

**Meeting of the Center Board Chairs (CBC) of the Consultative
Group on International Agricultural Research**

December 3, 2005

**Marrakech, Morocco
AGM05**

DRAFT
*Summary Record
of
Proceedings*

**VIRTUALLY APPROVED BY THE ALLIANCE BOARD,
FEBRUARY 22, 2006**

Table of Contents

Attendance	03
Opening Remarks and Welcome	04
Agenda Item 1:	04
• Review and Approval of Draft Agenda	04
• Formal Approval of Minutes of Penang Meeting, May 2005	04
Agenda Item 2: CBC Retreat – Update and Follow-Up	04
Agenda Item 3: Matters arising from meeting of CBC/AE ExComs, Hyderabad	06
Agenda Item 4: Stripe Review: Update on Review Panel and Advisory Committee	08
Agenda Item 6: Board Nominee Process	10
Agenda Item 7: Issues arising from Science Council meeting, Penang, Sept. 2005 ..	12
• Role of Boards in Performance Measurement	13
Agenda Item 9: Any Other Business:	14
• CBC Budget	14
• Appointment of CBC Vice-Chair	14
• Other	14
Annex 1: Agenda	16
Annex 2: AB/CBC Working Group Membership	17
Annex 3: Decision/Actions Table, Marrakech	18

Attendance

<i>CIAT</i>	Jim Jones, Board Chair Yves Savidan, Board Chair (designate)
<i>CIFOR</i>	
<i>CIMMYT</i>	Lena Lange, Board Chair
<i>CIP</i>	Jim Godfrey, Board Chair
<i>ICARDA</i>	Margaret Catley-Carlson, Board Chair Guido Gryseels, Board Chair (designate)
<i>ICRISAT</i>	Uzo Mokwunye, Board Chair and <i>CBC Chair</i>
<i>IFPRI</i>	Frances Stewart, Acting Board Chair
<i>IITA</i>	Mortimer Neufville, Board Chair Brian Harvey (designate)
<i>ILRI</i>	Uwe Werblow, Board Chair
<i>IPGRI</i>	Tony Gregson, Board Chair
<i>IRRI</i>	Keijiro Otsuka, Board Chair
<i>IWMI</i>	Remo Gautschi, Board Chair
<i>Africa Rice Center WARDA</i>	Gaston Grenier, Board Chair
<i>World Agroforestry Center</i>	Eugene Terry, Board Chair
<i>WorldFish Center</i>	Trond Bjorndal, Board Chair
<i>CBC Executive Secretary</i>	M. Caryl Jones-Swahn

Opening Remarks and Welcome:

Uzo Mokwunye, Chair of the CBC. Opened the meeting welcoming Lena Lange, Chair of the Board of CIMMYT; Frances Stewart, Acting Board Chair of IFPRI; Yves Savadin, Board Chair-designate, CIAT; Guido Gryseels, Board Chair-designate, ICARDA; and Brian Harvey, Board Chair-designate, IITA. Regrets had been received from Angela Cropper (CIFOR), and Isher Judge Ahluwalia (IFPRI) who were not able to attend the meeting.

The Chair bid a special farewell to Margaret Catley-Carlson (ICARDA) and Remo Gautschi (IWMI) who were attending their last CBC meeting and thanked them for their invaluable contribution to the Committee.

The Chair made special reference to Bob Havener and John Vercoe who had passed away since the last meeting of the CBC. Both were dedicated men who had made enormous contributions to the CGIAR system.

Agenda Item 1

(i) Review and Approval of Draft Agenda

After a few points of clarification, the Draft Agenda was adopted and is attached as Annex 1.

(ii) Formal Approval of the Minutes of the Penang Meeting, May 2005

The Committee reviewed the draft minutes from the Penang meeting and, with a vote of thanks to the Chair and the CBC Secretariat for producing an excellent set of notes, the Draft Minutes of the meeting held in Panang from May 4-6, 2005, were approved. The final version is now posted on the CBC website.

