that funding for IFPRI's contribution had not been factored in yet. What had not been included were legal costs Centres would probably face once the Consortium was approved. It was deemed that these might be significant.

The Alliance decided that the budget prepared was reasonable and that a request would be made to the TMT to support the Consortium Planning and Consortium Board operations in 2009. It was noted that support from the TMT was essential in order not to slow the process of the transition down. Such financial support to the Alliance's proposal would be a sign of their commitment to the new CGIAR. Searching for alternative sources of funding e.g. from Centres was not feasible and searching alternative sources from donors would be too time consuming.

It was agreed that the Consortium Planning Team will keep the rest of the Alliance informed on this request and the response from the TMT.

It was agreed that we should avoid bilateral discussions for funds; where such intelligence is gained, the information should be brought to the attention of the Consortium Planning Team.

Identification of a Transition Manager

The Alliance agreed that it was important to keep the process of the Consortium design and architecture in the hands of the Alliance. A transition manager is considered key to this. The criteria for such a position would be someone who can manage the process, keep up the momentum and stick to milestones. This person would have skills and experience in organizing good consultations, brokering consensus among the Alliance membership, and communicating at a high level to the stakeholders. Candidates for the transition manager position must have experience in leading change processes, be knowledgeable of the System (but not an employee), be respected in international circles and able to speak convincingly that it is not 'business as usual'. The transition manager would be accountable to the CPT for moving things forward.

It was agreed that this position should be filled as quickly as possible and that whoever chosen would be able to work well with the team.

It was agreed that the Consortium Planning Team would be charged with making the choice of a suitable person. Nominations for suitable persons should be passed to the CPT.

Annex 2: Alliance Communiqué

The following communiqué was prepared and approved by the Alliance during AGM.

At their meeting of 28-30 November 2008 in Maputo, the 15 members of the Alliance of the CGIAR Centres agreed in principle to create a Consortium as a legal entity with the Centres as “shareholders”. The Consortium will have an international legal persona; it will be governed by a Consortium Board and managed by a CEO/Executive Director.

The Consortium will increase the capacity of the Centres to deal with global issues, catalysing innovation and harnessing synergies and collective strengths of the centres and partners to achieve at global scale the mission of the CGIAR. The Consortium will provide a strong system voice in international debates and fora and will offer a unified entry point into the System. The Consortium, working closely with partners, will lead the development of the Strategy and Results Framework for the whole system.

During the transition leading to the establishment of the Consortium, the Alliance has agreed on specific steps for co-designing, with our partners, the initial Strategy and Results Framework. We agreed to have a draft process by March 2009, hold initial consultations and present the process, and considerations about the nature of mega-programmes within the Strategy, to the May 2009 ExCo meeting. This will be followed by the consultation process to develop the Strategy and Results Framework and associated mega-programmes. We anticipate that the first Conference on Agricultural Research for Development, planned for early 2010 in Montpellier, will allow us to finalise this consultation process.

The Alliance has formed a task force of Board Chairs and Directors General that has been delegated the authority to manage the process of planning and establishing the Consortium together with the Alliance Office. This task force will ensure that a draft Consortium Charter is produced for discussion by the Alliance during its May 2009 meeting. The Alliance has agreed that the Consortium Board will appoint the CEO/Executive Director, set and monitor standards, make structural adjustments where necessary, improve delivery systems, ensure compliance with its decisions and manage risks.

Based on the draft Consortium Charter, the task force and the Alliance Office will provide to the full Alliance an ex ante assessment of the costs of establishing and operating the Consortium, including the costs of the Consortium Office, CEO/Executive Director, Board, common services and functions and management of mega-programmes.

The Boards of the Centres joining the Consortium will ratify the Consortium Charter, and approve the creation of the Consortium and its Consortium Office, including their operating costs, at the September-October 2009 Centre Board meetings.

We expect that the Consortium will be formally established, including the appointment of the Consortium Board, following this ratification, toward the end of 2009. The establishment of the Consortium as a full international legal entity may take more time, depending upon the legal options for incorporation that will be chosen.

We will work with the transition management team to coordinate our activities with all the teams working on the other foundation blocks of the change process.

Subsequent to the AGM, the Alliance agreed to post the communiqué on the Alliance website.

