

**Joint Meeting of the Center Board Chairs (CBC) and the
Center Directors Committee (CDC)
of the Consultative Group on
International Agricultural Research**

October 21-22, 2004

**CIMMYT
El Batán, Mexico**

*Summary Record
of
Proceedings*

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

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Attendance	3
Chairs’ Executive Summary	5
Opening Remarks and Welcome	6
Special Joint Session on Collective Action: “The Road from Addis to Mexico”	6
Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from ICARDA Meetings.	10
Agenda Item 2. Report from ExCo and Chairman’s Report (CBC and CDC).	10
Agenda Item 3. Compensation Study.	12
Agenda Item 4. Report from Working Group on Performance Measurement.	13
Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Charter.	16
Agenda Item 6. Board Orientation Program.	17
Agenda Item 7. Meeting with SSA Task Force Co-Chairs.....	18
Agenda Item 8. Update from the Working Group on Challenge Programs.....	21
Agenda Item 9. Closing Joint Session for Other Business, Wrap-Up and Decisions for Future Meetings.	23
Annex 1. CBC/CDC Decisions Taken AGM04	25
Annex 2. Statement of CBC and CDC: Centers Framework for	30
Collective Action.	30
Annex 3. Agendas from Joint Special Session and Business Meeting	32

Attendance

<i>CIAT</i>	Jim Jones, Board Chair 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 Hubert Zandstra, 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
<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>	John Vercoe, Board Chair Uwe Werblow, Incoming Board Chair Carlos Seré, Director General
<i>IPGRI</i>	Benchaphun Shinawatra Ekasingh, Board Chair Emile Frison, Director General
<i>IRRI</i>	Keiji Otsuka, Board Chair Ronald Cantrell, Director General
<i>IWMI</i>	Remo Gautschi, Board Chair Frank Rijsberman, Director General
<i>Africa Rice Center WARDA</i>	Richard Musangi, Board Chair Kanayo Nwanze, Director General, <i>CDC Chair</i>
<i>World Agroforestry Center</i>	Eugene Terry, Board Chair Dennis Garrity, Director General

WorldFish Center Robert Kearney, 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

Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Science Council Chair and SSA-TF 1 Co-Chair
Moise Mensah, SSA-TF2 Co-Chair
H. Jochen de Haas, SSA-TF2 Co-Chair

Chairs' Executive Summary

As 2004 Chairs for the CBC and CDC, we are pleased to present the minutes from our meeting held at CIMMYT, October 21-22, 2004. In many respects the meetings and the year were a watershed for the CBC and CDC, and ultimately for the CGIAR Centers.

As reported at AGM04, the outcome of the El Batan meeting was that the CBC was in full agreement of the unanimous decision of the CDC to form an Alliance for the purpose of the Centers working together in new and more effective ways to first and foremost better serve the needs of the world's poor. Also released at AGM04 was a joint statement for the Framework for Collective Action, which held both the immediate and longer-term goals for the Alliance (please see Annex 2). In this document, the CBC and CDC agreed to build on:

- Existing collaboration in programs, administration and policies;
- An analysis of deficiencies for collective action in the past, via a new focus on agreed upon guiding principles;
- Existing entities and mechanisms, such as the CBC, CDC and the Medium-Term, planning process and others, and;
- The determination of the Centers to improve and streamline programming efforts first in Sub-Saharan Africa, in collaboration with the Task Forces, before extending our work to other regions.

Following this meeting, the CDC agreed to immediately transform itself into the Executive of the Alliance of the Future Harvest Centers, while the CBC will act as the Alliance Board. Before our next meeting (May, 2005) the CBC and CDC Executive Committees will meet together to discuss progress and review priorities regarding the implementation of the Collective Action Framework of the Future Harvest Centers.

Other important items discussed during this meeting included updates from joint working groups on progress made in the CGIAR Compensation Study, further activities in the work of assessing and improving the work and governance of the Challenge Programs, and an in-depth discussion with both Committees on the recent report from the Working Group on Performance Measurement. Updates were also provided on the CGIAR Charter and the current Board Orientation Programs. We are grateful for the chance to have a joint meeting at CIMMYT with the Co-Chairs of the Sub-Saharan Task Forces on Programmatic Alignment and Organizational and Structural Alignment. We had a very useful discussion and exchange of information. (Please see Annex 1 for a complete update of all decisions taken and follow-up).

We thank our colleagues for their hard work and dedication in helping transform the work of the CGIAR Centers, and the Alliance, as we move forward in the year ahead via collective action and other ways and means for achieving new and exciting ways of working together.

A. Uzo Mokwunye
CBC Chair

Kanayo F. Nwanze
CDC Chair

Opening Remarks and Welcome

The CBC Chair, Uzo Mokwunye, opened the meeting with a welcome and thank you to CIMMYT staff for their hospitality. He introduced two Board Chairs attending their first meeting: Angela Cropper (CIFOR Board Chair), and Uwe Werblow (Incoming Board Chair, ILRI). He reported the CBC would bid good-bye to several Board Chairs after AGM04, including Benchaphun Shinawatra Ekasingh (IPGRI Board Chair), Robert Kearney (WorldFish Board Chair), Richard Musangi (WARDA Board Chair), and John Vercoe (ILRI Board Chair). He thanked the departing members for their time of service to both their institutions and to the System.

Kanayo Nwanze, CDC Chair, thanked Masa Iwanaga and Alex McCalla of CIMMYT for their welcoming hospitality and honored two departing Directors General, Ron Cantrell (IRRI) and Hubert Zandstra (CIP), who were attending their last CDC meeting and would be retiring before the CDC and CBC held their spring meeting.

Special Joint Session on Collective Action: “The Road from Addis to Mexico”

The CDC Chair began the Special Joint Session of the CBC and CDC by briefing the meeting on the decisions of the CDC preparatory to the Special Session. He reported that the CDC had unanimously agreed the Future Harvest Centers would form an alliance, and that the CDC would become the Alliance Executive. The CDC Chair reported the CDC was also in agreement that not all activities would qualify as falling under “collective action” and said this would be made clear when Centers entered into shared programs and activities. He added that a CDC drafting group was assigned to work on a document capturing the guiding principles the Centers wished to adhere to, and that the agreed set would be a modified version of the document prepared during the CDC retreat in Addis Ababa, July 2004.

The CBC Chair was pleased with the progress made by the CDC, commenting that this made the work of the CBC easier, as the CBC had agreed to base their next steps on the supposition that an alliance would indeed be formed. He said the CBC was in full support of the move to the alliance and agreed that the CBC’s next step was to consider the formation and transformation of the CBC into an Alliance Board. He said the following points were important to consider:

- There was a need for a clear understanding of what would be required of each body;
- The Alliance would be seen as a work in progress, and would be modified accordingly by the CBC and CDC when deciding next steps;
- It was clear to both Committees this was the right direction to take, given that the cost of *not* working in a better coordinated fashion would be greater than the costs associated with forming an alliance.