Agenda Item 2: CBC Retreat – Update and Follow-Up

Following the last meeting of the CBC in Penang, eleven members of the CBC held a two-day retreat on May 7-8, 2005. The retreat was designed to give the Chairs an opportunity to reflect on how to make the most effective use of their time, skills and knowledge to the benefit not only of their Centers but of to the whole CGIAR. The CBC retreat considered the changing roles and responsibilities of Boards, the CBC and the role the CBC can play in the reform process of the Centers and the CGIAR.

The Chair of the CBC tabled the Report of the Retreat which contains nine recommendations for discussion and adoption by the full CBC. The participants in the retreat urged the CBC to consider and adopt these recommendations in the interests of forging a more defined and cohesive role for the CBC for the benefit of the CGIAR System. The recommendations, once adopted, can be used to define the CBC on the web, in the Alliance Policies and Procedures, and in the CGIAR Charter.

Discussion:

- Roles and responsibility of Board Chairs as developed at retreat have been incorporated in Alliance Policies and Procedures document. A system of reporting on the recommendations should be setup and discussed at future meetings.
- In order to develop a common agenda of changes to Board composition, all CBC members should send Mort Neufville information on size and frequency of meetings, number of Board members, etc., for compilation and discussion at next meeting. Caryl Jones-Swahn was requested to work with Mort to design a matrix to capture this information. Once finalized, the matrix to be sent to Board Chairs for completion.
- Issues of diversity, skill sets, specializations, as well as the roles and responsibilities of individual Boards must also be fully discussed when the data is gathered.
- Suggest a rolling questionnaire be put together after the Stripe Review has submitted its report which will address the issue of Board composition, for discussion at each CBC meeting.
- Board Orientation Program focuses on outlining key functions of Boards, long term strategy, vision, etc. Board Chairs must be visionary in their thinking, planning short- medium- and long-term strategies. Board responsibility to set strategic direction for organization.
- Care should be taken to have sufficient technical capacity on Board to review the science in Centers.
- A self-evaluation of Board competency has been found useful to identify gaps in the skill set of Boards. One Center is in process of developing a Board competency profile which evaluates profiles of current Board members against the required skills for an effective Center Board. This strategic tool will be used both to identify gaps in Board skills and to focus the recruitment of potential new board members.
- Board Nominating Committees should undertake a critical review of Board skills and identify gaps in Board prior to suggesting potential new board members.
- Boards need financial expertise. However, in many cases technical experts are also financial specialists. Current CG database only lists one primary discipline to search from. Recommend database be updated to allow searches on two or three disciplines.
- Idea of recruiting common Board members to one or more Centers should be studied. What are the financial implications of having the same member on several Boards? What is the added value?
- Pros and cons of different Board structures should be contemplated given the fact that different organizations need different boards. Fads and fashions on current management thinking must be avoided. Boards with responsibility in part for regional representation, training in a region, etc., need Board members to reflect regional issues. Boards with global mandates do not need the same kind of stakeholder representation. Issue of what makes great boards great? How the board members interact with each other is vital in order to get the maximum and best performance.

- Discussions on the nature of Boards very useful, and should be placed on the agenda for the next several AB meetings.
- Further discussion to be had with members of Stripe Review panel.
- A recommendation on effective reporting and communication should be included in the Recommendations. How the CBC reports and communicates in response to various issues must be established.

Decisions:

- Motion to adopt the recommendations as set out in the Retreat document proposed, seconded, and unanimously adopted.
- Motion to transform the CBC into the Alliance Board proposed, seconded and unanimously adopted.

Next Steps:

- Mort Neufville to work with Caryl Jones-Swahn to design a matrix to capture information on size and frequency of Board meetings, number of Board members, etc. Once finalized, matrix to be sent to Board Chairs for completion. Data to be available at next AB meeting in April 2006.
- Caryl Jones-Swahn to send analysis of composition individual Center Boards to Board Chairs.
- Critique on CIMMYT Board by Don Marshall to be sent to Board Chairs.
- Request CG Secretariat to amend the CG data base to include additional primary discipline fields.