Annex 3: Participants to the Alliance Meeting 28-30 November

Participants

Alliance Meetings (AB and AE) 28-30 November 2008 Joaquim Chissano International Conference Center Maputo, Mozambique

| | |
|--|---|
| Africa Rice Centre (WARDA) Papa Abdoulaye Seck, Director General Getachew Engida, Board Chair | IRRI Robert Ziegler, Director General Elisabeth Woods, Board Chair Michael Jackson (representative 30/11) |
| Bioversity International Emile Frison, Alliance Executive Chair Tony Gregson, Board Chair | IWMI Colin Chartres, Director General Nobumasa Hatcho, Board Chair |
| CIAT Geoff Hawtin, Director General Gordon McNeil, Board Chair | World Agroforestry Centre Dennis Garrity, Director General Lynn Haight, Board Chair |
| CIFOR Frances Seymour, Director General Andrew Bennett, Board Chair | WorldFish Centre Stephen Hall, Director General Remo Gautschi, Board Chair |
| CYMMIT Thomas Lumpkin, Director General Julio Berdeque, Board Chair | Alliance Office staff Anne-Marie Izac, Chief Alliance Officer Fiona Chandler, Scientific Liaison Officer Veronica Lazzari, Program Assistant |
| CIP Pamela Anderson, Director General Ruth Egger, Board Chair | Alliance Board Josephine Hernandez, CGIAR Secretariat |
| ICARDA Mahmoud Solh, Director General Guido Gryseels, Board Chair | Alliance Deputy Executive Rodomiro Ortiz (Alliance Deputy Executive, Chair) Gerry O'Donough (Alliance Deputy Executive, Finance) John McDermott (Alliance Deputy Executive, incoming Chair) |
| ICRISAT Willie Dar, Director General Stein Bie, Board Chair | Guests Jonathan Wadsworth, DFID |
| IFPRI Joachim von Braun, Director General Gunnar Sorbo, replacing the Board Chair, Ross Garnaut | Facilitator: Alayne Reesberg |
| IITA Hartmann, Director General Bryan Harvey, Board Chair | Apologies: Ross Garnaut |
| ILRI Carlos Seré, Director General Uwe Werblow, Board Chair | |

Annex 4: Summary of expectations and concerns regarding the Alliance/Consortium role in the transition

- Need to ensure that funds are significantly increased. Get past our collective fear of what is looking like a huge bureaucracy
- Agreement on principles and transition process that results in significant gains and reduction of transaction costs. Centres and partners will have resources to move forward on this.
- Address mega-programmes and ensure that their development will not place a heavy burden on the centres. No “carrot” coming in the next few years. Important to look forward and the centres govern the transition process.
- Want to move forward; great to know if there is donor support because if this isn't coming it isn't worth doing; transaction costs and bureaucracy; role of natural resources; mega-programmes and performance contracts definitions; leadership is driven by the centres for the implementation
- Need to build and improve taking into account internal and external. Need agreement on principles to move forward – and not focus too much on details. This stage it is an intellectual exercise because the other actors are not included.
- Agree on specific principle issues and the role of the consortium board. Other points relate to the prepared statement by ICARDA Board.
- Centres take leadership and that the process that the Consortium puts in place addresses a broader picture. Leave the meeting with more than a common understanding and an Alliance task force to start implementation. Done between the meetings.
- Come out of the meeting with the dimensions of the strategy and results framework, how partners will be involved (interests of donors and partners don't always coincide) and how this can be put in place in a reasonable timeframe. Worth going through with the Consortium approach even if no extra funds because it is worth doing.
- Cautiously optimistic. How to ensure a strong centre/alliance representation and voice in what is going to come out at the end. NRM and water issues need a strong voice in the system in the next 12 months. Good look at financial issues – still retain some level of independence.
- Amount in the Fund does matter. Coming up with a clear transition process that manages the tensions.
- Support broad strategic directions. Concerned about trend towards centralisation. Looking for clarity and consensus on key issues especially the legal basis of consortium board and role of centre boards. Need to see how content goes alongside with this.
- Get a sense of various design elements of the reform can be designed at an optimum level of aggregation (so not burdened with unnecessary transaction costs).
- Supports the change. Alliance needs to take leadership in the Consortium building and the centres take the leading role. Strategy and Results framework can be tackled easily enough as well as the mega-programmes