Discussion.

- CBC members pointed out that Board Chairs would still need to consult with their individual Boards, in order to move forward. One member said that CBC members were at different states with regard to the spectrum of opinions about an alliance, and that this must be taken into account.
- CBC members were pleased to hear the understanding reached that not all activities entered into would be considered as collective action, and stressed the need to clarify how specific activities would enhance or improve the work of the Centers.
- The CBC stressed that the Alliance Board would be made up of the existing CBC, would not require the appointment of a separate body, and would not be required to serve as the Alliance Board at all times, rather only when required.
- Members emphasized that there were many on-going activities involving Center collaboration, and did not want to see these impeded.
- One CBC member stressed the importance of taking into account the dynamics currently underway, and how this important decision would feed into other activities (namely the SSA Task Forces). It was therefore considered essential that the Alliance be introduced and understood by the SSA Task Force members.
- It was acknowledged that this was a two-way process involving the Task Force members, to fully understand what the Centers were planning and for the Centers to understand how the System might evolve in the future.
- The idea of a dynamic and evolving activity would need to be accurately conveyed to the CGIAR membership, so that members would recognize this as a move in the right direction. A speaker said the move toward collective action should be seen as complementary to the change and reform process currently underway within the System.
- The CGIAR had evolved only in part as a System, because it has a missing link, another speaker stressed. The step towards collective action was an attempt to fill this gap and should be interpreted as part of the logical evolution, with a need for the Centers to become more proactive in the future.
- Speakers asked for further clarification as to how the Alliance Board would interact with the individual Boards.
- Another asked if the CDC was ready to demonstrate that an alliance of this nature was prepared to deliver “more bang for the buck”?

The CDC Chair responded positively to the above points and stressed that activities to be implemented through the “quick wins” programs focused initially on SSA, including issues identified within the MTPs, and would provide the CDC with what was needed to move forward with tangible new results. He added the CDC was not in a position to advise the CBC on their roles and responsibilities, but did want the Alliance Board to provide collective governance and provide conflict resolution. He mentioned three important reasons the Centers needed to operate as an alliance:

- To improve the Centers capacity for collective action
- To create a mechanism for conflict resolution
- To raise awareness and visibility of the Centers through an alliance

A CBC member suggested the need for a signed document (or an agreed upon charter) to help clarify the principles and formulate a schedule for collaborative activities. He suggested the document address ongoing activities, as well as new areas of collaborative work. The CDC Chair agreed and said the CBC and CDC would begin by signing off on agreed upon guiding principles and a resulting time frame, and would explore the idea of formulating an Alliance Charter.

Learning from the past and making changes for the future. The discussion continued by reviewing what had taken place in the past for the Centers, how the move toward an Alliance of the Future Harvest Centers would differ from past activities, and what this would mean for individual Boards and Centers alike:

- The CBC stressed the need to discuss what an Alliance Board would mean for individual Boards and how the CGIAR membership would view this body. The question was raised, “were the new responsibilities given or earned”?
- It was not for the Centers to ask for endorsement, rather to clarify to the membership what they planned to do, and how new activities would be carried out. One member suggested holding a briefing session with key donors, to help clarify issues or alleviate any concerns that might exist.
- There was a need to know what constitutional responsibilities would be given to the Alliance Board (on the part of the individual Boards) in order to make an alliance work.
- The Boards may not need to cede anything over to the Alliance Board. Rather it was important for the Boards to accept that collective action by Centers was in their communal best interest. If the Boards would be required to cede any powers, these would need to be agreed upon by Centers entering into an agreement to work together.
- One may not rule out the possibility to cede powers to a central authority. This would depend on the function of such a central board. The role of the Alliance Board would probably eventually extend beyond conflict resolution, and the Committees would need to decide how “deep” some of the issues of integration would extend.
- The suggestion was made to document the benefits, as some speakers thought the Committees would not need to do anything more than convince others that this was a good idea that required action.
- One member asked if a time frame would be attached to any of the quick wins and if there would be an interim meeting with the CBC as the Alliance Board?
- The CDC Chair responded there would most likely be a meeting of the CBC and CDC Executive Committees early in 2005 to begin work, and to prepare for the May meeting. The next step for the CDC would be to take decisions as to how and when they would implement the Executive Office and prepare for collective activities to be put into motion between AGM and May.

- It was also worthwhile to consider what had stopped the Centers from working together more effectively in the past, to avoid repeating some of the same mistakes.
- Cause for the trouble in the past was perceived as a lack of will and cooperation. In order to get past this the Centers must focus on the strengths of each Center and add a clear division of labor.
- The way forward might be found in how the Centers chose to work within their “overlapping mandates” and view these as areas where they were capable of helping farmers increase their earning capacity. The need to focus on a more constructive way of moving forward was emphasized.
- It was suggested that existing overlapping mandates be viewed as areas for the work of the Alliance.
- It would be useful to look beyond mandates. The MTP process included in the “quick wins” was seen as one way to effectively approach this.
- Often Center scientists on the ground were ready and willing to work together, but problems or constraints at the executive level had precluded joint efforts.
- The Centers should be cautioned against oversimplification. What was most important was the Centers’ agreement that the poor were the primary clients, and that this principle should be the driving force behind decisions taken and collective work pursued. This meant extending partnerships beyond the CG partners.
- The suggestion was made to look for areas of optimal synergies from the collaborating Centers. This would also apply to ecoregional and regional work and responsibilities.
- The issue of overlapping mandates was seen as a real issue to tackle in the future, and would not be resolved or properly addressed during the current meeting. The general consensus was that there was a need for the Boards to provide strong incentives for collaboration, accompanied by assistance in conflict resolution and governance.
- Speakers agreed the behavior of the Centers would be scrutinized closely in the coming year, as the Alliance of the Future Harvest Centers came into being, and it was important to realize that there were conflicts in the past, but that mandates must be secondary if Centers were to successfully work together.
- The donors would also need to see how an alliance would help solve problems, providing solutions that several players could participate in and be a part of.

Moving Forward. The CBC and CDC were pleased to take the next steps towards the formation of an alliance and realized it was a work in progress, but an important first step. The CBC Chair stressed that five years from now the Centers would be judged by the progress made. Now that approval was given, he said the CDC must create small committees to put ideas into play, realizing that issues such as commodities and ecoregional aspects would be included in future discussions.

The Chairs said that the Committees agreed in principle to the task before them and would ask the Executive Officer of the FHAO to work with members of the CBC in

drafting a one page document that could be read during the CGIAR Business Meeting, as an official kick-off and to inform the membership.

The CBC and CDC Chairs closed the session with thanks to the members of both Committees for taking the important first steps in a very positive direction. They acknowledged obstacles existed, but said success would be determined by how the Centers learned to handle the challenges, and in how they designed creative ways to include their partners and clients.

Decisions.