Agenda Item 3: Matters Arising from the ExComs at Hyderabad

The Chairman draw members' attention to Recommendation 6 of the CBC Retreat recommending that the CBC adopt four priority themes as the highest priority issues of the CBC agenda, and that a program of CBC action be developed to address the issues. The program could include delegating CBC members to lead the consideration of the issues and/or hiring specialists to develop appropriate materials for the CBC to consider.

One of the tasks undertaken by the Executive Committees of the CBC and the Alliance Executive at their September 1-2 meeting in Patancheru was to draw up the list of priority themes which are:

- (i) Promoting governance reforms in the Centers
- (ii) Encouraging strategic MTP development in SSA and other regions
- (iii) Development of the Alliance
- (iv) Continuation of the Board Orientation Programs.

The Chairman stressed that the AB must not sit still, but should have a problem-solving focus. He recommended that the AB adoption the priorities to enable them to support the system moving forward.

Discussion:

- The AB should provide leadership in developing strategic MTPs in other regions, taking into consideration the knowledge and experience gained from the African MTPs.
- It was recommended that a group of AB members, perhaps together with the colleagues from the AE, review various models for regional or sub-regional collaboration to determine the strengths and weaknesses before making a recommendation on which model to use in which region.
- It was recognized that it was too early to review the African MTP process as a whole, but that there was an opportunity for the AB to comment on using this same process in other parts of the world. There are lessons to be learned from starting the process and these should be captured.
- Much effort is being focused on the problems of the system, perhaps to the exclusion of solving the underlying problems the system was created to address. How can the expertise of the AB be harnessed to focus on the fundamental issues of concern?
- Concern was raised that the reforms were pushing ahead too quickly, without determining the impacts of the changes on poor people. Perhaps it was hasty to undertake a set of global reforms until the impacts of the African MTPs had been analyzed.
- It was agreed to include Conflict Resolution as a priority area for the AB, and members endorsed the Conflict Resolution Guidelines as tabled in the joint meeting of the AB/AE.
- A recommendation was tabled to put together a small group of AB members to discuss the issues facing the Alliance Board. This group could also meet with the Chair of the SSA-Task Force for further discussion as to the status of the TF. It was agreed that the AB should be an integral part of the discussions regarding reform in the system, and should take a driver's seat in the process.
- It was agreed to set up several sub-groups to report back to the AB on substantive issues.

Decisions:

- The AB will adopt the following priority areas and will form small working groups to study the issues and report back to the AB:
Names and AB members of sub-groups:
Group 1: Exploration of Models for Closer Programmatic and Structural Cooperation: Messrs/Mms: Werblow, Lange, Terry, Bjorndal
Group 2: Encouraging the development of Strategic Programmatic Collaboration: Messrs/Mms: Gryseels, Terry, Neufville, Ahluwalia, Werblow
Group 3: Operationalizing the Alliance: Messrs/Mms: Grenier, Otsuka, Jones, Ahluwalia plus members of the Alliance Executive
Group 4: Enhancements to Board Orientation Programs: Messrs: Godfrey, Terry, Gregson, Harvey
Group 5: Conflict Resolution: Messrs. Godfrey, Harvey, Gregson.

A listing of all CBC Working Groups is attached as Annex 2.

- Motion to adopt the Conflict Resolution Guidelines as tabled in the joint AB/AE meeting was proposed and accepted.

Agenda Item 4: Stripe Review: Update on Review Panel and Advisory Committee

The Chair reminded members that at their meeting at CIMMYT, Mexico, during AGM04, the AB had agreed to work with the CG Secretariat to establish a panel to undertake a stripe review of Center governance. The Terms of Reference had been finalized and circulated to all members of the AB and to ExCo. As specified in the TOR, an Advisory Group for the Panel has also been organized with the following as members: Uwe Werblow (Board Chair of ILRI), Francisco Reifschneider (CGIAR Director), Kevin Cleaver (Director of ARD, World Bank), and Usha Barwale (Chair, CGIAR Private Sector Committee).

