

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

May 5-6, 2005

**WorldFish Center
Penang, Malaysia**

*Summary Record
of
Proceedings*

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

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Attendance	3
Chairs’ Executive Summary	5
Opening Remarks and Welcome	7
Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Overview: CGIAR Changes, Opportunities and Challenges for the Future Harvest Centers – The Way Forward.....	7
Agenda Item 2. Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from CIMMYT Meetings and ExCom Rome Retreat.....	8
Agenda Item 3. Alliance Charter.	8
Agenda Item 4. Status Reporting on Alliance Response to SSA Task Force Report.	10
Agenda Item 5. IFAD Negotiations FHAO Update.....	12
Agenda Item 6. Actions to Operationalize the Alliance.	13
Agenda Item 7. CGIAR and its’ Centers: Visions and Missions.....	14
Agenda Item 8. Contracting and Conflict mechanisms.	14
Agenda Item 9. Update on Board Orientation and Lessons Learned.	16
Agenda Item 10. SSA-TF Discussions.	17
Agenda Item 11. CGIAR new Priorities and Strategies.	19
Agenda Item 12. Joint Videoconference with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider.....	21
Agenda Item 13. Follow-up to GRPC meeting.....	25
Agenda Item 13.1 Approval by Center Boards of Draft Agreement	25
Agenda Item 13.2 Guiding Principles for GMOs in collections.....	26
Agenda Item 14. Report from Joint Working Groups	27
Agenda Item 14.1 CGIAR Compensation Study.....	27
Agenda Item 14.2 Challenge Programs	28
Agenda Item 14.3 Performance Measurement	29
Agenda Item 15. Other Business.	30
Statement to ExCo.	32
Closing Remarks.	32
Annex 1. CBC-AE Decisions Taken May 2005	34
Annex 2. Final Agenda Joint Meeting	38

Attendance

<i>CIAT</i>	Joachim Voss, Director General
<i>CIFOR</i>	Angela Cropper, Board Chair David Kaimowitz, Director General
<i>CIMMYT</i>	Alex McCalla, Board Chair Masa Iwanaga, Director General
<i>CIP</i>	Jim Godfrey, Board Chair Pamela Anderson, Director General
<i>ICARDA</i>	Margaret Catley-Carlson, Board Chair Adel El-Beltagy, Director General
<i>ICRISAT</i>	Uzo Mokwunye, Board Chair and <i>CBC Chair</i> William Dar, Director General and <i>AE Chair</i>
<i>IFPRI</i>	Isher Judge Alhuwalia, Board Chair Joachim von Braun, Director General
<i>IITA</i>	Mortimer Neufville, Board Chair Hartmann, Director General
<i>ILRI</i>	Uwe Werblow, Board Chair Carlos Seré, Director General
<i>IPGRI</i>	Tony Gregson, Board Chair Emile Frison, Director General
<i>IRRI</i>	Keijiro Otsuka, Board Chair Robert Zeigler, Director General
<i>IWMI</i>	Remo Gautschi, Board Chair Frank Rijsberman, Director General
<i>Africa Rice Center WARDA</i>	Gaston Grenier, Board Chair Kanayo Nwanze, Director General
<i>World Agroforestry Center</i>	Eugene Terry, Board Chair Dennis Garrity, Director General

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

FHAO Meryl Williams, Executive Officer
Kerri Wright Platais, Executive Secretary, CDC

CBC Executive Secretary M. Caryl Jones-Swahn

Special Guests (in chronological order)

Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Science Council Chair and SSA-TF Co-Chair
Ian Johnson, CGIAR Chair
Francisco Reifschneider, CGIAR Director

Chairs' Executive Summary

As Chairs of the Committee of Center Board Chairs (CBC) and the newly transformed Alliance Executive (AE, former Center Directors Committee), we are pleased to present the joint summary of proceedings from the May 2005 meetings held at the WorldFish Center. The new challenges and opportunities within the CGIAR System provided the backdrop for the Committees to meet and discuss ways in which they could contribute to the ongoing reforms, in order to make the CGIAR more relevant for the poor and the hungry. Critical in our thinking is the way in which we explore and build partnerships for the Centers (both within and outside the CGIAR).

In addition to videoconferences with Per Pinstrup-Andersen, in his capacity as both a Co-Chair for the Sub-Saharan Task Force and as Chair of the Science Council, we met by videoconference with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider (please see Agenda Items 10, 11 and 12). We discussed and decided on the following:

- The CBC and AE nominated a selection committee to oversee the development of the ToR for and recruitment of the Executive Director of the Future Harvest Alliance Office (FHAO), with a view to having the position filled by AGM05 if possible. Discussions would continue with IFAD, as a potential location for the small office, and an IFAD representative would be invited to join the Selection Committee. Continued work on the draft Alliance Charter will be sped up for eventual approval by the Alliance.
- The Alliance agreed to set up a mechanism for regularly harmonizing the Centers' missions, visions and strategies, ensuring that they are aligned to the CGIAR mission and with each other.
- Two members from each Committee were nominated to serve on a steering committee to develop the ToR for a consultant who would develop an Alliance guideline on contractual and conflict resolution. The ToR would pay close attention to distinguishing the links between contractual mechanisms and the conflict resolution needs, and to developing a typology of conflict events. The mechanisms would target the resolution of large conflicts that stand in the way of major efficiency gains.
- Prior to our joint meetings, two Board Orientation Programs were held at WorldFish. During a total of seven sessions over the last year, 88 Board Members from all 15 Centers have participated.
- The Committees approved the document covering 'Agreements Between Governing Body and the IARCs and Other Relevant International Institutions' and authorized the Directors General of Centers with genebanks to sign on behalf of their Centers, following each Boards' approval. Boards were encouraged to approve the Agreement as soon as possible, so that the Centers would be working under the Treaty arrangements as soon as the Treaty was approved. Final wording is expected in February, 2006.

- The document on ‘Guiding Principles for the Development of Future Harvest Centres’ Policies to Address the Possibility of Unintentional Presence of Transgenes in Ex Situ Collections’ were approved as the Alliance guiding principles. The relevant Centers will prepare procedures for their specific crops, and were requested to post the guiding principles on their Center’s websites.
- And finally, the Center Deputy Directors Committee (CDDC) would be asked to draw up a list of issues for clarification and resolution, building on those provided by the CBC and AE, for further monitoring and participation in the Performance Measurement System.

We look forward to the continued challenges and work before the Committees, as we improve our collective action and fully implement the reforms underway.

A.Uzo Mokwunye
CBC Chair

William D. Dar
AE Chair

Opening Remarks and Welcome

Uzo Mokwunye, Chair of the Committee of Center Board Chairs (CBC) opened the meeting. Trond Bjordal, Chair of the WorldFish Center Board of Trustees, said it was a great honor to welcome the two Committees to the WorldFish Center.

The CBC Chair welcomed new members: Uwe Werblow (ILRI), Tony Gregson (IPGRI), Gaston Grenier (WARDA), and Trond Bjordal (WorldFish). He noted this would be the farewell meeting for Richard Musangi, Board Chair for The Africa Rice Center/WARDA, and sent best regards to Jim Jones (CIAT) who had departed after the CBC Board Orientation, for health reasons. The CBC Chair introduced the members of the Executive Committee for CBC: Jim Godfrey (CIP) as the new Vice Chair and Alex McCalla (CIMMYT) the outgoing Vice-Chair.

Willie Dar, Chair of the Alliance Executive (AE), formerly the Center Directors Committee (CDC), welcomed two new Directors General to the meeting: Robert Zeigler (IRRI) and Pamela Anderson (CIP). He introduced the members of the AE ExCom, Kanayo Nwanze and Joachim Voss. By tradition, he explained, the former Chair remained a member of the Executive Committee, along with the incoming Chair for the following year.

The Chairs offered thanks to the Executive Officer (EO) of the Future Harvest Alliance Office (FHAO), Meryl Williams, for her strong support since the AGM04 meetings, and to the Executive Secretaries, Kerri Wright Platais (FHAO) and Caryl Jones-Swahn (CBC) for their work in meeting preparation.

Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Overview: CGIAR Changes, Opportunities and Challenges for the Future Harvest Centers – The Way Forward.

The CBC Chair said that the Centers were buffeted by new challenges in the landscape surrounding their work, and stressed the importance of viewing the changes underway as part of the framework of a System undergoing various reforms. He emphasized the need for the CBC and AE to contribute to these reforms, in order to make the CGIAR more relevant for the poor and the hungry, by exploring ways in which to build partnerships (both within and without the CGIAR).