- The CBC and the CDC endorsed the establishment of an Alliance of the Future Harvest Centers to further enhance the collective action of the CGIAR Centers, and to enhance the current reform programs initiated for the CGIAR.
- The CDC would transform itself immediately into the Executive of the Alliance.
- The CBC would transform itself into the Alliance Board and would inform their colleague board members.
- An agreed joint statement of CDC and CBC was released widely during AGM04.
- Between AGM04 and May 2005, the CDC and CBC ExComs would meet to discuss progress and review priorities regarding implementation of the Collective Action Framework.

Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from ICARDA Meetings.

The CBC and CDC Chairs opened the regular CBC/CDC meeting the following day (22 October), and reviewed the Next Steps document from the ICARDA meeting. The CDC Chair reminded the group that the ICARDA meeting summary had been approved virtually for the first time during the summer months, and therefore would not be reviewed in its' entirety.

Discussion.

- There were no additional items proposed or follow-up needed to the Next Steps document.

Agenda Item 2. Report from ExCo and Chairman's Report (CBC and CDC).

The CBC Chair reported on the meeting of ExCo 7, which took place in Rome, September 13-14, 2004. One of the key items covered was the issue of the selection of Center Board members via the CG nominee process. The CBC discussed this issue the day prior, and would develop a message for AGM04. The CBC Chair thanked Meryl

Williams for her assistance with both preparation of materials and meeting follow-up for the CBC and CDC Chairs.

The CBC Chair said that the good news for the CGIAR System was an increase in faith in the Centers, seen through an increase in current funding levels, with other donors prepared to contribute more. He reported this was the first ExCo meeting where the Science Council was fully engaged. The SSA Challenge Program was approved. ExCo would recommend during AGM that the SSA Challenge Programs receive 18 months of initial funding, after which time the program would report to the Science Council, and then to ExCo for continued funding.

The CBC Chair briefly reviewed the current process by which nominees for Boards were received. He said ExCo preferred to see the CGIAR nominate and have a greater say in who served on Center Boards. The concern was that a two-tiered system would be put in place, and that Boards would not be able to perform due diligence.

The CBC would suggest that ExCo nominate Board nominees from the database. If none of the candidates met the criteria, the Center would report this to ExCo. If the nominees were suitable, the Boards would choose from the list the members for the Board. This was the preferred solution, to help the Boards maintain independence in the selection of their members.

Discussion.

- The suggestion was made that ExCo be requested to set up evaluative criteria, and establish a sunset clause for the new procedures.
- The process should also be evaluated within five years time, to ensure the envisioned changes were met.
- Some members cautioned against entering into a negotiating procedure over the appointment of new board members, as this would not be preferred by the Boards.
- Concerns were raised that the new process not be used as part of the performance criteria for the Centers (i.e., how many ExCo nominees were taken).
- The general consensus was that the existing database was not considered useful for Board selections, and the new database system planned to go into effect after AGM04 would hopefully address the shortcomings of the past.
- Concerns were raised that the current process was too convoluted, as potential Board Members may not want to wait through an extensive review process, prior to being selected, and that multiple nominees would need to be made to ExCo for approval in the event that some were not available.
- The CDC Chair said it was essential that CBC and ExCo agree on the criteria for going forward. He said that the desire to have CGIAR nominees stemmed from the desire to have Board members who held a wider knowledge of the CGIAR.
- The group agreed that the criteria needed to be better spelled out, and where problems existed, the Boards should be able to make their own searches and selections, and hold the final decision. The CBC members were in general

agreement that they did not want to enter into negotiations with either the Secretariat or ExCo.

- If the System was unhappy with the no-objection mechanism (not having enough teeth) then something could be put in place at the annual meeting to help review the process.
- The new database would not contain resumés and was perceived as a possible weakness. If the database process could not be agreed upon, then in the interim the Boards should be able to appoint nominees according to the old process, so as not to experience delays, or have vacancies go unfilled.
- Concerns were raised with regard to the database, and what steps the Centers could take if it proved inoperable.

Conclusions.

- The CBC Chair emphasized the need for the Boards to be able to preserve due diligence.
- The Nominating Committee Chairs and Board Secretaries would help select the three nominees to be chosen from the CGIAR database. The Boards would then make their selections and send nominees to ExCo.
- If ExCo turned down nominees, the need may arise for a special committee to further clarify concerns or issues raised.
- CBC members summarized that they understood the importance of CGIAR nominees on Boards, and accepted a new procedure to fill the CGIAR nominees on Boards, and a new database. They did not want to be forced into a situation of negotiation after the process has been completed, and reiterated it was ultimately a Board's decision.

Agenda Item 3. Compensation Study.

Robert Kearney reported there was no new progress regarding the Compensation Study, since the CBC and CDC last met. A report was being prepared for the CGIAR by the consultant Sandra Lawrence and this included a time table for future products. She would report that most of the comparator data for the Centers had been collected. The report on the comparisons to markets would be concluded in early 2005, with the NRS report completed along with the component for international staff by mid-2005. The full study would be completed by the end of 2005.

Discussion.

- Comments were made that this was a very important report, which raised concerns over the lack of requested involvement by the CDC.
- It was surprising to hear of a report going forward to ExCo 7, without former consultation with CBC, as the study was designed as a joint activity (CBC and ExCo).

- The Chairs said that as new information became available, the membership would be informed.

Agenda Item 4. Report from Working Group on Performance Measurement.

A presentation was given by Mort Neufville and Adel El-Beltagy, who serve on the Working Group on Performance Measurement (WGPM) as the CBC and CDC representatives, respectively. The working group met in April and again in September, with the most recent report distributed to the CBC and CDC for feedback and discussion. Mort Neufville said that the WGPM requested they report back to the working group with the CBC and CDC's suggested modifications to the indicators presented in the report.

Mort Neufville said that the working group document on performance measurement was shared with the Science Council and ExCo7, with agreement that a performance measurement system would be implemented. He said some elements and indicators were relevant to Center staff and programs, while others were directly related to management and governance. In addition, some indicators, although very important, were difficult to quantify or document and would therefore require additional information.

Mort Neufville and Adel El-Beltagy requested the following of the Committees:

- Review the draft document, with particular attention to the eight performance measurements that were identified and accepted by the WGPM;
- Suggest modifications or changes to the indicators;
- Agree upon staff members to serve as "focal points" for communicating with the Centers;
- Assist the working group in identifying the specific tools needed to gather the data;
- Suggest methods for verification;
- Review the timeline for implementation (with recommendations); and
- Provide recommendations on how performance measurement results should be shared.

Mort Neufville reported that the criteria used in selecting the indicators were based on the significance of the indicator, balance, simplicity, transparency and reliability of information. He said that an expanded group of Technical Experts and Resource Persons (TERP) would meet in November or early December to fine tune the indicators, with December or January as the time frame projected to explore the feasibility of an online data collection form, with input from identified center focal points. In January or February, 2005 the WGPM planned to submit its final report to ExCo for approval, with March, 2005 as the target for implementation of on-line data collection.