The Review Panel was been selected, and comprised:

- Mr. Sam Paul, India, Chair of the Panel and expert in governance;
- Mr. Paul Egger, Switzerland, with expert knowledge of the CGIAR; and
- Ms. Lili-Ann Foster, Canada, an expert on fiduciary/governance issues.

The Panel held its inaugural meeting in Washington on September 26, and had determined their work plan which included phone calls to members of the Alliance to seek their views in advance to face-to-face meetings in Marrakech. The current plan was for members of the Panel to meet with the AB and AE during their meetings in Marrakech as well as one-on-one meetings with individual members if found necessary. Panel members will also take the opportunity for discussions with members of the CGIAR.

The Chair introduced and welcomed members of the Panel to the meeting of the AB.

On behalf of the Panel, Sam Paul, reiterated the steps the Panel had taken to date including informing the AB that a survey had been sent out to various stakeholders within the CGIAR, including Board Chairs, Board Members, Center Directors, Center senior staff and CGIAR members, requesting their views and opinions on a variety of issues, including the organization and management of Board Business, current best practices, the culture of learning and change within Centers, expectations of the Stripe Review, etc.

Approximately 65 responses had been received to date highlighting particular Center strengths and weaknesses. The responses could be bundled into five or 6 broad categories enabling the Panel to take an in-depth review of specific issues. These included:

- Board size, composition, frequency of meetings, roles and responsibilities;
- Ways of improving the efficiency of Boards;
- Board orientation;

- Strategic vision of Boards;
- Clarification of roles of different partners in CG system to achieve greater harmony;
- Board autonomy; independence vs. accountability; internal evaluation; CCERs.

The deadline for receipts of responses to the Questionnaire was extended to early January, and AB members were requested to encourage senior staff members of their Centers to complete the survey.

Mr. Paul also requested AB to provide additional issues which the Stripe Review might take into account during their review.

Discussion:

The AB requested the Stripe Review Panel to provide advice on:

- The ideal number of Board meetings per year: face-to-face or virtual, including the role of the Board ExCom vs. meetings of the full Board.
- The balance between meeting at Center headquarters where discussions with Center staff could be had easily vs. meeting in the field where important Center research could be seen.
- Ways in which Boards can play a strategic role in a Center vs. providing accountability? How does a Board move from playing a supervisory role to providing strategic advice?
- The advisability of Board interaction with Center staff – too much vs. too little.
- Issues of diversity and the importance of listening to the opinions of all Board members.
- The availability of best practice models of governance including the pros and cons of large Boards vs. small Boards.
- Size and composition of Boards, including skills-mix, regional representation, diversity, etc.
- The measurement of Board performance vs. the effectiveness of the Center.
- Board culture: how to ensure Boards work effectively, harnessing the experience, talents, and passion of Board Members.
- Time constraints on Board members and Board Chairs as members of AB.
- The best way for Boards to collaborate across Centers. Occasional interaction very useful
- The length and number of years of Board terms.
- Board self-evaluation and performance monitoring. Dynamics of working together as a Board.
- Center constitutions and rules of governance with respect to Boards.
- What kinds of Boards are needed to respond to ever changing environment? Does Board hold in trust the assets of the Center and provide a monitoring role, or should they also include a leadership role to manage the institute?
- The profile of a good Board member, including the mix of specializations.
- Relationship of Board members to home country funding.

- The revision of the Board nominee process at the completion of the pilot phase. Improve collaboration between Center Boards and the CG Secretariat.
- Rewriting/updating the CG Board Guidelines.
- Board Secretaries: ideal profiles and skills.

Decisions:

- The Stripe Review Panel will submit its report simultaneously to the AB and Secretariat for comment. These comments along with the Stripe Review Panel report will be submitted to ExCo12, and verbally report to AGM06.

Informal discussions continued over lunch.