The AE Chair emphasized the need to highlight that the Centers were ready for the challenges before them, and were working to turn challenges into opportunities. In follow-up to the meetings in Mexico, an agreement was made to enhance and operationalize the Alliance of the Centers of the CGIAR, and progress had been made. Now the Centers must decide how to go further. He said that the Alliance would continue to build upon what was set in place, and act upon the necessary changes.

The request was made to cover Agenda Item 3. The Alliance Charter as the last item of the meeting. The CBC had not discussed this issue thoroughly in their separate meeting but would share ideas with the AE if time allowed. For the time being, it was

necessary to devote as much time as possible to the response to the Task Forces report on SSA. The agenda was modified and passed.

Agenda Item 2. Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from CIMMYT Meetings and ExCom Rome Retreat.

The Executive Officer highlighted a few items for further clarification from the previous meetings. A joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the CBC and AE was held at IPGRI, February, 2005. Two items for follow-up were modified. The first was the hiring of a Consultant for the Conflict Resolution and Contractual Mechanisms, which was suspended following the release of the SSA-TF, and would continue after the WorldFish meetings, and secondly, the production of an e-newsletter, with the decision taken by the Chairs to tie this product to the quarterly production of CGIAR News and the Chairman's and Directors letter to the CGIAR membership, to avoid duplication of efforts and better enhance the flow of information for collective action.

Discussion.

- The request was made that conflict resolution needed a concrete policy to further clarify the processes to be followed, as this was lacking and had caused confusion in the past.
- The CBC Chair responded that this was addressed by the ExComs during the Rome meeting and would receive proper attention and follow-up.

Agenda Item 3. Alliance Charter.

Note: Although this item was discussed later in the meeting, for purposes of the meeting summary, the order of Agenda Items remains the same.

The CBC Chair asked Margaret Catley-Carlson to brief the AE on the discussions held during the CBC meeting. She explained the current draft of the Alliance Charter had been a tricky document to discuss. She reiterated after the Addis meetings, held July 2004, the concept of forming the Alliance was based on proactive ways (new forms of doing business) and new regulations and common standards. By Mexico the CBC was in agreement to act in a "Supreme Court" type of role, but began to wonder what kind of new work CBC members would begin to take on. Questions about liability began to be raised: "Would there be new responsibilities and accountabilities?"

During the Penang meetings, she explained, it became evident that the Alliance had undergone further and thoughtful development. Yet, despite the agreed tasks of reporting to the Centers' Boards, the CBC had not yet taken the step to operationalize the CBC to serve as the Alliance Board. She said this was perhaps a matter of conceptualizing and understanding the process and the need to further define how the responsibilities of Boards would change. The CBC and AE have a joint task of reporting to their Boards on the types of action, scope of the Alliance, governance arrangements,

administrative teeth, etc. and, in this context, helping the Boards to decide if they will let their Board Chairs form the AB.

As the document was currently written, she said the CBC was unable to agree on some of the language, and was uncertain as to what powers would need to be given over from the individual Boards to the Alliance. This was important as Board Chairs were asked to become the Alliance Board, and recognizing that when the Board Chairs returned to their Center Boards, they would have to help fellow members understand next steps.

Despite the need for further clarity, she emphasized the CBC's full and continued support for the Alliance, and for development of various areas, such as conflict resolution mechanisms and the MTPs, but stressed the CBC needed a better understanding on the changing relationships. The CBC needed to specify its concerns so these could be addressed and the Alliance could move ahead.

Emile Frison, as a member of the joint drafting committee of the Charter, said thanks were owed to John Vercoe, who had taken on the primary responsibility for the drafting, with help from Jim Jones, Meryl Williams, Adel El-Beltagy, Victoria Henson-Apollonia and himself. He stressed the drafting committee worked to find a tool that would allow the Centers the opportunity to engage in more collective action and create a platform by which to facilitate and foster collaboration. He said the wording in the Charter reflected this.

Furthermore, no power was proposed to be ceded at this stage. Regarding the fiduciary responsibilities, he said that there were no changes and further legal advice could be sought regarding contractual arrangements, as the Alliance progressed.

Discussion.

- Having evolved as a System for 30 years, a speaker suggested it would behoove the Centers to be careful about some of the directions in which things were moving. The Centers were preparing to become more accountable for collective action and the governing mechanisms created, but did not know exactly what this would mean. When medium-term plans containing items considered for collective action are approved by a Board, there was a need to know and clarify the links with other activities as well as the implications for the Center.
- In general, speakers agreed it would be good to get input and know how to improve upon the existing draft Charter. Major changes at the level of the Boards would include their evaluations of the Director General. Currently the DGs were evaluated in terms of leadership and contribution to their Center, and this could be modified to include their performance as part of a collaborative structure. Therefore, one way in which Board responsibilities would change was in the assessment of accountabilities of the DGs.
- The suggestion was made to set up a Steering Committee to better define governing mechanisms for with collective action.

- Despite the desire of many to move forward, the CBC stressed it could not continue until ambiguities were clarified. Speakers said they could not continue in good faith unless the difficult areas were addressed.

Conclusion.

- The existing draft of the Alliance Charter was seen as a work in progress, and the hard work which had brought the document to its' current state acknowledged.
- Some Board Chairs needed reassurance and further clarification and legal advice could be sought before taking the discussions to the next level.
- The CBC strongly and fully supported the Alliance and was not back tracking on what had been agreed upon in Mexico, and would help to carry the Charter forward.

Note: Following the Penang meetings and a retreat attended by 11 members of the CBC, the Chairs designated Jim Jones, Margaret Catley-Carlson, Emile Frison, Pamela Anderson and Meryl Williams (resource person) as the Charter Drafting Team (CDT) to move forward the process of consolidating the Alliance by 1) reviewing the draft Charter, taking into consideration the comments made by the CBC and legal consultants and 2) taking action to ensure the process of consolidating the Alliance is strengthened.

Agenda Item 4. Status Reporting on Alliance Response to SSA Task Force Report.

The AE Chair reported the latest version of the SSA Task Force report was released and included in the meeting documents. Compared with earlier version, no significant changes were made. Therefore, the collective response prepared by the CBC and AE in early April remained relevant.

Dennis Garrity was requested to give a powerpoint presentation highlighting the summary of the AE discussions. The presentation focused on exploring alternative options to the recommendations made in the report, backed with well thought through and agreed upon next steps. He stressed a longer-term (10-20 year) vision and strategy was needed for the work of the Centers in Africa. An update was presented of the two regional MTPs underway for East and Southern Africa (led by ILRI) and West Africa (led by WARDA and IITA).

The AE suggested three possible alternatives: 1) a consortium approach, less formalized with a Coordinator or Director appointed who would report to the Alliance Board (when formed); 2) a joint venture approach, an idea that was described as more structured, with legal weight (and was preferred by the Alliance Executive, as an innovative alternative to what was already underway in the regions); 3) The consolidated centers approach (as outlined in the Task Force recommendations).

Discussion.

- When asked what would be the relevance of an MTP for East and Southern Africa, the answer was to serve as a coordination unit for joint activities between the centers and the SROs. What was missing in collective activities to date was a person who served as a “watchdog” or policing role to help monitor the behaviors of the Centers and their partners. This person would report to the Alliance Board, or a sub-set of the Alliance Board complemented by respected African Regional representatives to add feasibility and credibility to the initiative. Southern Africa had been added to align the program with the Task Force requests.
- There was broad agreement that the analysis of the Task Force was solid. Therefore, the question was raised, how would the overburdening of the NARSs, the large number of projects, and the physical arrangement of the Centers be addressed?
- The issue of lack of coordination and duplication would be addressed through a centralized hub that would pay attention to inefficiencies caused by a short-term need to acquire longer-term solutions. There was broad agreement that the Centers needed to move into a more strategic production of global public goods. The joint venture proposal, was also compared to a Challenge Program for the region.
- When asked if this approach would go down the development continuum rather than going towards the research continuum (as preferred by the Science Council), speakers said it was important not to lose sight of the need for global public goods throughout Africa, as emphasized through discussions with African NARSs.
- The consortium model would pull together the resources of the Centers, whereas in the joint venture model, the Centers would be part of a larger community and would help to govern the model.
- To be credible, any arrangement must include all the Center activities in the region, and be concerned with inclusiveness of all partners.
- The issue of regional disaggregation was acknowledged as a problem for the international public goods for the CGIAR, and the proposed solutions currently did not address the problem on a continental level. A suggestion was raised to eventually design a separate MTP that addressed the broader issues, for water, policy, institutional issues, to ensure that the whole of the CGIAR research could be brought to bear on the larger situation for Africa at the continental level.
- A word of caution was raised as to whether there would be new sources of funding available for the changes proposed. The question was raised as to whether the Centers were really looking “outside the box” and how would this affect the institutional arrangements in terms of resource allocations? Much of what was suggested would require new money for a start-up phase.
- Speakers stressed the need for a strong, bold and flexible solution, one which captured the vision of the CGIAR in 10 years time. The Board issues and responsibilities should be addressed explicitly. However, a longer-term vision for Africa should be an essential starting point within which to embed any option.

