

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

**May 4 - 6, 2005**

**WorldFish Center  
Penang, Malaysia**

*Summary Record  
of  
Proceedings*

## *Table of Contents*

Attendance .....	3
Agenda Item 1 .....	4
• Welcome .....	4
• Review and Approval of Draft Agenda .....	4
• Formal Approval of Draft Minutes from Aleppo Meeting .....	4
Agenda Item 2: Follow up from May 2004 CBC meeting and Working Groups .....	5
• Genetic Resource Policy Committee (GRPC) .....	5
• CGIAR Board Nominees .....	7
• Update on Science Council Meeting .....	7
• Board Orientation Programs .....	9
Agenda Item 3: Sub-Saharan Task Force Report.....	9
Agenda Item 4: Collective Action – Update .....	11
Agenda Item 5: CBC Stripe Review .....	13
Agenda Item 7: Reports from Centers.....	14
Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business.....	14
• CBC Budget.....	14
• Date and Time of Next Meeting.....	14
• Liability Insurance.....	15
• Search for New Center DGs.....	15
• CBC Representation on Working Groups.....	15
Agenda Item 9: Follow-Up from Joint CBC-AE Meeting.....	15
• Date and Time of Next Meeting.....	16
Agenda Item 10: Preparation for ExCo8, Berlin.....	16
Closing Remarks.....	16
ANNEX 1: Final Agenda, CBC Meeting.....	17
ANNEX 2: CBC Message to ExCo8 on SC Priorities and Strategies Paper.....	19
ANNEX 3: CBC Working Groups.....	20
ANNEX4: Centers’ response to SSA TF Report (short version), for ExCo8.....	21

## ***Attendance***

*CIAT*

*CIFOR* Angela Cropper, Board Chair

*CIMMYT* Alex McCalla, Board Chair

*CIP* Jim Godfrey, Board Chair

*ICARDA* Margaret Catley-Carlson, Board Chair

*ICRISAT* Uzo Mokwunye, Board Chair and ***CBC Chair***

*IFPRI* Isher Judge Ahluwalia, Board Chair

*IITA* Mortimer Neufville, Board Chair

*ILRI* Uwe Werblow, Board Chair

*IPGRI* Tony Gregson, Board Chair

*IRRI* Keiji Otsuka, Board Chair

*IWMI* Remo Gautschi, Board Chair

*Africa Rice Center* Gaston Grenier, Board Chair  
*WARDA* Richard Musangi, outgoing Board Chair

*World Agroforestry Center* Eugene Terry, Board Chair

*WorldFish Center* Trond Bjorndal, Board Chair

*Executive Secretary* M. Caryl Jones-Swahn

### ***Special Guests:***

David Buckle, IoD, London (May 4, 2005)

Phillip Merry, Philip Merry Consulting Group Pte Ltd, Singapore (May 6, 2005)

### **Opening Remarks and Welcome:**

Trond Bjorndal, Chair of the Board of WorldFish, welcomed all CBC members to Penang, and wished everyone an enjoyable and interesting stay.

Uzo Mokwunye, Chair of CBC, opened the meeting welcoming Trond Bjorndal, Chair of the Board of WorldFish, Tony Gregson, Chair of the Board of IPGRI, Gaston Grenier, Chair of the Board of the Africa Rice Center (WARDA), and Uwe Werblow, Chair of the Board of ILRI, to their first CBC meeting. The Chairman bid a special farewell to Richard Musangi (WARDA), who was attending his last CBC meeting, and thanked him for his contribution to the Committee. Regrets had been received from Jim Jones (CIAT) who, for health reasons, had left Penang earlier in the morning.

The Chair thanked Alex McCalla for serving as the CBC Vice-Chair for the past year, and made special reference to the work he had undertaken to create the programs for the Board Orientation Programs, and to lead the faculty over the past year. Jim Godfrey was welcomed as the new CBC Vice-Chair.

A full list of participants is included in this report.

### **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 Mexico Meeting, October 2004**

The Committee reviewed the draft minutes from the Mexico 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 Mexico from October 21-23, 2004, were approved. The final version are now posted on the CBC website.

### **Agenda Item 2: Follow-Up from October 2004 CBC Meeting and Working Groups:**

#### **(i) GRPC**

Tony Gregson presented this item, and informed the CBC that Benchaphun Sinawatra Ekasinge, former IPGRI Board Chair, had attended the GRPC meeting on behalf of CBC. Of the many issues discussed in the meeting, the most important was the finalization of the "Guiding Principles" for the development of Center policies to address the possibility of the unintentional presence of transgenes in ex-situ collections. These Principles had been developed after wide consultation with all stakeholders, especially NGOs, whose comments had been taken into consideration in the final paper.