Agenda Item 6: Board Nominee Process

The Chair informed membership that during ExCo9, Jimmy Smith (CIDA), on behalf of the ad-hoc Committee set up by ExCo, was asked to update ExCo on the experience of the ExCo Ad-Hoc Committee on the CGIAR Nominee process to date. Mr. Smith noted that the CGIAR agreed at AGM04 to pilot the process for two years, using the procedures established in cooperation with the CBC.

During the first round, six Centers had identified vacancies to be filled. In each case, Centers proposed 1-3 candidates to fill vacancies, and Members proposed an additional 0-3 candidates. In no case did Centers accept Members' suggested nominees. It is felt that a need exists to reexamine the process given the low success rate.

The Ad-Hoc Committee identified three main problems:

- (i) Inconsistent application of the agreed criteria, i.e., that the nominees should have expertise in the areas of finance, governance, or CGIAR System knowledge;
- (ii) Lack of, and varied, Center Board awareness and understanding of the agreed procedures; and
- (iii) Tight timelines between the initiation and completion of each cycle.

The Ad-Hoc Committee suggested two options to address the above issues:

- (i) Pilot an additional cycle without any changes in the process used in the first cycle; or
- (ii) Modify the process slightly to address the problems experienced during the first cycle, and use the modified process in the second cycle (September 2005-March 2006).

The minutes of ExCo9 indicate the following decisions were taken:

1. ExCo agreed that the Ad-Hoc Committee's Option 2 on agreed criteria would be implemented for the second cycle (September 2005 – March 2006) through completion of the two-year pilot period.

2. ExCo expressed disappointment with the rejection of the Ad-Hoc Committee's suggestions by the Boards, but agreed that the two-year pilot phase should be completed before considering major changes to the process.

Discussion:

- Several Centers felt that the nominations received from the Membership did not meet the requested criteria and were therefore unsuitable for their Board vacancies. In some cases, Centers had requested qualified scientists to fill Board vacancies, but had received names of financial experts, even though the Board already had sufficient financial expertise.
- Board Chairs requested that due diligence be undertaken by Ad-Hoc Committee to ensure criteria of Members' nominees meet Center requirements prior to submitting candidates.
- One Center who appointed a Board Member from their original rather than taking one of the Members' nominations, had received feedback from the CG Secretariat that their choice was significantly better than had they selected one of the Member's nominees.
- One Center was informed that no one in the database matched the required profile.
- In one case, the Board decided to downsize and therefore had requested and obtained agreement from the CG Secretariat to reduce the number of CG Nominees on the restructured Board.
- AB believes both Boards and Members are still in the learning phase with the new process and expressed concern that the database was still not populated with a enough competent candidates. The database still needs to be strengthened with candidates meeting the required criteria for Board vacancies.
- One Board Chair felt that their nominations committee had not undertaken due diligence in nominating their applicant prior to review by the Ad Hoc Committee. He stressed the need for Centers to be very confident with their suggested nominees before presenting the list to the Ad Hoc Committee.
- The issue of amending the database to include more than one primary discipline was discussed, and it was agreed to raise this issue with the CG Secretariat.
- The Chair reminded Board Chairs that they only needed to follow the agreed-upon process when filling CG Nominee vacancies, and suggested that the pilot phase be completed prior to AB making suggestions on amending the system. The item will be discussed at AGM06 when the AB will be in a position to table their views on the pilot program and present recommendations to the CGIAR.

Decision:

- CBC stated their commitment to continue working with the current system for the pilot phase prior to suggestions changes to the process.

Agenda Item 7: Matters arising from SC Meeting, Penang (for Information)

The Chairman briefed the AB on the matters arising from the Science Council meeting in Panang, September 5-9, 2005. In addition to discussing and adopting the CGIAR System Priorities, the Science Council also reviewed the MTPs of various Centers and Challenge Programs.