- The option of working towards a full merger of the Centers in the region seemed plausible to some, and should be seriously considered. Others cautioned against creating new entities, and preferred to focus on specific research problems.
- Caution was raised, in terms of the need to seek legal advice when discussing collective action, particularly to determine governance oversight and the legal implications of what would be expected (collectively and individually) from the Center Boards.
- The MTPs proposed would need “teeth” to be considered new, innovative and effective. The key would be to link the MTPs with the demands placed by the NARS, as this was one of the areas of disconnect that currently existed. The Centers needed to be clear they were responding to their internal mechanisms, and would not be starting afresh, but rather building on existing commonalities.
- The suggestion was made to form a small sub-committee to work on the proposal for the ExCo8 meeting in Berlin in the following week.

Conclusion.

- The CBC and AE recognized the need for a strategy and clear vision for working with the Centers’ key partners to properly orient their future work in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).
- There were some immediate issues that needed fixing. One solution was to commit the Centers to collective action in SSA (East, West and the overarching issues) and put in place new MTPs with enough substance or “teeth” to be considered serious.
- Two alternative models to the SSA Task Force option were considered: a consortium and a joint venture model.

Decision.

- The Alliance representatives would advise ExCo8 that the Alliance saw a need for a compelling vision and strategy for the CGIAR in SSA to guide the work of the CGIAR for the next 10-20 years. This vision and strategy should be developed collaboratively with their partners and would make maximum use of the current materials of relevance, such as the new SC priorities, the MDGs, etc.
- The CBC and AE tasked Joachim Voss, Hartmann, Steve Hall, Margaret Catley Carson, Kanayo Nwanze, Carlos Sere and Dennis Garrity to redraft the statement based on the discussion and clear this with the Chairs before distributing it for one final round of comments via e-mail in preparation for its’ presentation at ExCo8.

Agenda Item 5. IFAD Negotiations FHAO Update.

The AE Chair reported the joint ExComs had met with representatives from IFAD during their February meeting in Rome, to pursue some of the key points for establishing the Alliance Office at IFAD headquarters. He added in principle IFAD had agreed to serve as host. The Executive Officer said that interactions with IFAD had required a

certain amount of detail to begin the conversation. The planning suggestion was that there would be an Executive Director (international hire), Marketing Officer (international hire), Executive Secretary (local hire) and an office Administrative position (local hire).

The next steps would be to approve the size of the office, and note that formal budget requests would be formulated for discussion at the December meetings. It was also imperative to begin the selection process for the Executive Director, as the EO had a short-term contract and would be unavailable during the later part of 2005. Therefore, a selection committee must be formed to establish the Terms of Reference and begin the process, with hopes of filling the position before the year's end.

Discussion.

- The AE Chair said that the selection committee would oversee the development of the ToR for the Executive Director, and the Committees agreed to have two members from each Committee participate.
- The question was raised as to how many members from outside of the AE and CBC should be asked to serve on the selection committee.
- Strong preference for a staff member from IFAD was given, along with suggestions to ask the Director of the CGIAR, Francisco Reifschneider, to participate on the selection committee as well, since the FHAO is a unit of the System Office.
- Others wanted to see a donor represented on the selection committee.

Decisions.

- FHAO at IFAD, Rome: the AE and CBC approved the draft FHAO office composition of Executive Director and Marketing Officer (international hires), Executive Secretary and Administration Officer (local hires) and requested a full budget proposal be prepared for the consideration of the AE in December 2005, for funding in 2006.
- The CBC and AE chairs to nominate a selection committee to oversee the development of the ToR for the Executive Director and to be responsible for the recruitment of the Executive Director, with a view to having the position recruited by AGM05 if possible. An IFAD representative would be invited to join the Selection Committee.
- Remo Gautschi and Keijiro Otsuka to represent the CBC, with Willie Dar and Joachim Voss (as current and incoming Chairs) for the AE, with the Executive Officer to provide support.

Agenda Item 6. Actions to Operationalize the Alliance.

The Executive Officer presented a matrix from the July, 2004 Addis Ababa retreat and said that these items should be continued with new timelines decided in order to

operationalize the guiding principles. The consensus of the Committees was to leave the list and its timelines to the Chairs and the Alliance Office, to be adjusted accordingly.

Decisions.

- The matrix of Alliance formation activities developed at the July, 2004 Collective Action Retreat would be reviewed and timelines revised by the Chairs and the FHAO.

Agenda Item 7. CGIAR and its' Centers: Visions and Missions.

Joachim von Braun presented the background to this agenda topic. During the management training session at Harvard in December, 2004, one of the items discussed was the need for a shared vision and mission across the Centers and the Alliance. Concerns were raised that the vision and mission of the Centers were not sufficiently coherent. The AE Chair requested a follow-up note be prepared.

IFPRI staff provided the Committees with an update to the paper, with a comparative summary of the key aspects of each Center's vision and mission, as captured from the existing materials on the respective websites. He said overall the missions and visions were fairly coherent and in general agreement, but there was room for improvement. What was missing was a mechanism in the System to agree to or share strategies and help define what they mean. Secondly, strategy documents should become complimentary as the more allied the Centers became, the greater the need to be better coordinated.

Joachim von Braun suggested the CBC and AE regularly look at strategy documents when they come to the group, and provide some commentary. In addition, the Code of Conduct should include that draft strategies go to the AE before they were approved by Center Boards. The CBC Chair emphasized in addition to the vision and mission of Centers, the CGIAR vision and mission should be included as well. This was agreed to by the group.

Decision.

- The Alliance agreed to set up a mechanism for regularly harmonizing missions, visions and strategies, ensuring that they were aligned to the CGIAR mission and with each other. The mechanism should include that it would be part of the Alliance Code of Conduct to bring these documents through the AE before finalization, and for Board Chairs to check that this has been accomplished before receiving final approval by the Center Boards.

Agenda Item 8. Contracting and Conflict mechanisms

The idea for a consultancy to help bring focus and definition to the way forward for the Alliance on issues of contracting and conflict mechanisms originated from the

joint ExCom meetings, February, at IPGRI. ExCom members had agreed that there was a need to establish rules and allow the group to have help in drafting contracts and resolving conflicts, as one way to provide some backing to the Alliance

The Executive Officer highlighted three “next steps” the Committees would be asked to take:

- The CBC and AE would designate a Steering Committee to work with the consultant and the EO to finalize the ToR for developing a contractual and conflict resolution mechanism, taking into account the latest principles and practices discussed in the draft Alliance Charter. The Steering Committee to include one or more CBC members (one to Chair), one or more AE members, Bruce Scott (delegated by the CDDC) and the EO.
- The Steering Committee would work with the consultant to produce a final draft for the consideration of the CBC and AE in their December meetings.
- The funds for the consultancy and any other costs to come from the AE 2005 contingency fund.

Discussion.

- The observation was made that two different areas needed resolution. Guidance on contracts being the first, and help on conflict resolution as the second.
- Conflict resolution when it occurred was basically over mandate disagreements and program activities. The other issue of contracts could be partially handled through working relationships between Centers, and should not imply grievances were the norm, but rather the exception.
- The size and degree of conflicts should be taken into account. The ToR should focus on the bigger conflicts which stand in the way of major efficiency gains. It was also important to acknowledge there were healthy conflicts, from which often good work resulted.
- This was considered by some to be an issue of great importance, and one if handled correctly might make a difference in whether the Alliance would effectively work together, or fail.

Decisions.

- Through the chairs, CBC and AE would each nominate two members for the proposed Steering Committee for the consultancy on contractual and conflict resolution. The steering committee would be charged with defining the ToR of the consultancy, paying attention to distinguishing the links between contractual mechanisms and the conflict resolution needs, and developing a typology of conflict events. The mechanisms should be especially targeted at the resolution of large conflicts that stand in the way of major efficiency gains.
- The CBC nominated Jim Godfrey and Angela Cropper, the AE nominated Kanayo Nwanze and Joachim Voss.

Agenda Item 9. Update on Board Orientation and Lessons Learned.