In addition, the GRPC had requested the Centers:

- To convene a group of technical experts from within the CGIAR to assist the Centers to implement the Guidelines in the most effective and economical way;
- To coordinate the development of best practice Guidelines for crops maintained in their genebanks and have them published and widely distributed;
- To coordinate regularly update the data base on the state of the art of GMO development for the crops for which they have expertise and have them published and widely distributed;
- To establish a monitoring mechanism through which Centers report back to the GRPC on the steps taken to implement the Guidelines and to develop specific Guidelines per crop.

The Alliance Executive will be presenting the Guiding Principles to the CBC with a request that these be forwarded to the Center Boards.

With the coming into force of the International Treaty of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the FAO Commission of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) acting as the Interim Committee for the International Treaty, has created a Contact Group for the Drafting of the Standard Material Transfer Agreement and adopted its terms of reference. The CGIAR is asked to nominate one representative to this group. The first meeting of the Governing Body is due to be held in February 06.

It was noted that the CGIAR must be more proactive in terms of delivering its message about the importance of genetic resources for food and agriculture and multilateralism to the constituencies who are participating in the various meetings, and, to this end, the CGIAR through the SGRP, should develop more presentations and other means of communication. Cooperation with FAO in this endeavor is considered important.

Dr. Gregson also raised the issue of the impact of ethics on corporate governance at the Centers, and stressed the importance of all Centers having ethics committees. Specific focus should be placed on Center interactions with members of the private sector, and the ethics of CG scientists dealing with traditional knowledge. He recommended that Board Orientations programs should focus on these issues.

As a closing remark, Dr. Gregson mentioned that the Spellgard (sp?) long-term storage facility had been approved, in principle, by the Government of Norway, and that details were still to be worked out. It was felt that this was very good for the long-term conservation of genetic resources.

Dr. Gregson stressed the importance of this subject and recommended the CBC pay serious attention to these issues.

**Discussion:**

- The issue of liability insurance for Board members was raised, and it was decided to discuss this matter under “Other Business”.
- As a matter of clarification, it was mentioned that the Board Orientation program does cover the issue of risk management.

**Next Steps:**

- Further discussion on this topic to be undertaken in the joint CBC/AE meeting.

**(ii) Board Nominee Process**

The Chairman introduced this item by reminding members that after the Business Meeting held in Mexico last October, a new process was in place for the selection of CG nominees to Center Boards. The process was developed by the CBC and the Secretariat, followed by endorsement of ExCo, and was due to remain in force for 2 years, when it would be reviewed and possibly amended. The nominee process falls in two six-month periods (one starting in March and the other in September) for identifying and appointing CGIAR-nominees to Center boards using the agreed process; the first period is currently underway.

The CGIAR Secretariat has restructured its candidate database to allow CGIAR members and others to suggest candidates who could be considered for CGIAR positions, including membership in the Boards. The database would allow Board Nominating Committees to search and access the information on potential Board members. It would also allow individuals whose names are in the database to update their own CVs and other relevant information. Guidelines have been developed on the use of the database in consultation with CBC, the Science Council Secretariat, and Board Secretaries.

**Discussion:**

- Experience showed that the database was still lacking a full and complete cadre of potential candidates for Boards, and the Chair reminded members that it is the responsibility of Board Secretaries to populate the data base with names and cvs from which to choose.
- Several Boards had entered names into the database and had also used the database to come up with a list of suitable nominees. These lists had been sent to the ExCo for approval, and had either come back approved or, in some cases, additional names had been added to the slate of candidates.
- In some cases the names of candidates which had been added to the lists were not necessarily suitable Board Members. Care must be taken to vet the names put forward by ExCo.
- Concern was raised that ExCo had not been asked to approve the shortlist of candidates, and that the Secretariat has assumed this role. The Chair stated that ExCo had delegated this task to a Working Group of three members who reviewed all lists presented by Centers.

- Step 4 on the process for selecting CG nominees to Center Boards was queried. Once ExCo approves the list of candidates, and the Board indicates its preferred candidate from this list, is there any reason why ExCo would not agree to this selection?
- Some members felt that once the list has been approved by ExCo, that all candidates on the list are automatically approved and it is only if the Board wishes to add another name to the list that a ‘negotiation’ with ExCo would arise. Others believed that if Boards did not select a name which had been added by ExCo, then their preferred candidate would not be approved. Clarification on this issue should be sought.
- It was agreed that the process must be given a chance to work. Candidates who are added to the original list either from ExCo or from the new database may, in fact, add value to Boards.
- It was suggested, and then agreed, that each Board go through the complete cycle after which the system be monitored and evaluated. Boards should document their experience for synthesize into a final report at the end of the first round.