Adel El-Beltagy pointed out that the Medium Term Plans (MTPs) would see a percentage of achievements against the MTP targets, and that Centers would be judged against this, raising the profile and importance of the MTP documents. He added there would most likely be a scenario whereby Centers reported every two years on requested information. He said the number of indicators had been reduced from 62 in number to 37, and noted that comparisons between Centers would be difficult.

Discussion.

- Overall, Committee members felt the indicators were concrete, but raised concerns as to how the Centers would effectively collect data on 37 indicators, and questioned how the relative weight of the indicators would be determined.
- The question was raised as to who would determine when data were no longer relevant to impact, and if there would be a “grandfathering” of the data used.
- If surveys were required for the collection of information, how would the issue of different stakeholders for fisheries, forests, and water be addressed? Several speakers were concerned that Center partners would not be pleased with frequent surveying, and cautioned against overburdening their partners with the process.
- The list of qualitative indicators was long and diverse. Members cautioned against approving the indicators until it was clear how they would be used. Qualitative and quantitative indicators were mixed together, and it would be important to ensure they would not be simply added up.
- Further clarification was needed, regardless of the indicators, as to who would serve in the position of an auditing body. The auditing function would be critical to ensure indicators were properly collected, recorded and analyzed. The suggestion was made that the current system was flawed, in that it tried to push indicators too far into what had been traditionally held in the System for reviews.
- Concerns were raised with respect to global and regional mandates, as performance against self-set goals could become an issue. The question was raised, who helps the Centers achieve their goals? This would become increasingly important, as what was measured would be what gets done. A speaker cautioned against perverse incentives that could serve to skew what was measured and accounted for.
- Regarding financial health indicators, some speakers said delays in funding cycles would need to be taken into account, while others noted the importance of clarifying the diversity of income to each of the Centers. The suggestion was made that financial diversity was similar to a stock portfolio, and critical to a Center’s health. Concerns were raised that the surveys could also be problematic, if they proved too costly.
- The sheer amount of work required by the Centers in order to adequately do this work should be addressed. In 2004, eight indicators were used, and the work generated was enormous. The suggestion was made that indicators be added or phased-in over time, and that a jump to 37 in one year could create an unrealistic workload.

The CDC Chair thanked the group for their initial responses, and requested that they provide feedback to the specific questions set out by the WGPM. He said it was in the Centers' best interest to help move the process forward in a positive light, with specific recommendations.

A series of specific recommendations were given by CBC and CDC Committee members and included:

- A number of the indicators could be used in improving the EPMR system. It was suggested that this be done on a five year basis and could be moved into EPMRs to make them more systematic.
- One speaker said he could anticipate problems with indicators leading to outcomes and impacts of the quality of programs, and said it would be unrealistic to do this every two years. He suggested there was a need to look at the difference in short-term and longer-term data collection.
- The suggestion was made that no surveys take place in the first year, and that all finance and management indicators be handled through the Secretariat, with those related to science to go through the SC Secretariat. Emphasis was placed on being able to measure performance against plan. The first year, due to the tight timeframe, speakers requested that Centers be able to work with data already in their existing databases.
- By all indications, speakers said the list needed to be cut down into the basic minimum that could be used the first year. The suggestion was made that a small group consisting of CBC and CDC members be designated to formulate specific recommendations.
- Three cluster groups were suggested: First category involved indicators appropriate for reviews (EPMRs or MTPs - three or five year cycles); the second category included seven indicators related to stakeholders or surveys of trainees; the third category contained 21 indicators the Centers should be able to answer based on information contained in their current databases.
 - Category 1 (EPMR/MTPs): 1, 2, 3, 5, 24, 26, 27, 28
 - Category 2 (Surveys/SPIA): 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 23, 35
 - Category 3 (Existing Database Information): 6, 12-22, 29-34, 36 and 37 (the last two related to finance)
- Speakers wanted to test the assumption that donors would use these indicators in assessing their allocations. Ultimately, Committee members felt donors would look at their own development agendas and priorities, to see how the Centers agendas matched their own.

Conclusion.

- The CDC Chair thanked the Committees for their discussion and noted the request made from the WGPM for feedback. He noted progress had been made in the indicator process and was grateful to Mort Neufville and Adel El-Beltagy for their continued work on behalf of the CBC and CDC.

- The working group was expanded to include members who would help assist with the programmatic aspect, and provide a consolidated response to feed into the Technical Experts and Resource Persons (TERP) report. The group included Alex McCalla, Joachim von Braun, Jim Jones, and David Kaimowitz (in addition to Mort Neufville and Adel El-Beltagy).

Decisions.

Adel El-Beltagy and Mort Neufville, as CDC and CBC representatives in the Working Group on Performance Management, with assistance from Alex McCalla, Joachim von Braun, Jim Jones and David Kaimowitz would rearrange and cluster the indicators into three areas to help determine the schedule for implementation, e.g.:

1. Review type indicators - which rely on the use of existing documents, these are indicators (1, 2, 3, 5, 24, 26, 27 and 28). These indicators would align with the EPMR process.
2. The survey type indicators (SPIA) which would rely on the conduct of surveys, could be extensive in nature and therefore should be done in a three to five year cycle. These indicators would also align with the EPMR process.
3. Annual performance measurement - i.e. measurement and evaluation using existing data base. Indicators (6, 12, 25, 29, 34, 36 and 37).

Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Charter.

John Vercoe attended the drafting meeting held in Washington D.C. in August, and reported on progress made in the drafting of the CGIAR Charter. A copy of the revised Charter was before the group. He said it was a valuable exercise and thanked Alex McCalla for his help in contributing to changes in the second volume. He felt the document would be considered useful, particularly in helping others to more easily understand the System, and was pleased that the Centers' edits and suggestions were now included.

The CBC Chair reported that ExCo 7 took the decision to accept the Charter, and on a no-objection basis, the Charter was accepted and adopted. The main body of the Charter was now fixed, but additional edits could be provided to John Vercoe.

Discussion.

- The question was raised as to how the Charter would be amended, with a CBC member pointing out that reference to the Program Committee (which had ceased to exist) and discussion of the powers of a DG should be amended.

Conclusion.

- John Vercoe would take forward the suggested changes for the re-adjustment in light of the CDC/CBC discussions for AGM04.

- The Chairs thanked John Vercoe for his help and work over the past year to see the Charter through, including edits and requested changes on behalf of the Committees.

Decision.

- John Vercoe, on behalf of the Centers, would liaise with the Secretariat regarding the requested changes (Program Committee of ExCo and a statement concerning the powers of the DG).

Agenda Item 6. Board Orientation Program.

Alex McCalla provided a summary note and update on the progress and plans for the Board Orientation Program. He said two back-to-back training sessions would be held at CIMMYT, immediately following AGM. Thirteen of the 15 Centers had a total of 15 participants registered for each session. Six Board Chairs would also participate in the program.