Alex McCalla, as head of the faculty for the Board Orientation Program, presented a short synopsis of the program to date. During a total of seven sessions over the last 12 months, 88 Board Members from all 15 Centers had participated. One Center sent 11 Board members, with three Centers contributing 10, and all Centers having trained three Board members. Five DGs had participated to date, along with one donor who participated as a program evaluator. Each program was supported by the Institute of Directors (IoD) from London, with David McWilliam and David Buckle having joined for the most recent session.

Overall, the evaluations of the program were high. The program was one that seemed to convert skeptics to supporters. The program had been co-funded by the Centers and the CGIAR Secretariat. Future plans included having one program a year, in association with AGM. The program was taught most recently by CBC members, with the core group of faculty either planning to or having retired from the CBC within the next year's time. Therefore, additional support was needed, along with the request for more case studies and new information from the Centers.

The best indication of the program's success was feedback provided from one DG and Board Chair who had a significant number of Board members go through the program. They commented that they had seen a significant improvement in the level of interaction and commitment from their Board members as a result.

Alex McCalla noted a document in the meeting binders, prepared by Meryl Williams in follow-up to the Addis Ababa training session earlier in the year, which was for information with no formal action required.

Discussion.

- The possibility of having the next session attended by the Board Secretaries was raised and well received.
- How would the positive outcome from the programs translate into more positive interaction or impressions of the Boards within the CGIAR System?
- Alex McCalla responded that he had been very impressed with the breadth, depth and experience Board Members brought to the CGIAR. The difficult reality was there was no use for them within the System, and would like to see them viewed as an asset rather than a cost. The diversity of experience within the Boards was one of the strongest positive factors.
- The observation was made that there were a numbers of ways to obtain training in corporate governance. Did this work need to be done internally, and had a cost benefit analysis been done?
- Board governance presented a challenge in the private and in the not-for-profit sector and board governance in the CGIAR presented a sufficiently distinct set of challenges that could not be addressed sufficiently by outside vendors. The core of the program was delivered by the Institute of Directors in London, who had

gone through the learning curve required to understand the CGIAR and commented they found the System to be very complex. To contract with another outside vendor at this point in time would cost at least three times as much as the current program.

- The CBC Chair said that the suggestion was made that all new Center staff and donors could benefit from the material covered on the first day of the training, as it provided general information on the CGIAR history, change program and future challenges. He thanked Alex McCalla for his leadership and all of the CBC members and staff who had contributed to the program.

Agenda Item 10. SSA-TF Discussions.

The CBC Chair opened the meeting with Per Pinstrup-Andersen on videoconference from New York, with WorldFish staff working to connect two additional Co-Chairs, Moise Mensah and Jochen de Haas, via telephone hook-up. (Moise Mensah connected for a brief moment, and Jochen de Haas was not online). The CBC Chair mentioned that 14 of the 15 CBC members were present, with all of the DGs, and wanted to thank the Co-Chairs for the hard work they had done on behalf of the CGIAR system.

The AE Chair added his thanks to the Task Force Chairs, and for the opportunity to interact during this meeting. He said that the Committees were in a learning mode and would like to learn more of the process that brought the Co-Chairs to these decisions and recommendations for the SSA TF paper.

Per Pinstrup-Andersen thanked the CBC and AE for the two reports prepared, the first on factual errors and errors in judgment to the Science Council (SC) and the second to a response for ExCo. He reported no changes in the substance of the report were made, as this would have meant postponing the delivery of the report, but that changes would be incorporated with those received from ExCo, following the meeting in Berlin. He reminded the Committees that Moise Mensah and Jochen de Haas served as Co-Chairs on the structural side, while he and Paco Sereme served on the programmatic side.

Per Pinstrup-Andersen provided the following synopsis :

- The Task Force Chairs recommendations were based on full consensus of the four Co-Chairs and members of the Task Forces. He reported during their research and investigation they had found more disorganization, overlap and wasteful use of resources than expected. There was very little collaboration across Centers, and they wanted the Centers to work harder at keeping each other informed.
- He posed the question: How do we get a cohesive, better coordinated program in Africa without doing damage to the CGIAR? He thought the option of the two MTPs was a great idea, but once the MTPs were developed, was there certainty that that the Centers and the collaborators would support and buy-in, and not view the programs as something forced upon them.

- He said that the AE was the right good group to get these new initiatives underway, but was not sure if it was the correct choice to implement inter-Center activities. He suggested over the next 18 months the AE should move ahead as quickly as it could to develop the MTPs.
- One option suggested by the consultants which was rejected by the Task Forces was to create a Sub-Saharan Africa center. The reason for its rejection was that it would occupy 45 percent of the CGIAR resources and the rest of the CGIAR would probably not be viable, unless all of the CGIAR was organized around regional centers. This, in the view of the Task Forces, would reduce the effectiveness of the CGIAR to generate international public goods. Therefore, the suggestion was made to have two facilitating Centers as recommended in the report.
- He asked what would happen if the MTPs were developed and then six months later, Centers were found to be doing research outside of the MTPs in the same region, how would this be handled and what would the repercussions be? He noted what was currently missing was a monitoring implementation agency to ensure Centers complied with agreements.

The CBC Chair asked some of the DGs from Centers located in SSA Africa to provide a quick update of the discussions held jointly with the CBC and AE, and their suggestions on how to move forward. Overviews for plans to develop an East and Southern Africa MTP (overseen by ILRI, in close consultation with ASARECA and SADDCC) and a West and Central Africa (overseen by WARDA and IITA, in close work with CORAF) were briefly discussed.

- Per Pinstrup-Andersen emphasized once the CGIAR priorities were in place, the SC and Centers would work within these priorities and collaborate accordingly. He said the System must take care to protect the research priorities, once established, and work to identify overlapping areas.
- The idea of being all things for all people must be changed. He stressed the Centers must be able to say to their counterparts in the region, “you tell us what you want and we will to tell you which parts we can deliver, as well as which elements would be delivered by others”.
- If the Centers could move quickly to put the MTPs in place, there was a better chance that their leadership would remain intact and stressed it was important for all Centers to take ownership and interest.
- Speakers on behalf of the Centers responded that they recognized two key objectives of the Task Force were to seek greater programmatic coordination and coherence with Centers, SROs and stakeholders, and secondly, to improve the integration of research within the System.
- In looking at the future, there was strong agreement during the AE and CBC meetings that the CGIAR and its’ Centers develop a long-term vision for Africa, one that looked 10-20 years ahead, taking into account as well what the CGIAR would look like a decade ahead.
- Rather than consolidating Centers, the Committees discussed the option of a joint venture approach, with an independent Director working on behalf of the Alliance

to begin to draft the contracts and oversee the work of the MTPs. The concept needed further development, with reference to the appropriate joint Center mechanisms. The Centers were not seeking a centrist type of consolidation, but rather a more flexible way to establish contractual arrangements among themselves.

- Per Pinstrup-Andersen responded that what was paramount was working to achieve the goals before the Centers. He said he was cautious of new ideas that required the creation of a new structure. He said he would be more comfortable if the Alliance Executive were the party accountable for the first 18 months of the MTPs, and cautioned against creating new governance structures at this point in time. He said that the tendency of the System was to create new structures, but rarely get rid of old ones.

Agenda Item 11. CGIAR new Priorities and Strategies.

Per Pinstrup-Andersen stayed online, as WorldFish Center worked to connect with FAO to facilitate Ruben Echeverria, Executive Director of the Science Council, in joining the discussion. Unfortunately, this connection was not successful, and the meeting continued with Per Pinstrup-Andersen providing an update for the Committees on the recent Science Council meetings held at IWMI, along with the new Science Priorities for the CGIAR System, including performance monitoring and the current plan for Center MTPs.

Congratulations were given to the entire SC team by the Committees for the work accomplished to date.

Discussion.

- With respect to the long standing partnerships with national programs and their partners, the question was raised as to why capacity building did not feature more prominently in the current priority discussion and what would this mean for existing research programs? In addition, as priorities moved to the 80/20 research program, with 20 percent of the resources to be considered for new and innovative ideas, where would capacity building and training belong?
- Per Pinstrup-Andersen responded that capacity building was an integral part of priority research covered under the 80 percent and only freestanding capacity building would fall into the 20 percent. To avoid having the CGIAR locked into a “straight jacket” the SC stressed the importance of finding ways in which more innovative and exploratory research was possible, in order to keep research programs flexible. For the System as whole, 80 percent should be spent on priority research. If the System fell much below 80 percent, it would begin to lose credibility. The SC would look at new ideas each year, and consider these as they came up, as it was important to maintain a long-term perspective. He also reminded the group these were guidelines for the System as opposed to strict rules and regulations.