The following items were brought to the attention of Board Chairs for information and appropriate action:

- **MTPs:** The criteria used by the Science Council to evaluate Center MTPs were not the same as the criteria used by Boards. The Science Council had been requested to work with the CDDC to standardize these evaluations. The Boards and the Science Council are urged not to give conflicting instructions to management.
- **Performance Measurement:** The results of the Performance Measurement review are now available. The Science Council will audit Center inputs. Boards are responsible for Center information and must monitor and evaluate data for accuracy.
- **EPMRs:** The role of the Boards in the EPMR process. As EPMRs will rely heavily on the results of CCERs, due diligence must be undertaken by Boards during the CCER. Centers should share best practices and experiences. The AE has developed a handbook to ensure all issues are covered prior to the start of the EPMR. The Monitoring and Evaluation scheme developed by the Science Council and adopted by ExCo puts a burden on Boards to ensure Centers are ready for their EPMRs.

Discussion:

- Centers should share experiences on EPMRs, and a regular update of the AE handbook would enable this to be done in a systematic manner. The handbook could also include a section on how to prepare for Board interaction with the EPMR panel.
- The EPMR process should now be simplified by the commissioning of CCERs, although one Center had recently felt overwhelmed by the amount of documentation resulting from an ongoing programmatic review. Members were requested to highlight the simplifications they experienced in the process to ensure the best model was adopted.
- Current processes include a greater scrutiny of Board performance, and this can be expected to increase in future EPMRs. Boards must prepare background documentation well – self-evaluation, DG evaluation, etc. Boards must also insist that governance experts on panels be prepared, have read all critical documents, and that interview have been held, etc.
- It is vital that the Chair of the EPMR with the management/governance specialist from Secretariat meet Board Members during Board Meeting in order to have the opportunity to see how Board operates in session. Board meeting should be

conducted as 'business as usual' with no restrictions. Closed sessions should also be open to EPMR panel members.

Agenda Item 7 a: Performance Measurement System

Dr. Neufville tabled the "Lessons Learned from the Pilot Year 2004: Implementation of the CGIAR Performance Measurement System," which was based on findings from the CGIAR Secretariat, the Science Council, the CGIAR Internal Audit Unit and considers feedback from Centers.

The Performance Measurement (PM) System was piloted in 2005 with data from 2004. The exercise has been a positive experience for all involved: it helped Centers to better understand their own performance; and members expressed satisfaction with increased accountability and welcomed new information on performance which also helped in their funding allocation decisions.

The CG Secretariat and the Science Council's joint assessment of the pilot experience indicate that the exercise has been useful for Members and Centers, and have agreed that refinements are necessary. An improved PM System is expected to be in place for 2005. Suggestions for refining the performance elements and specific indicators include the following:

1. Eight Performance Elements (Results Dimension and Potential to Perform Dimension)
 - Outputs
 - Outcome
 - Impact
 - Stakeholder Perception
 - Quality of Research Staff
 - Quality and Relevance of Programs
 - Institutional Health: Governance, Culture of Learning and Change, Diversity, Financial Health
2. Performance Data Collection
3. Verification of reported data

One change which impacts Board Chairs directly, is the request for the Board to submit a short statement describing the most important three actions taken by the Board in the previous year for improving the performance of the Board, and the difference these actions have made in the performance of the Board.

Unless changes to be above elements and indicators are made at AGM06, the refined Performance Indicators will be finalized for 2006 and the final indicators will be submitted to Center Boards.

Discussion:

- Members supported the Performance Measurement System, but questioned whether the changes to the indicators had been discussed by the Working Group.
- As the overall assessment of Centers and the resulting budgetary decisions by donors will be impacted by the PM System, Members were encouraged to submit their comments and questions to Mort Neufville who will follow-up with the CG Secretariat.

Decisions:

- Members to submit their comments to Mort Neufville for follow-up with the Working Group.

Agenda Item 9 Any Other Business**(a) CBC Budget****Decisions and Action Items:**

2005 Budget

- 2005 budget approved.