He was pleased that the attendance numbers were up from the spring session held in the U.K., stating they had been able to fill the minimum number required by the CG Secretariat (who were funding the first session at CIMMYT). He asked for comments or suggestions to the planned material, and said another pair of back-to-back sessions would be held in Addis in February, 2005, and then another in May in Asia. Once completed, the back log of new members would be eliminated, and one program per year should suffice for the training of new Board members.

Alex McCalla reported a full year's program was submitted to the Secretariat, but the dates for the sessions were not yet set. He added the funding for future courses would be based on the evaluation of those held at CIMMYT.

The CBC Chair confirmed the dates for February and May training sessions would be finalized before the course was completed at CIMMYT, and said that subsequent training sessions would be regional in focus (Africa-based Board members for Addis and Asia-based Board members for the Asian location).

Discussion.

- The request was made to set the dates as soon as possible, to better accommodate and ensure participation.
- Members hoped that costs would be kept lower, with a regional focus for Board members from Africa and Asia.

Agenda Item 7. Meeting with SSA Task Force Co-Chairs.

The CBC and CDC met jointly with the Co-Chairs from the Task Force for Programmatic Alignment (TF-1) and the Task Force for the Organizational and Structural Alignment (TF-2) to:

- Receive a report on the progress and the next steps of the Task Forces work.
- Discuss the linkages between work of the Task Forces and the Centers Collective Action initiative, as well as the SSA-CP.

Per Pinstrup-Andersen, H. Jochen de Haas, and Moise Mensah joined the CBC and CDC. Paco Sereme, Co-Chair of the Task Force for Organizational and Structural Alignment (TF-2) was unable to join, due to his attendance of the GFAR meeting in Mexico City.

The CBC Chair welcomed the Co-Chairs. Per Pinstrup-Andersen said that they came to listen and looked forward to receiving feedback from the group. He provided a brief update. The two Task Forces had been meeting separately and together since last May in Germany and the majority of the work had been divided among the three consultants: Eugene Terry, Lukas Brader and Joseph Mukibi.

The consultants met in Washington in August, and visited seven countries, with a wide range of discussions and interactions with partners in various consultations. Per Pinstrup-Andersen invited observers from the CDC and CBC to attend the discussion of the progress report and unfinished draft report on Sunday, October 24. He said the meeting was by invitation only, but wanted Center management to be there. During the meeting they would take stock of where they were, and where they would be by the planned end to the Task Forces work in March, 2005.

Per Pinstrup-Andersen shared with the CBC and CDC some of the issues and questions before the Task Forces:

- Where should the CGIAR be on the continuum of basic to cutting edge development research, or was this too linear an approach, particularly in light of the SSA Challenge Program?
- Should the 15 Future Harvest Centers continue to do the work where the NARS were not strong enough to do this themselves, or work with the larger NARS who had the capacity?
- The consultants had heard during the consultations that on-farm research should be done by the nationals, and not the Centers.
- The need to discuss where in the continuum of basic to applied research should the CGIAR be? This would also need to link with the System-wide Priorities.
- How would programmatic alignment properly link with system priorities globally?

- Should the Future Harvest Centers help the SROs by setting priorities by sub-regions? Who would decide and what would be the role of the client institutions vis-à-vis the Centers?
- Should the CGIAR mandate be amplified to include wealth creation and help African farmers under the pressure of increasingly global markets? This posed another question: Who will invest in African agriculture?
- Competitiveness was also considered extremely important. If poor Africans were going to escape poverty, the OECD countries would have to abolish their import tariffs.
- Governance and management structure: If the CGIAR spends almost 50 percent on SSA, need to interact across other regions as well, rather than set up a governance structure for Africa alone. The Center Alliance approach, with an Alliance Board and high level management structure, offered tremendous opportunities for working together, and would help prevent the creation of a new superstructure.

The CBC and CDC Chairs updated the guests on decisions taken during the Special Session on Collective Action and shared with them the formation of a draft statement on the Centers framework. (Annex 2, document distributed during AGM). The Chairs stressed the need to build on existing levels of cooperation, and specific programs to enhance capacities within the CBC, CDC, and the modification of tools such as the MTPs. They reiterated that every action taken by the Centers would not be considered collective in nature, only designated activities and programs, or those designed specifically for a collective approach.

The Task Force Co-Chairs were pleased to hear of the progress made and asked a few questions of the Chairs. Moise Mensah asked how conflict resolution would be handled, if power was not ceded by the Boards. More importantly, he said it would be great to have an alliance, but cautioned that for the purposes of working in SSA, the SROs must be in charge of defining their own strategies. The CBC Chair responded that the Boards would remain independent, and that the CBC would become the Board for the Alliance for activities involving collective action. This would be important when controversy arose and as oversight was needed.

The CDC Chair agreed, and emphasized that collective action would go beyond programs, into corporate events, financing, and services. The initial quick wins were programmatic in structure. A regional MTP would be produced and would enable the Centers and their partners to work together, organized on a regional basis. He stressed the need to seek convergence with programmatic alignment in SSA and saw this as a two way process, to achieve convergence, both through changes made by the Centers and the findings of the SSA Task Forces.

The Committees entered into discussion with the Task Force Co-Chairs, with respect to the work focused on SSA:

Discussion.

- Concerns were raised that the linear “basic to applied” model would not be very helpful, as NARS that handled on-farm research might ignore the importance of participatory research, and speakers did not want to see this happen. Different priorities existed within the continuum of poverty alleviation vs. wealth generation. Since the first priority of the CGIAR was to alleviate poverty, any program decisions made should take this into account. It was therefore important to recognize the necessary differences in priorities between the Centers and the SROs.
- The question was raised as to how fish, forests and water would fit in with the current structure of SROs, as they did not have the same partners, particularly in Africa. A speaker noted other partners, who were not SROs, were also important to the work in Africa.
- Speaking in his capacity as one of the consultants hired for the study, Eugene Terry answered in the absence of SROs engaged in areas of joint interests, the Task Forces had engaged in discussion and could confirm the stakeholders were thinking holistically, and looking at a broad set of targets, that included fish, forests and water. He said the desired outcome was a forward looking process, to properly account for these issues.
- The Centers position their work determined by the needs and priorities of a region or country. Similarly, system priorities would need to be adjusted, to fit the priorities of the regions and countries (to be seen as more responsive, flexible). If NARSs were weak, it becomes a priority to see that they are strengthened. A speaker stressed the need to look beyond the NARS, in order to diversify partners in the field, and speed up the process of dissemination.
- The concept of wealth creation was a very welcomed one, and could serve to liberate the System from working only with certain groups. With regard to partnerships with NARS, one member cautioned that they were a part of the set, but should not be the only sub-set of possible partners and players. He added that the Task Force report had the opportunity to set the tone on this topic.
- A great deal of diversity existed between country level priorities and strategies in African countries. Some governments had begun to decentralize their agricultural research, and a speaker asked how this would impact the findings and recommendations of the Task Forces. He asked if it would make sense to have clusters of countries from which to take the lessons learned? He added sub-regional political organizations were becoming major players, and asked how the panels planned to interact with them.
- The traditional technology paradigm of the older CGIAR system was not working, and it was agreed there was a need to look more at co-development processes and how to scale up and absorb the lessons learned.
- A question was raised regarding the upcoming report to be prepared by the Blair Commission, and if the CGIAR would have a reasonably high profile (or how they would be linked) as it would be important to ensure that the agriculture chapter accurately reflected the situation in Africa.