- Similar questions were raised with respect to fruit and vegetable production and post harvest technologies, as they were not included in the current System priorities. In terms of substance for Priority Area Three, Per Pinstrup-Andersen responded it remained important to set priorities today that would produce the research results needed 20 years from now. In order to deal with poverty in the rural areas, the System would need to help tackle the bottleneck of knowledge and technology to adequately address rural poverty and post-harvest technology.
- The shared concern of many Board Chairs was raised that while there was a clear desire to nudge the whole system up the research scale in the creation of public goods, this went counter to being NARS- responsive and dealing with the issues of rural poverty alleviation. Therefore the poorer a country, the less likely to receive the goods the Centers produced. How would the System remain responsive to the NARS and to getting to the issues of poverty via the 80/20 scenario? Some Board Chairs did not share the confidence of the SC and believed the poorest countries might stand to lose the most.
- Per Pinstrup-Andersen answered that the same could be said about all kinds of rural infrastructure. The question before the CGIAR was how much of this development should it take on? The SC believed research was needed that could benefit the majority, along with more advocacy than had been done in the past. Unless the market worked, the poor would not benefit.
- With respect to the timeline for the new priorities, the Science Council did not want to wait until AGM05, as the Centers would be unable to take these into account as the priorities for their 2006 MTPs. If need be, the priorities could be approved virtually and then go to the Centers with the guidelines on how to prepare their MTPs. The SC did not want to wait too long, as there was a need to get the MTPs underway and not lose time.
- With respect to the new evaluation for Performance Monitoring, the SC would like to see more weight placed on Center Commissioned Reviews, and stressed the five year cycle should be adhered to, with the Boards of the Centers to take more responsibility. This would make the EPMRs better and stronger. Link performance measurement to the MTPs, so that a duplication of indicators was not created. This would mean that the MTPs be taken seriously. If this system did not work, would have to return to the indicators used earlier, which the SC did not think were a good match for the work of the Centers.
- Several of the DGs were delighted to hear the MTPs would be taken seriously, as they represented a great deal of planning and strategic thinking for the Centers.

The CBC Chair noted the latest document on implementation procedures for Center Commissioned Reviews had not been reviewed by the CBC. Per Pinstrup-Andersen responded that this document was still in draft form, pending consultation with the CBC. The AE Chair thanked Per Pinstrup-Andersen for his time, and stressed the importance of a strong working relationship between the Centers and the Science Council.

Agenda Item 12. Joint Videoconference with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider.

The CBC and AE met via videoconference with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider, following their meetings with Per Pinstrup-Andersen. The CBC Chair thanked the CGIAR Chairman and Director for joining and said the Committees were looking forward to learning the new developments in both the World Bank and the CGIAR.

Update on new CGIAR developments and World Bank Changes

Ian Johnson said they were delighted to join in the meeting and provided a brief update on the new President of the World Bank, Paul D. Wolfowitz, who would begin his term formally on the first of June, but by mid-May would be in place. Ian Johnson reported he had met briefly with the new President, and would have a longer session with him by mid-summer.

- He said no immediate changes were anticipated in the short-term, but added this did not preclude later changes. The nomination and election of the new President were not without controversy, and stressed the new President would be working with the Executive Directors, to help in the early days of transition.
- The Gleneagles G8 summit would be coming up with two main issues of importance for the Bank: Africa, with the United Kingdom (presidency of the G8) Africa Commission to discuss the preparation of the action plan for Africa, and secondly, issues surrounding climate change could prove to be contentious.
- Africa would be high on the priority list for the new Bank President, who would probably visit Tanzania within the first few months of his term. Ian Johnson would work to see that he received a good look at issues in agriculture, and would brief him accordingly on issues dealing with both agriculture and climate change.
- With respect to the CGIAR, he did not anticipate any surprises and planned to receive the full funding request for the coming year.
- The Global Environment Facility's next tranche of replenishment was underway, with the donor consultation set to begin within the next two months. A major debate was taking place on performance standards, with resource allocation based on performance. The performance work of the CGIAR was considered very timely, as it represented the wave of the future. This debate was driven by the U.S., who recently tightened the hatches on IFI funding and fiduciary responsibilities.
- A CBC member noted the Centers and the entire System had been engaged in the process of reform over the last few years, and very often the success of reform was judged by donor support. She asked if the System as a whole had looked at whether the reforms had made an impact in development outcomes, and specifically whether the impact of reforms had made a difference for the poorest of countries?
- Ian Johnson responded an evaluation had not yet been made, but agreed it was a good idea. He believed the funding increase to USD 400 million and rising, was in part attributed to the fact that the CGIAR had demonstrated its ability to

change. However, it was too early to know what the impact was on the ground. SSA TF was one element of the evaluation process.

- Like all reforms of institutions, the mere sense of reform stimulated change in conversation and very often the intangibles, not the tangibles were the first to change. Ian Johnson highlighted the general mood amongst the donors was incredibly positive towards of the CGIAR, and viewed the CGIAR as becoming a more imaginative institution than ever before.
- Alex McCalla reported the two Board orientation programs were recently completed (joined by Francisco Reifschneider via videoconference for one portion), with almost 90 members of the CGIAR Board members having participated over the last 18 months. The CBC was very impressed with the diverse range, breadth and depth of the candidates and asked how these people could be better utilized within the System, and viewed as assets rather than a collective cost.
- Ian Johnson agreed that there were opportunities to utilize the skills of more people in the regions as representatives and stakeholders. He said that this was one avenue not fully explored. Secondly, there were opportunities to engage board members in places where corporate work and increased advocacy for agriculture and research was required. He said he welcomed additional ideas as to how board members and corporate activities could be better promoted.

CGIAR Updates and Funding Outlook.

Francisco Reifschneider presented a brief overview on several areas of current activity, including the funding outlook for 2005:

- Compensation Study. Phase I and II were now finalized (IRS and NRS) and the recommendation made to have the information shared immediately with Board Chairs, DGs and members of the CGIAR. He said the results of the survey provided an interesting snapshot of the challenges facing the System regarding compensation and how to make the System more attractive to mobilize the best and brightest for work in agricultural research.
- Performance measurement. Updated information was received from all Centers, with the analysis of programmatic aspects to be finalized by the SC. An update would be presented at ExCo8 regarding the interesting differences with regards to the different Centers.
- World Bank support was expected to continue at USD 50 million for this year, and remained the largest provider of non-restricted funds to the Centers. The CGIAR was the only group that did not receive cuts, and the performance measurement pilot exercise strongly helped the outcome.
- Restructuring of the CGIAR Trust Funds. As discussed with the AE during the April teleconference, this fund was important because USD 120 million moved through these trust funds to the Centers. A new trust fund was established in the Bank this year with very low administrative rates. Members would continue to be able to express their allocation preferences, which was also a special feature for the CGIAR Trust Fund.

- Strengthening governance and leadership. Francisco Reifschneider participated in the videoconference from Washington, D.C. to Penang over the weekend Board Orientation course. The second Harvard leadership training session would be held the first week in October and, like the first program, would include a media training component.
- Commission on Africa report and the Enlarging Freedom report by Koffi Annan highlighted the importance of agriculture, agriculture science and technology and the CGIAR. The recognition was for the quality of work produced from the Centers and made evident that agriculture was back on the development agenda.
- Funding outlook. The financial peer review system generated by several Centers and the Secretariat showed very good news, with USD 453 million reported for 2004, and a great outlook for the coming year. A note of caution: with increased funding came additional expectations associated with accountability and transparency, but overall, excellent financial results for 2004.

Update on the Alliance: Continuing Reforms in the CGIAR System and New Initiatives.

The CBC Chair emphasized the spirit of creativity and reform was sought within the formation of the Alliance, and hoped it was viewed as an addition and an enhancement to the reform process. Based on recent conversations, both internally and with colleagues in the Science Council, it was clear if the CGIAR planned on meeting its goals in the short and medium-term, it was essential the Centers continue to improve upon their collective work. The AE Chair reported the first of the new initiatives was discussed in further detail during the last meeting of the ExComs in Rome (February). A series of Quick Wins were outlined and included the development of regional MTPs. A second update would be provided by IRRI and CIMMYT, regarding their programmatic work together.

SSA Developments.