2006 Budget:

- Board Orientation Program: participants to contribute \$2,000 registration fee to attend the program. Remainder of costs to be divided between AB and CG Secretariat. CG Members will be invited to participate in future programs.
- Full 2006 budget to be tabled in April to contain contingency fund to cover shortfall in budget.
- Chair to receive honorarium for 20 days @ \$350 per day per annum starting in 2006, an increase of 10 days over previous years.
- Board member compensation package to be reviewed by AB Working Group on "Exploration of Models for Closer Programmatic and Structural Cooperation." Caryl Jones-Swahn to send current compensation package to Working Group.
- Alliance Board to approve the budget for the AE at the April 2006 meeting.
- Caryl Jones-Swahn to follow up with AIARC on the issue of professional indemnity insurance (page 15 of Mexico minutes).

(b) Appointment of CBC Vice-Chair

Eugene Terry nominated and unanimously selected to be the Vice Chair of AB.

(c) Date and time of next meeting

In order to coordinate with the AE, the AB agreed to hold two meetings in 2006, the first on April 26 and 27 at CIAT Headquarters, Cali, Colombia, and the other prior to AGM06.

(d) Other

Members of the Alliance Board recognized the contributions of the outgoing Chair, Uzo Mokuwunye, and extended a vote of thanks for his time and dedication to the work he had

undertaken on behalf of the CBC/AB and the System. His tireless contribution to the establishment of the Alliance ensured a successful result, and members were especially cognizant of the energy and diplomacy he brought to the table to ensure the process was undertaken in a smooth, good natured and efficient manner.

Closing Remarks

The Chair thanked the AB for their kind words and wished them well in implementing the Alliance in the coming months. He closed the meeting bidding a fond farewell to Margaret Catley-Carlson and Remo Gautschi, wishing them well in their future endeavors and hoping their paths would cross again in the not too distant future.

With a vote of thanks to the Executive Secretary, the meeting was adjourned.

Annex 1
Committee of Board Chairs (CBC)
Timed Agenda
December 3, 2005
Marrakech, Morocco

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
<i>Saturday, December 3, Palais des Congres, Room Karam 3, Marrakech</i>		
8:30	Opening Remarks and Welcome	Chair
08:45	Agenda Item 1: Review and Approval of Draft Agenda a. Formal Approval of Minutes of Penang Meeting, May 2005	Chair
09:00	Agenda Item 2: CBC Retreat – Update and Follow-Up a. Adoption of Roles and Responsibilities of CBC	Chair, Vice-Chair M. Catley-Carlson
<i>10:30 Coffee Break</i>		
10:45	Agenda Item 3: Matters arising from meeting of CBC/AE ExComs, Hyderabad	Chair Vice-Chair
11:45	Agenda Item 4: Stripe Review: Update on Review Panel and Advisory Committee	Chair Uwe Werblow
12:15	Agenda Item 5: Stripe Review continued: Meeting with Stripe Review Panel – to be continued during lunch	Chair
<i>12:30 Lunch with Stripe Review Panel</i>		
2:15	Agenda Item 6: Board Nominee Process	Chair
2:45	Agenda Item 7: Issues arising from Science Council meeting, Penang a. Role of Boards in Performance Measurement b. Role of Boards in new Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures	Chair
<i>15:15 Coffee</i>		
15:30	Special Meeting: CBC and AE with Science Council Chair and Executive Director	Chairs
16:30	Special Meeting: CBC and AE with members of the Private Sector Committee	Chairs
17:00	Agenda Item 8: Report from Chair of AE on discussions and decisions taken at Marrakech AE meeting	W. Dar, Chair, AE
17:30	Agenda Item 9: Any Other Business: a. CBC Budget b. Appointment of CBC Vice-Chair c. Other	Chair
18:00	Wrap Up of Meeting	Chair
<i>19:30 CBC Chair's Dinner (location tbc)</i>		

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
<i>Sunday, December 4</i>		
14:00-15:30	Follow-up Meeting for the CBC and AE ExComs a. AGM05 Statements from Chairs b. Preparation for AGM05 c. Next Steps and Decisions from joint CBC/AE Meeting	CBC and AE ExCom members