- The importance of identifying the technologies needed for Africa was raised by another member who said it was not clear what tools and technologies were currently needed, and asked if the Task Force would provide this information.

Answers and Comments from the Task Force Co-Chairs.

- Per Pinstrup-Andersen said that wealth creation and competitiveness were complimentary, not one or the other, as people were known to escape poverty by either becoming more competitive, or being forced to leave farming. He said the CGIAR needed to be careful that when it spoke about wealth creation, it was in the context of wealth generation for the poor.
- With regard to system priorities vs. regional priorities, it was not as easy as simply saying system priorities must change, because they must be seen in the larger picture, for the entire world. He added system priorities could not be adjusted to what was needed only in SSA.
- Jochen de Haas acknowledged the Alliance Board was more of an “evolution, than a revolution,” and said it would make sense to remain flexible. If a recommendation was made that new management and governance structures were needed, then the Centers would need to be ready to respond to questions on these changes.
- With respect to the move to decentralize research, one option would be to take more of an ecoregional approach. Per Pinstrup-Andersen said the Task Forces were interacting with NEPAD and other key players.
- Concerning the Blair Commission report, Per Pinstrup-Andersen said they were working to interact and agreed that the CDC or Centers needed to interact as well.
- Moise Mensah acknowledged that some NARS perceived a competition for resources with the Centers, and said the System must be seen to be helping and not competing with the NARS. He also felt the technologies needed in Africa had been well defined in the past, and it was now a matter of bringing the tools to bear for those who needed them. Per Pinstrup-Andersen added if the System priorities were on target, this would help not only Africa, but all regions where the CGIAR works. He stressed the need to go beyond diagnostics to more action.

The CBC Chair closed the session, with thanks to the Task Force Co-Chairs for having joined. He stressed the desire of the Centers to be seen as interacting with the Task Forces, and said that the plans for the Alliance would add value to the work of the Task Forces. He thanked them for the invitation to attend the briefing prior to AGM, and said they looked forward to continued interaction.

Agenda Item 8. Update from the Working Group on Challenge Programs.

Remo Gautschi, as Chair of the Joint CBC/CDC Working Group on Challenge Programs provided an update to the Committees. He reported in a prepared summary note for the group that the decision was taken during ExCo 6 to mandate the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariats to undertake a review of ongoing pilot Challenge

Programs. A consultant, Dr. Guy Poulter was hired from the U.K. to undertake such a study.

Remo Gautschi said the report prepared by Dr. Poulter was completed and presented to the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariats in early September. The report was then synthesized by the Secretariats into a document entitled, “Synthesis of Lessons Learned from Initial Implementation of the CGIAR Pilot Challenge Programs” as a joint report by the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat, and released just prior to the CBC and CDC meeting. The document would also be discussed at AGM04. He added he did not agree with the document entirely, but said overall it was a good report.

The CBC Chair raised the concern that the document before the group did not clarify the role of the Boards and said the issue of linkages between the CP governance bodies and the Center Boards was not addressed. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Discussion.

- A speaker said he was less concerned with the findings of the report, after having learned of the progress made, with regards to the Alliance. He suggested formulating guiding principles for the Alliance Board, similar to those being prepared for the Alliance Executive would help clarify any unanswered issues. This idea was endorsed by other Committee members.
- Governance issues were considered context specific, and therefore would not present a major dilemma, providing the rules of the game were clearly spelled out.
- The point was brought up if the CBC had functioned as an Alliance Board when the Challenge Programs (CPs) began, a different combination of CP governance might exist today.
- The Challenge Programs contained a variety of outside players, and the question was raised as to how the various partners would accept oversight from the Alliance Board? A speaker felt the CPs operated better as unincorporated joint ventures, and was not sure a new approach would be well received.
- Another speaker disagreed, and said that the CPs were a form of collective action, with the major partners continuing to be the Centers. The fiduciary responsibility of the CPs ultimately rested with the Center Boards. He said the same concept would apply to the system-wide and ecoregional programs, with respect to extended partners and governance.
- The case of Harvest Plus was raised, where the DGs of the two participating Centers were part of the CPs governance board, and a joint audit committee of IFPRI and CIAT was put in place.
- It was important to have variation among CPs, and a speaker suggested it was too early to decide what worked and what did not.
- Lessons learned existed that could be applied in priority setting, day to day management, etc. and the suggestion was made that these also be reviewed. In addition, the Science Council had prepared a commentary on programmatic

lessons, based on the three MTPs of the Challenge Programs, which was recommended as another important source of information.

Conclusions.

- The CBC Chair said that the CBC would revisit the paper, in relation to the creation of the Alliance Board, and would review the idea of developing guiding principles for the Alliance Board.
- The CDC Chair suggested the Charter for the Alliance could include the principles for the Alliance Board, along with guiding principles for the Alliance Executive.
- Remo Gautschi and members of the working group (Eugene Terry, Adel El Beltagy and Masa Iwanaga) were thanked for their work and report.
- The WG Committee was asked to continue monitoring progress for Challenge Programs, as a means of keeping the CBC and CDC informed.

Agenda Item 9. Closing Joint Session for Other Business, Wrap-Up and Decisions for Future Meetings.

Alliance Charter. The suggestion was made to form a small working group to address the guiding principles, Alliance Charter, and the development of the Executive for the Alliance.

Decisions.

- A Joint Working Group of CBC and CDC on the Alliance Charter was formed, composed of John Vercoe and Jim Jones (CBC), Adel El Beltagy and Emile Frison (CDC), with Meryl Williams (FHAO). The target would be to have a draft started before John Vercoe retired from CBC at the end of November. The Joint Working Group would develop a timetable and set of milestones. Key drafts would go to CDC and CBC (for distribution to Center Boards) at appropriate points.

Joint Statement of the CBC and CDC.

Suggested edits and changes were received for a draft Joint Statement in circulation. It was decided the CBC would re-draft the existing document, working with Meryl Williams, and would share the next version with the CDC in the following days. (The final version was released during AGM, see Annex 2)

Future Meetings.

- By the end of January, a draft of the Alliance Charter would be available for the CBC and CDC ExComs, prior to their meeting together between the end of January and mid-February, 2005.