- The Quick Wins to be pursued by the Alliance were outlined by Carlos Seré and Kanayo Nwanze and included information on two regional MTPs, one for Eastern and Southern Africa, working with ASARECA along with an initial 10 Centers. Howard Elliot would be involved in the stock taking exercise and linking ASARECA priorities with the Centers' work, in order to better meet the priorities of both. A similar MTP was under discussion and planning for West and Central, with CORAF as the key partner in the development process.
- Dennis Garrity provided a synopsis as to how the various programs could be better integrated. He added that the Centers agreed it was imperative that the CGIAR work on a long-term vision and strategy for the next 10-20 years.
- The Centers and their Boards were looking at greater programmatic coherence and objectives, including how to more efficiently integrate research support and services. This would include embarking on a study for option for the development to better implement the MTPs, without increasing transaction costs.

- Ian Johnson responded that the upcoming discussions of the SSA Task Force report would be very important at ExCo8 and it was critical to get the most out of the discussion. He added all groups concerned were trying to achieve the same objective: coherence and more efficient integration of services in SSA. He congratulated the Centers on the speed in which their study and thinking had progressed and agreed with the shared concept of a long-term vision for Africa. He added that the Task Force report had gone further in its' recommendations than had been expected.
- Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider agreed the Centers were on the right track in their contributions to the overall reform program. The long-term vision was important for Africa, and should be extended to Latin America and Asia as well. The expectations many had for the System were tremendous and would continue as the Centers gained recognition for their work.
- As research institutions, the CGIAR must continuously look to the future and must evolve beyond the MDGs, as income increases in poor countries might not be accomplished by the 2020's or 2030's. Therefore, it was important to remain focused on research and not lose sight of the global mandate. The Centers were also well equipped to address the major issues of adaptation to climate change.

Alliance between IRRI and CIMMYT.

- Masa Iwanaga provided a short update on the IRRI and CIMMYT alliance. He said this was a "home grown" initiative to find a more cost effective way of doing research. IRRI and CIMMYT Management met the week prior to discuss details and the possibility of implementing joint programs, and would meet again in June at CIMMYT to finalize the implementation plans.
- Based on the nature of the program, appropriate financing, management and governance structures would be developed. Further progress would be reported during AGM05. Progress on development of joint programs was moving faster than anticipated, due to the level of excitement shared by the scientists and strong support from the BoTs.
- Ian Johnson appreciated the update and said great expectations were set from some donors that more would result from these discussions, but acknowledged both institutions had gone as far as their BoTs felt comfortable.

Staffing in the CGIAR Secretariat.

- Two vacancies within the Secretariat. The process for the Governance Advisor was underway with a short list of twenty persons identified. With the passing of Ravi Taldvalker, the search for a Financial Advisor would soon begin. Senior appointments would be done in collaboration with the AE and CBC.

Other Business.

- The AE Chair said that the Alliance Executive had approved the principles of engagement with the private sector and would participate in a meeting with the Private Sector Committee in the fall.
- The importance of agriculture and human health continued on the Centers' agenda. A consultation was planned for June/July organized by IFPRI.
- Ian Johnson was pleased to hear of the continuing work on agriculture, the environment and human health and said he hoped someday UNEP and WHO could become co-sponsors of the CGIAR.

Agenda Item 13. Follow-up to GRPC meeting

Emile Frison drew the Committee's attention to two documents dealing with the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA). He said that the Centers were committed to making this material available and maintained under internationally accepted standards of conservation. In June, 2004, after seven years of negotiations, the Treaty entered into force and ensured that facilitated access and benefit sharing was upheld. Thirty-four crops and a number of forage species were now part of the multilateral system. The International Treaty will allow facilitated exchange of germplasm without the need for bilateral negotiations. A material transfer agreement (MTA) is now being used by the centres, but this will have to be replaced by the Standard Material Transfer Agreement (SMTA) that will be negotiated by the members of the Governing Body (GB) of the Treaty. It was foreseen that the current agreement between FAO and the Centers would be replaced by a new agreement to be signed with the GB of the Treaty.

Agenda Item 13.1 Approval by Center Boards of Draft Agreement

The current draft originated from a meeting held at IRRI two years ago. This version was reviewed by the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the only change noted was a number of elements have been put in square brackets and were still open for negotiations. The bulk of the text was not bracketed, and agreement reached. The Genetic Resources Policy Committee of the CGIAR also reviewed the document and was in agreement with the changes. The GRPC recommended to the Center Boards that they authorize the DGs to sign the agreements, providing there were no new significant changes.

Discussion.

- The question was posed if the Centers should wait until the bracketed wording was removed? Emile Frison answered this would not be necessary and emphasized the importance of not waiting too long, as the Centers would be operating under the new treaty, once in effect.
- Further clarification determined this agreement would be signed only by the Centers that held plant genetic collections in trust.

- The proposal was put forward that the AE and CBC approve the document and authorize the DGs to sign the document, once it is finalized.

Decision.

- The AE and AB approved the document covering ‘Agreements Between Governing Body and the IARCs and Other Relevant International Institutions’ and authorized the Directors General who’s Centers have genebanks to sign on behalf of their Centers, following each Boards' approval. Boards were encouraged to approve as soon as possible, so that the Centers would be working under the Treaty arrangements as soon as the Treaty was approved. Final wording expected in February, 2006.

Agenda Item 13.2 Guiding Principles for GMOs in collections.

The issue of the unintentional presence of transgenes in collections came to the attention of the GRPC a few years ago. In August 2004, a workshop of experts was held, representing all the Centers and a number of outside experts from the public and private sector. Based on the outcome of this workshop, the guiding principles were drafted. Comments were taken into consideration from other stakeholders, including the NGOs and farmers organizations, and during the last GRPC meeting in Rome (March), the final guiding principles were prepared.

The GRPC requested that the CBC and AE formally adopt the guiding principles as a prelude to adopting more specific measures for each Center with genetic resources related issues. The text was distributed in advance to all Centers, and a formal submission was now requested.

Discussion.

- Masa Iwanaga, as a member of the GRPC, confirmed the document had gone through a very intensive process, one that stemmed from how the Centers managed risk. If approved, he requested the information be placed on Center websites, to assist in proactive communication.
- A question was raised as to what constituted adequate documentation, with the answer given that this was based on scientific assessment of risk, and was not put in terms of absolute recommendations.
- A speaker commented that this document served an important policy document to protect the Centers from those opposed to GMOs in any form. The document represents a science based and politically sensitive approach. Based on what happened with maize in Mexico, it was clear that the Centers needed proactive communication on what they were doing on the matters of transgenes and collection material.
- Another speaker reminded genebank Center that they had legal responsibilities to ensure the quality of the collections. If transgenes existed in a specific accession, international agreements such as the Cartagena Protocol must be followed.

- To speak only of risk did not make economic sense, as there were benefits to take into account as well. The issue of risk was heavily debated in the GRPC, and the question was not whether the technology was useful or not useful. The cost dimension was brought in because Centers had received onerous requests to test for specific types of transgenes in situations where the risk was non-existent. The risk from the scientific assessment point was very small, but if a country wanted testing done, they would need to pay for it.

Decision.

- The CBC and AE approved the document on ‘Guiding Principles for the Development of Future Harvest Centres’ Policies to Address the Possibility of Unintentional Presence of Transgenes in Ex Situ Collections’ as the Alliance guiding principles. The relevant Centers would then prepare procedures for their specific crops, and were requested to post the guiding principles on their Center’s websites.

Agenda Item 14. Report from Joint Working Groups

Agenda Item 14.1 CGIAR Compensation Study

Uwe Werblow prepared an update for the Committees, reporting on a meeting of the total Compensation Steering Group that took place April 25th, in Zurich. The study had three phases: Phase I and II focused on the total compensation of internationally recruited staff and Phase III on the compensation for locally recruited staff.

- Phase I and II were now complete. The Steering Group revised results based on updated overview charts and final report, which included data from all Centers and the System Office. The results showed that variations and differences existed in total compensation, but were not dramatic. There were similar benefit policies but diversity existed in plan design, implementation and delivery methods.
- Center compensation packages were reviewed with comparator organizations outside the System (international organizations) and focused on staff at headquarters and outposted staff. Initial results indicated that higher staff levels salaries and benefits in Centers were comparable to outside organizations, but the lower staff level was below the comparator organizations. DGs salaries and benefits were higher than those in comparator organizations.
- Phase III was a review of the compensation for locally recruited staff, with special emphasis placed on total benefit packages. The survey was currently underway, with questionnaires to be completed by May 31, 2005, with a target completion date of mid-year.
- Reports of Phases I and II would be transmitted to Center Chairs and DGs, but would not contain individual data. Center identifications would be coded, and each Chair and DG would know their own code, without having access to other Center’s data. This would be available soon after ExCo8.