Annex 2

**AB/CBC WORKING GROUPS
As of January 2006**

Committee/Working Group	AB/CBC Lead Chair	Committee Members	AE Reps.
Performance Measurement	Mort Neufville	Jim Jones	Adel El-Beltagy
Compensation	Uwe Werblow		Kanayo Nwanze
Board Nominees			
Gender & Diversity	Isher Ahluwalia		Frank Rijsberman
GRPC	Tony Gregson		Emile Frison
AP & P	Jim Jones		Emile Frison
FHAO Executive Officer Search Committee	Remo Gautschi Kei Otsuka		Willie Dar Joachim Voss IFAD Rep. Meryl Williams
Group 1: CG Center Governance	Uwe Werblow	Lena Lange Eugene Terry Trond Bjorndal	
Group 2: Encouraging the development of Strategic Programmatic Collaboration	Guido Gryssels	Eugene Terry Mort Neufville Isher Ahluwalia Uwe Werblow	
Group 3: Operationalizing the Alliance	Gaston Grenier	Jim Jones Kei Otsuka Isher Ahluwalia	
Group 4: Enhancements to Board Orientation Program	Jim Godfrey	Eugene Terry Tony Gregson Brian Harvey (as of July 06)	
Conflict Resolution	Jim Godfrey	Angela Cropper Tony Gregson Brian Harvey (as of July 06)	

Annex 3

AB/CBC Decisions/Actions Table Marrakech, Morocco

*Meeting of the Center Board Chairs (CBC) of the Consultative Group on International
Agricultural Research
December 3, 2005
Marrakech, Morocco
AGM05*

<i>Agenda Item</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Decision/Action</i>	<i>Status</i>
2	CBC Retreat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB/CBC adopted recommendations as set out in Retreat document. • AB/CBC adopted recommendation to transform the CBC into the Alliance Board (AB) • Mort Neufville agreed to capture information on size and frequency of Board meetings, number of Board members, etc., which will be sent to Board Chairs. Data to be available at next meeting in April 2006. • Caryl Jones-Swahn to send analysis of composition of individual Boards to Board Chairs. • Critique on CIMMYT Board by Don Marshall to be sent to Board Chairs – Lena Lange • CG Secretariat to amend the CGIAR data base to include additional primary discipline field. 	
3	Meetings of ExComs	<p>AB/CBC adopted the Conflict Resolution Guidelines as tabled in the joint AB/AE meeting. AB to adopt following priority areas and form small working groups to study issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CG Center Governance 2. Encouraging the development of Strategic Programmatic Collaboration 3. Operationalizing the Alliance 4. Enhancements to the Board Orientation Programs 5. Conflict Resolution 	
4	Stripe Review	The Stripe Review panel will submit its report simultaneously to the AB and the Secretariat for comment. These comments, along with the Stripe Review panel report, will be submitted to ExCo 12, and verbally reported to AGM06.	
6	Board Nominee	AB stated their commitment to continue working with the current system for the pilot phase prior to	

	Process	suggesting changes to the process.	
7a	Performance Measurement	Members to submit their comments on the recently updated Performance Measurement System to Mort Neufville who will follow-up with the Working Group.	
9a	AB/CBC Budget	<p>2005 budget approved.</p> <p>2006 Budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Orientation Program: participants to contribute \$2,000 registration fee to attend the program. Remainder of costs to be divided between AB and CG Secretariat. CG Members will be invited to participate in future programs. • Full 2006 budget to be tabled in April to contain contingency fund to cover shortfall in budget. • Chair to receive honorarium for 20 days @ \$350 per day per annum starting in 2006, an increase of 10 days over previous years. • Board member compensation package to be reviewed by AB Working Group on “Exploration of Models for Closer Programmatic and Structural Cooperation.” Caryl Jones-Swahn to send current compensation package to Working Group. • Alliance Board to approve the budget for the AE at the April 2006 meeting. • Caryl Jones-Swahn to follow up with AIARC on the issue of professional indemnity insurance (page 15 of Mexico minutes). 	
9b	AB Vice-Chair	Eugene Terry selected to be Vice Chair of AB.	
9c	Date/time next meeting	April 26-27, 2006 CIAT Headquarters, Cali, Colombia	