- A full meeting of both Committees would take place the first week of May, 2005. WorldFish Center offered to host. The dates were set for May 4-6 (Wednesday-Friday) in Penang, Malaysia.
- A Board Orientation program would be scheduled to coincide with the joint meeting.

The CBC and CDC Chairs closed the meeting, thanking CIMMYT for their kind hospitality and said they were encouraged by the progress made during the meeting, and looked to the Committees to provide the necessary leadership for the Centers, in this new and exciting time.

Annex 1. CBC/CDC Decisions Taken AGM04

***Key Decisions Table
Special Session and Joint Meeting of the
CBC/CDC
CIMMYT, AGM04
October 21-22***

Number	Subject Matter	Decision Text	Action
04/CBC- CDC/AGM/1	Collective Action Framework (joint with CBC)	1.1 The CBC and the CDC endorsed the establishment of an Alliance of the Future Harvest Centers to further enhance the collective action of the CGIAR Centers, and to enhance the current reform programs initiated for the CGIAR.	
04/CBC- CDC/AGM/2	Collective Action Framework (joint with CBC)	2.1 The CDC would transform itself immediately into the Executive of the Alliance.	
04/CBC- CDC/AGM/3	Collective Action Framework (joint with CBC)	3.1 The CBC would transform itself into the Alliance Board and would inform their colleague board members.	
04/CBC- CDC/AGM/4	Collective Action Framework (with CBC)	4.1 An agreed joint statement of CDC and CBC was released widely during AGM04.	
04/CBC- CDC/AGM/5	Collective Action Framework (with CBC)	5.1 Between AGM04 and May 2005, the CDC and CBC ExComs would meet to discuss progress and review priorities regarding implementation of the Collective Action Framework.	Meryl Williams to interact with ExComs on dates and location
04/CBC- CDC/AGM/6	CGIAR Working Group on Performance Management (with CBC)	6.1 Adel El-Beltagy and Mort Neufville, as CDC and CBC representatives, respectively, in the Working Group on Performance Management, with assistance from Alex McCalla, Joachim von Braun, Jim Jones and David Kaimowitz would rearrange and cluster the indicators into three areas to help	

		<p>determine the schedule for implementation, e.g.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review type indicators - which rely on the use of existing documents, these are indicators (1, 2, 3, 5, 24, 26, 27 and 28). These indicators would align with the EPMR process. 2. The survey type indicators (SPIA) which would rely on the conduct of surveys could be extensive in nature and therefore should be done in a 3-5 year cycle. These indicators would also align with the EPMR process. 3. Annual performance measurement - i.e. measurement and evaluation using existing data base. Indicators (6, 12, 25, 29, 34, 36 and 37). 	
04/CBC-CDC/AGM/7	CGIAR Charter	7.1 John Vercoe, on behalf of the Centers, would liaise with the Secretariat regarding the requested changes (Program Committee of ExCo and a statement concerning the powers of the DG).	
04/AGM/CBC-CDC/8	Alliance Charter	8.1 A Joint Working Group of CBC and CDC on the Alliance Charter was formed, composed of John Vercoe and Jim Jones (CBC), Adel El-Beltagy and Emile Frison (CDC), with Meryl Williams (FHAO). The target would be to have a draft started before John Vercoe retired from CBC at the end of November. The Joint Working Group would develop a timetable and set of milestones. Key drafts to go to CDC and CBC (for distribution to Center Boards) at appropriate points.	
<i>Additional Decisions Pertaining to the Collective Action Framework</i>			
Number	Subject Matter	Decision Text	Action
04/AGM/CBC-CDC/9	Collective Action Framework (CDC)	9.1 The support for the Alliance Executive would be developed during 2005, building on and improving the work currently underway through the Future Harvest Alliance Office, and	

		as a member of the Systems Office.	
04/AGM/CBC-CDC/10	Collective Action Framework (CDC)	10.1 A set of 10 Guiding Principles was approved. (see below) It was agreed these principles would not supersede earlier CDC agreements, especially the CDC Code of Conduct.	
04/AGM/CBC-CDC/11	Collective Action Framework (CDC)	11.1 CDC to request CDDC to advise in detail how to proceed on Recommendation number eight of the Retreat Report, regarding common standards and shared services.	CDDC Chair
04/AGM/CBC-CDC/12	Collective Action Framework (“Quick Wins”)	<p>12.1 In terms of research and collective action, and in concert with the work currently underway of the two Task Forces for SSA, the CDC decided to take the initial first steps which will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two regional MTPs to focus on SSA Programmatic Alignment. These will include SSA-Eastern and Central Africa MTP (with ILRI as the coordinating Center) and SSA-Western and Central Africa (with WARDA as the coordinating Center, working with ICRISAT and IITA). ○ A Country Pilot study for Kenya will also get underway, to further clarify and solidify the work of the various Centers in Kenya. 	Carlos Sere; Kanayo Nwanze to advise CDC on progress and plans by 15 December 2004 on the two sub regional plans respectively
04/AGM/CBC-CDC/13	Collective Action Framework – New Initiatives	13.1 The CDC agreed to formulate a collective response to the Science Council on commentaries on the MTPs in 2005. Joachim von Braun, Hubert Zandstra and Meryl Williams to draft the response during AGM04. The CDC would consider the priority for longer-term follow-up to the	On the longer term follow-up, Joachim von Braun to inform CDC by 15 December

		collaborations suggested by the SC during the CDC May 2005 meeting.	2004 of next steps.
		13.2 During the May 2005 meeting, the CDC would consider the next steps in developing a common strategy for capacity strengthening in SSA.	
		13.3 A CDC program for region-specific programmatic alignment for Asia-Pacific, LAC and CWANA would be developed for discussion and decision at the CDC May 2005 meeting.	CDC Regional Sub Committee Chairs to advise CDC by 15 February of plans and progress
04/CBC-CDC/AGM/14	Collective Action Framework (support services)	14.1 The support service unit for the Alliance should be termed an Office and not a Secretariat, to overcome concerns that it will be duplicating and not complementing the collective action support to the Centers by the CGIAR Secretariat.	
04/CBC-CDC/AGM/15	Sub Saharan Africa – Challenge Program and FARA link	15.1 Dennis Garrity, as incoming SSA Sub-Committee Chair would be charged, through his Chair position, to work with FARA on how to effectively and actively contribute.	

The following 10 Guiding Principles were agreed to for the Alliance of Future Harvest Centers. These principles do not supersede earlier CDC agreements, such as the CDC Code of Conduct, but are additional to them.

Guiding Principles:

To enable the Centers to make their vision of collective action a reality, the following set of Guiding Principles have been agreed to:

- 1) *Our allegiance is first and foremost to the poor.*
- 2) *Collective Actions shall be based on the principle of partnership among equals (internal and external).*
- 3) *Collective action implies mutual respect among Centers and no hierarchy of Centers. Except under clearly defined circumstances, no Center will make an*

automatic assumption of leadership for an action. Centers do not assume line responsibility for other Center's staff.