Discussion.

- Interest was expressed by many Centers looking forward to receiving the preliminary reports of Phase I and II.
- The Committees should take into account whether the information proved valuable, to help determine the effectiveness of the exercise.
- Phase I showed some interesting discrepancies across Centers and called for harmonization of policies and benefits across Centers. The Centers might need to rethink some policies, in order to remain competitive in the markets for lower categories of staff.
- Difficult to straight jacket systems that should be responsive to the market. The CGIAR had no interest to underpay, if it wanted to hire the best people.
- The results of the study could be helpful in disclosing best practice from the Centers for the compensation and benefits, but ultimately the package was for the individual Boards to supply.
- This study was donor driven and should put to rest the criticisms that the Centers were overpaying.
- Centers could learn a great deal and there was good information in the report. If there were few opportunities for career development, this was important to note.

The CBC Chair thanked Kanayo Nwanze and Uwe Werblow who served on the Steering Group, on behalf of the Committees.

Agenda Item 14.2 Challenge Programs

Remo Gautschi chaired what he referred to as a “silent working group,” in that it continued to monitor the work of the Challenge Programs, but had not met since the last joint meeting. He added the group would remain silent as long as there were no black clouds hanging over the horizon for the CPs. Oversight included the following:

- **Monitoring:** The CPs made good use of communications (newsletters and progress reports) to help monitor their progress. More progress reports could be made to ExCo, similar to the one produced by Water and Food.
- **Governance:** Currently still in the pilot phase with two or three different governance structures. The CP for Water and Food had streamlined its management structure to further cut costs. Work on governance was underway for all CPs.
- **Sharing of information among the CPs:** The three CPs were very good about sharing information, holding joint workshops to discuss common research topics, and continued to look for ways to collaborate. This continued to be important as a means to evaluate the different architecture of the CPs for the future.

Discussion.

- There was a need to look at the impact of the CPs on the System as a whole, after the pilot phases were completed.

- The plea was made that neither the CBC nor AE commission a review in the near future, as the CPs needed time and the ability to get on with their work. They were currently producing reports, MTPs, and newsletters, and did not need anything else.
- A distinction was made with regards to concerns raised for governance of the CPs, vis-à-vis the responsibilities of the Boards. As the Centers moved into consolidation, must continue to hold a watching brief on the fiduciary responsibilities for the CPs.
- The question was raised if any Center Board would have fiduciary responsibility of the SSA-CP and what implications this would have for the CBC? The response was none, as it would not be managed by a CGIAR Center. The accountability for the delivery of science would be on the participating Centers.

Agenda Item 14.3 Performance Measurement

Mort Neufville reminded the Committees that a significant discussion had taken place on this topic during the joint meetings at CIMMYT. A joint working group met during AGM04 and drafted a response, with the understanding that a meeting would take place January or February to decide on a final instrument. The CBC and AE were not a part of this meeting, but the CDDC participated, and indicators were sent out for review and response.

- Through recent conversations with the Secretariat he learned the April 15th deadline was met, and the data segmented into governance and institutional health, science, and stakeholder data (although it was currently uncertain which stakeholders participated).
- The Science Council would use the MTP process to measure success (with the first opportunity to do so in 2007, after the current systems were aligned). The Secretariat would handle finance, governance and institutional health.
- The data would be summarized for ExCo8 and then posted on a secured area of the CGIAR website. There would be no indexing of the data, and it would be up to the Centers to use the information as they saw fit.
- ExCo would be tasked with undertaking an assessment of the system and a review of next steps.
- Overall, the Centers had responded appropriately, with the first indication seen in the World Bank continued allocation of USD 50 million.
- The next step would be to improve the process and decide how to improve the exercise. The data should be aggregated over three years to gain a rolling average.

The following points were suggested for follow-up:

- CBC and the AE should be represented at the table to help look at the indicators.
- The Committees should be consulted for next steps.
- The Centers needed to know which stakeholders participated in the early survey.

Adel El-Beltagy, who also served on the Working Group, noted there were grey areas in the performance indicators that had led to some confusion, listing the example of how internationally recruited staff were defined. He added it was important to know who in the Science Council and Secretariat would hold responsibility for which areas, to provide a better harmonized and more transparent process.

Pamela Anderson added the final instrument was a product of the CGIAR Working Group on Performance Measurement, in which the CDDC did participate. She mentioned it was important for the CBC and AE to contribute to the oversight on institutional health for corporate governance, in order to help define the indicators used.

Discussion.

- The financial indicators still needed work, as reserves in well managed companies were usually about one year. The Centers had only 90 to 120 days. Looking at uncertainties was important. Needed indicators that would look at forward budgeting for up to three years.
- The Boards should decide the proper level of reserves.
- More input was needed via the working group to ensure confidence in how the financial indicators would play out.

The CBC Chair thanked Mort Neufville and Adel El-Beltagy for the update.

Decision.

- The CDDC would be asked to draw up a list of issues for clarification and resolution, building on those provided by the CBC and AE, for further monitoring and participation in the Performance Measurement System.

Agenda Item 15. Other Business.

Decision for Future Meetings.

The AE Chair said that with the new schedule in place for the Annual Meetings, there was a need to plan the dates and location for the next AE and CBC meeting. This year the AGM would not be held near a Center, although ICARDA was helping with the logistical support and oversight. The question before the Committees was whether to hold the pre-AGM meeting in Marrakech, or in another city (in conjunction with a Center) for better meeting support.

In addition, and taking the ExCo schedule into account, the Committees needed to assess the scheduling and timing of their meetings, in order to provide documentation in time for ExCo distribution.

Discussion.

- Several options were listed for the pre-AGM meeting, including Rome for proximity to IPGRI, Egypt (where ICARDA could provide support at a conference center near Mount Sinai), and in the hotel associated with AGM05 in Marrakech.
- The CBC was in favor of holding the meeting closer to or at the AGM meeting site.
- Several DGs, including those who had both helped in the oversight of previous AGMs cautioned against moving the meetings away from a Center, where the best possible logistical support could be given.
- CBC members acknowledged the support was best for meetings held at Centers, but said expectations could be lowered and excellent meetings still held away from a Center site. The real cost for some was the time involved in meeting locations away from the AGM site.
- The CBC preferred to meet only two days prior to AGM, one of the days with the AE. The AE would meet for three days prior (Thursday, December 1 thru Saturday, December 3, leaving Sunday, December 4 free for other meetings).
- For 2006, discussion was given to moving the spring meetings to the second week of April and to the second week of September to accommodate the ExCo schedule.
- Some speakers were in favor of adjusting the spring meeting to April, but the majority of speakers wanted to keep the second meeting linked to AGM.
- The point was raised that Board meetings were already scheduled for the second week in April and would need to be changed.
- The suggestion was made that the ExComs meet earlier in the fall (September) to fit information into the ExCo program.
- In addition, the Committees should make greater use of telecommunications and other means of holding discussions.

The CBC Chair stressed the importance of meeting together for both Committees and said one meeting a year needed to fit into the ExCo process, in order to ensure the Centers had a strong voice at ExCo.

Decision.

- Prior to the AGM05 in Marrakech, the CBC would meet for two days (December 2-3) and the AE would meet for three days (December 1-3), with Sunday the 4th free.
- In 2006, the committees would continue to meet twice a year, with one meeting held prior to AGM, and the other the second week of April. As necessary the CBC and AE ExComs would meet in September to better contribute to the ExCo meetings.

Statement to ExCo.

At the end of the meeting the Committees revisited the statement to go on behalf of the Alliance to ExCo8. The CBC Chair stressed it was also important to discuss how the Alliance would be structured, to address some of the issues raised.

The AE Chair asked Dennis Garrity presented on behalf of the AE a range of ideas to help improve the document and better conceptualize the SSA proposal.

1. Formal and regular multi-Centre priority setting consultation exercises with SSA partners.
2. Cross-Centre sub regional Medium-Term Plans would be created.
3. With SSA partner institutions, and based on excellent existing material, the Centers would create a CGIAR Strategy for Food Security, Environmental Improvement and Capacity and Institution Building in Africa to serve as the guiding document for the years ahead.
4. The Alliance would move to integrate research support services and corporate services in the ESA and WCA regions working toward the concept of regional hubs to provide both integration and cost sharing in research services.
5. The Alliance Board would develop a mechanism to oversee the MTP implementation process and would appoint a Director to be charged with the implementation of the above undertakings in 2006, administratively supported by one of the Centers in the region.

Discussion.

- Speakers emphasized the need to remain aware of the non-food commodities, as moving toward a more secure future for Africa meant more than food production.
- Importance was placed on developing a new mechanism without putting in place a new structure.
- As the strategy was developed, the regional MTPs must continue to refer to and include the work of the SSA Challenge Program.
- A drafting group was put in place to further refine the message and the key points to be presented.

The CBC Chair stressed the importance of moving forward and not spending too much time on the obstacles along the way. The draft would be prepared prior to ExCo8 and approved virtually by the two groups.

Closing Remarks.

The Chairs thanked their colleagues for the challenging but excellent sessions together. The Alliance was pleased that support was growing and recognized the need to nurture the seed that had been sown. On behalf of the CBC, the Chair reassured the Alliance Executive that they would do everything possible to promote and not stifle the

Alliance efforts. He reiterated the need to go ahead and move quickly with collective action to show its relevance and use for the entire System.

Annex 1. CBC-AE Decisions Taken May 2005

***Meeting of the Joint CBC and AE
Decisions Taken
WorldFish, May 2005
Version 6-30-05***

Number	Subject Matter	Decision Text	Action
05/Joint/May/01	Response to the SSA-TF Report	1. The Alliance representatives will advise ExCo8 that the Alliance sees a need for a compelling vision and strategy for the CGIAR in SSA to guide our work out for the next 10-20 years. This vision and strategy should be developed collaboratively with our partners.	
	Joint Statement for ExCo8 in response to the SSA-TF Report	2. The CBC and AE tasked Dennis Garrity to redraft the statement based on the discussion and clear this with the Chairs before distributing it for one final round of comments via e-mail in preparation for its' presentation at ExCo8.	Dennis Garrity, Chairs
05/Joint/May/02	Alliance of Future Harvest Centers of the CGIAR	1. FHAO at IFAD, Rome: the AE and CBC approved the draft FHAO office composition of Executive Director and Marketing Officer (international hires), Executive Secretary and Administration Officer (local hires) and requested a full budget proposal be prepared for the consideration of the AE in December 2005, for funding in 2006.	EO
		2. The CBC and AE chairs to nominate a selection committee to oversee the development of the ToR for the Executive Director and to be responsible for the recruitment of the Executive Director, with a view	Remo Gautschi, Keiji Otsuka, Willie Dar, Joachim Voss, and an IFAD member, with Meryl Williams to

		to having the position recruited by AGM05 if possible. An IFAD representative will also be invited onto the Selection Committee.	provide support.
		3. The matrix of Alliance formation activities developed at the July 2004 Collective Action Retreat is to be reviewed and timelines revised by the Chairs and the FHAO.	CBC, AE chairs, EO
05/May/Joint/03	Harmonizing Centers vision, mission and strategy documents	The Alliance agreed to set up a mechanism for regularly harmonizing missions, visions and strategies, ensuring that they are aligned to the CG mission and with each other. The mechanism should include that it will be part of Alliance Code of Conduct to bring these documents through the AE before finalized and for Board Chairs to check that this has been accomplished before receiving final approval by the Center Boards.	AE Code of Conduct to be amended accordingly. DGs to forward new Center strategy documents and mission statements to all other DGs and report back to the AE on outcomes. FHAO to assist where requested. Board Chairs to check that Center strategies and mission statements have been forwarded for comment to AE in advance of finalization.
05/May/Joint/04	Contractual and conflict resolution mechanisms	1. Through the chairs, CBC and AE will each nominate two members of the proposed steering committee for the consultancy on contractual and conflict resolution. The steering committee will be charged with defining the ToR of the consultancy, paying attention to	CBC and AE chairs CBC and AE chairs to nominate members Jim Godfrey, Angela Cropper, Joachim Voss,

		distinguishing the links between contractual mechanisms and the conflict resolution needs and developing a typology of conflict events. The mechanisms should be especially targeted at the resolution of large conflicts that stand in the way of major efficiency gains.	Kanayo Nwanze and Meryl Williams (support) nominated
05/May/Joint/05	Genetic Resources Policy Committee	1. The AE and AB approved the document covering ‘Agreements Between Governing Body and the IARCs and Other Relevant International Institutions’ and authorized the Directors General whose Centers have genebanks to sign on behalf of their Centers, following each Boards’ approval. Boards were encouraged to approve as soon as possible, so that the Centers would be working under the Treaty arrangements as soon as the Treaty was approved. Final wording (expected in February, 2006).	All DGs for Centers with genebanks.
		2. The CBC and AE approved the document on ‘Guiding Principles for the Development of Future Harvest Centres’ Policies to Address the Possibility of Unintentional Presence of Transgenes in Ex Situ Collections’ as the Alliance guiding principles. The relevant Centers would then prepare procedures for their specific crops, and were requested to post the guiding principles on their Center’s websites. The genebank Centers should post the approved Guiding Principles on their websites.	All DGs for Centers with genebanks.
05/May/Joint 06	CGIAR Performance Measurement	The CDDC would be asked to draw up a list of issues for clarification and resolution,	CDDC, EO to liaise

	System	building on those provided by the CBC and AE, for further monitoring and participation in the Performance Measurement System.	
05/May/Joint/07	Committee meetings	1. Prior to the AGM05 in Marrakech, the CBC would meet for two days (December 2-3) and the AE would meet for three days (December 1-3), with Sunday the 4 th free.	CBC Sec, ES
		2. In 2006, the committees would continue to meet twice a year, with one meeting held prior to AGM, and the other the second week of April. As necessary the CBC and AE ExComs would meet in September to better contribute to the ExCo meetings.	CBC Sec, ES

Annex 2. Final Agenda Joint Meeting

***Joint Meeting of the
Center Board Chairs (CBC) and
The Alliance Executive (AE)
Timed Agenda
Version 4-21-05
WorldFish***

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
<i>Thursday, May 5</i>		
8:30	Committees meet separately	
10:30	<i>Coffee Break (followed by Joint Session in the Chambo/Makumba Room)</i>	
10:45	Agenda Item 1. Welcome and overview: CGIAR Changes, Opportunities and Challenges for the Future Harvest Centers – The Way Forward	Chairs (U. Mokwunye and W. Dar)
11:00	Agenda Item 2. Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from CIMMYT Meetings and ExCom Rome Retreat	Chairs/FHAO
11:15	Agenda Item 3. Clearance of Alliance Charter	Chairs
12:15	<i>Lunch (Block J, Tilapia Room)</i>	
13:15	Agenda Item 4. Status Reporting on Alliance Response to SSA Task Force Report 4.1 Committee reports on individual discussions 4.2 Update on Alliance “Quick Wins” and work in SSA	Chairs K. Nwanze and D. Garrity
14:30	Agenda Item 5. IFAD Negotiations (Update on FHAO)	Chairs/ M. Williams
14:45	Agenda Item 6. Actions to Operationalize the Alliance (update)	Chairs
15:15	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
15:30	Agenda Item 7. CGIAR and Centers : Visions and Missions	J. von Braun
16:15	Agenda Item 8. Contracting and conflict mechanisms (policy and procedures)	Consultant
17:00	Agenda Item 9. Update on Board Orientation and Lessons Learned document	A. McCalla and M. Williams
17:30	<i>Cocktail and Joint Dinner (to be held at WorldFish, due to evening videoconferences)</i>	
19:00	Agenda Item 10. SSA-TF Discussions (Audio/videoconference)	Chairs and TF Co-Chairs
20:00	Agenda Item 11. CGIAR new Priorities and Strategies (Audio/videoconference)	P. Pinstrup-Andersen and R. Echeverria
21:00	(New) Agenda Item 12. Joint Videoconference with Ian Johnson and Francsico Reifschneider	Chairs
22:00	Wrap-up of the Day	Chairs

Time	Agenda Item	Director(s) or Person(s) Responsible
<i>Friday, May 6 (Joint meeting cont.)</i>		
8:30	Agenda Item 13. Follow-up to GRPC meeting 13.1 Guiding Principles for GMOs in collections (to be adopted as an Alliance document) 13.2 Approval by Center Boards of draft agreement to be signed by Centers	E. Frison
9:15	Agenda Item 14. Report from Joint Working Groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation Study (confirmed) • Working Group on Challenge Programs • Working Group on Performance Measurement 	U. Werblow/ K. Nwanze R. Gautchi M. Neufville/A. El-Beltagy
9:30	Wrap-up of Meeting and discussion of Future Meetings	Chairs
<i>10:30</i>	<i>Coffee Break (Committees resume separate meetings for rest of day)</i>	