- 4) The Centers will ensure transparency through open communication among themselves and with partners and stakeholders.*
- 5) The problem to be addressed or the opportunity to be sought through collective action would get the best possible team(s) or mechanism assembled from center resource and in cooperation with partners.*
- 6) Priority setting should be based on open, transparent practices, including stakeholder consultation with participating Centers, research and development partners and investors.*
- 7) For areas identified as a collective-action initiative of the Alliance, each participating Center is accountable to the collective-action's governing mechanism, which is accountable to the stakeholders.*
- 8) Any conflicts shall be resolved among the Centers through the collective action governing mechanism; if this is not achieved quickly, it will be resolved by the CBC or its delegated body.*
- 9) For each collective-action problem to be solved or opportunity to be captured, clear specifications and reachable objectives will be identified. Shared standards and practices (for administration and science) will be employed whenever justified to minimize transaction costs and increase efficiencies.*

Annex 2. Statement of CBC and CDC: Centers Framework for Collective Action.

Draft Statement of CBC and CDC on the Centers Framework for Collective Action

**22 October 2004¹
CIMMYT, Mexico**

Significant and continuing efforts have been made in the past years to reform the three pillars of the CG system: the Consultative Group, its Executive Council and Partners, the Science Council, and the 15 Independent agricultural research Centers. As a continuation of that process, Center Directors and Board Chairs of the 15 Centers have decided that as well as proceeding with initiatives to increase the transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of individual Center Programmes, they will also enhance their capacity for collective action. During the meeting of ExCo 7, ExCo members were pleased to see the results of the work of the CDC held in Addis Ababa in July, 2004, and said that they would look for the early benefits.

The mechanism by which this will be done is through the creation of a formal Alliance to:

- Build on their extensive existing well performing collaboration in programs, administration and policies.
- Build on an analysis of deficiencies which have characterized collective action in the past with specific major Guiding Principles to address these past deficiencies
- Build on existing entities and mechanisms such as the Center Directors Committee, the Committee of Board Chairs, the Medium Term planning process and others.
- Build on a determination of the Centers to improve and streamline programming efforts in SubSaharan Africa, in collaboration with the System Task Forces, as a first priority.

At the level of Center management, the Alliance will therefore govern *the collective* work of the independent Centers, establish mechanisms for conflict resolution and speak with a common voice to raise the visibility of the issues the Centers address collectively. The Centers recognize the importance of involving others from the outset, such as regional and national partners, in framing collective actions in order to ensure that the action serves the people we are trying to reach.

The present Center Directors Committee will transform itself to become the Alliance Executive, based on major Guiding Principles designed to address past challenges and

¹ As amended by FHAO on 24 October by the addition of the comment on the ExCo7 discussion.

with greater decision making powers and accountability. This will extend the CDC's own operating and policy reforms of recent years and make it more proactive.

The Board Chairs warmly welcome these positive developments, and, will support this new and creative impetus by acting as a Board for the Alliance, with an initial focus on serving as a higher body on conflict resolution.

At the level of the system, the Executive Committee at its meeting in September 2004 welcomed both the foresight represented in organizing this work, and the important step forward that would be represented by its implementation.

In addition to the reforms agreed in governance of the Centers' collective work, the Centers also agreed on a set of immediate actions to be implemented in the spirit of the Alliance and in consultation with ASERECA and SADC/FANR and CORAF. These are:

- Sub Saharan Programmatic Alignment: two pilot sub-regional MTPs to be developed, one for east and central Africa and one for west and central Africa
- A pilot project on country coordination to be conducted in Kenya

Streamlined CGIAR decision making and integrated System support services, plus greater programmatic alignment create a requirement for Centers to act in greater concert. These decisions are based on the growing strength and benefits of existing collaborations and the benefits to the CGIAR and its partners of greater future collective action. The Alliance and associated changes to the way the Centers do business together will benefit the Centers' partners and the whole CGIAR System through targeting collective Center resources more strategically and efficiently to meet partner needs, as well as to identify and seize emerging opportunities, with an initial focus on how to assist the poor farmers of Africa.

Annex 3. Agendas from Joint Special Session and Business Meeting

***Joint Meeting of the
Center Board Chairs (CBC) and
The Center Directors Committee (CDC)
Draft Timed Agenda
Version 10-18-04
October 22, 2004***

CIMMYT

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
Friday, October 22		
	Note: Special half-day Joint CBC/CDC Session held Thursday, October 21, "The Road from Addis to Mexico" (agenda attached)	
8:30	Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Review of Next Steps Document and Follow-Up from ICARDA Meetings	Chairs (U. Mokwunye and K. Nwanze)
8:45	Agenda Item 2. Report from ExCo and Chairman's Report (CBC and CDC)	Chairs
9:15	Agenda Item 3. Compensation Study	B. Kearney and K. Nwanze
9:30	Agenda Item 4. Report from Working Group on Performance Measurement	M. Neufville and A. El-Beltagy
10:00	Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Charter	J. Vercoe
10:40 Coffee Break		
10:55	Agenda Item 6. Board Orientation Program	A. McCalla
11:15	Agenda Item 7. Meeting with SSA Task Force Co-Chairs	Chairs
12:30 Informal Lunch with Co-Chairs of TF-1 and TF-2		
13:30	Agenda Item 8. Closing Joint Session for Other Business, Wrap-Up and Decisions for Future Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Challenge Programs Lessons Learned Document <p><i>(Committees to then divide into separate sessions to continue their business for the remaining part of the afternoon)</i></p>	R. Gautschi
19:30 CBC Chair's Dinner at the CIMMYT Guest House		
20:00 CDC Chair's Dinner hosted in the home of Masa and Kumiko Iwanaga (bus departs at 20:00)		

Joint CDC/CBC Meeting on the Collective Action Framework
Thursday, October 21
AGENDA

Revised 10-18-04

- 1. Issues and Overview of July Collective Action Retreat**
 - A. Introduction and presentation: CBC and CDC chairs**
 - B. Discussion**
- 2. Proposed next steps and decision making (consideration of the recommendations and the draft action plan)**
 - A. Recommendations and Proposals**
 - **Formation of Alliance**
 - **Alliance Board**
 - **Alliance Executive**
 - **Guiding Principles**
 - **Other recommendations:**
 - i. Conflict resolution mechanisms**
 - ii. Contractual mechanisms**
 - iii. Secretariat**
 - iv. Standards and procedures**
 - B. Corporate identity survey results**
- 3. Quick Wins – sequencing, assigning responsibilities, contract consultants, set timelines**
 - A. SSA as first priority**
 - i. East and Central Africa MTP**
 - ii. Nairobi country coordination pilot**
 - B. Evolutionary alignment in SSA**
 - C. Other regions**
- 4. From Mexico to May**
 - A. Actions and responsibilities, next decisions**
 - B. Costs**
 - C. Communicating the messages**