#### **Next Steps:**

- Chair to obtain further clarification on step 4 of the agreed process.
- Each Board to maintain data on the first cycle of the process in order for a report to be prepared for the next meeting of the CBC. This information will then form a basis for our report back to ExCo at the end of the pilot phase.
- Board Chairs to instruct individual Board Secretaries to populate the database.

#### **(iii) Update on Science Council**

Remo Gautschi reported on the meeting of the Science Council held at IWMI headquarters, Sri Lanka, in April 2005. The meeting focused on the Science Council’s final draft report on System Priorities which was to be discussed at ExCo8 in Berlin. It had been agreed that the system would focus on five priorities, with 23 sub-priorities. Other items on the agenda were: CIMMYT and IFPRI EPMRs; a brief session on the African Task Force report; and updates from the Science Council’s Standing Panels on Impact, Monitoring and Evaluation and Mobilizing Science. Participants at the meeting had also toured some of the areas devastated by the tsunami in Sri Lanka.

#### **Discussion:**

- Although a discussion of the priorities paper would be held at ExCo8 in Berlin, it was recognized that the system would not endorse the paper until AGM05. The CBC Chair had written to the Science Council Secretariat informing them this timetable did not leave enough time for Center discussion, and was awaiting a response.
- While Center scientists had been involved in the process, and it was recognized that the exercise had been participatory and widespread, several Boards felt that they were disconnected, and urged the SC Chair not to present the document to ExCo8 for endorsement prior to full consultation with Center Boards. The rushed

- timetable was of concern to some Center Boards, as the discussion at system meetings did not allow Boards to review the document at their meetings.
- It was recognized that the CBC needed to confirm to the Science Council their willingness and expectation to be substantive participants with respect to priorities and strategies – all Board program committees should participate fully.
  - Members also felt the paper was flawed because it did not propose any body for system overview, and insisted that this major failing be rectified in the next draft.
  - Concern was raised that the 80%-20% split of resources between upstream research on public goods and down-stream development was not realistic. Many countries are not yet in a position to take the product from a Center and move it into farmer's fields. The recommendations seemed to remove capacity development from Center mandates.
  - Members stressed that system priorities was a major item for discussion in the Board Orientation Programs.
  - The paper is a welcome first step in developing system priorities, but incomplete in part because the Boards of Centers were not involved in the process. The document must be refined to take CBC input into account.
  - The link between system and Center priorities was questioned. It was agreed that future MTPs must be based on new priorities, with Center management and scientists being part of the process.
  - The process of priority setting must be dynamic and, to have meaning, must be linked to resource allocation. This point raises the huge question of who allocates funds.

**Next Steps:**

- CBC to be represented at next Science Council meeting to be held in September at the WorldFish Center.
- Further discussion of this topic to be undertaken at the video-conference with the SC Chair in joint session with the AE.
- Board Chairs concern regarding the division of resources between upstream research on public goods and down-stream development to be conveyed to ExCo8. Margaret Catley-Carlson to draft note for discussion during CBC Retreat for onward transmission to ExCo8. This note is attached as Annex 2.

**(iv) Board Orientation Programs**

David Buckle of the Institute of Directors (IoD), London, thanked the CBC for the opportunity to meet with the full CBC. In his experience, all participants in the course are fully committed to the Centers and are interested in furthering their understanding of the role and responsibilities of Board Members. He stressed that Boards must appreciate the risks involved in running a Center, and must ensure that members have the requisite skill set to manage all situations. The success of CG Boards, and therefore the Orientation Programs, depends on whether BOTs will have an opportunity to put lessons learned into effect.

Alex McCalla gave a brief synopsis of the programs to date: during the seven sessions held over the last 12 months, 88 Board Members from all 15 Centers had participated. Five DGs had participated to date, along with one donor who participated as a program evaluator. Overall the evaluations of the program were high, and seemed to convert skeptics to supporters. Future plans included having one program a year in association with AGM.

As most of the core group of faculty had, or were planning to retire in the near future, he requested additional organizational support from CBC members. This included the request for more case studies and new information from Centers.

**Discussion:**

- Board Chairs who had participated in the programs commended the organizers and were especially grateful to the IoD for their instruction.
- Members felt that participation in the course added value to their overall experience.
- Eugene Terry agreed to join the CBC faculty for Board Orientation Programs.

**Next Steps:**

- Further discussion of this topic to be undertaken in joint session with the AE.

### **Agenda Item3: SSA Task Force**

In introducing the agenda item, the Chair recognized that many Boards have not met to discuss the near final report of the SSA Task Force which was due to be discussed at ExCo8, but requested the CBC to come together to take a joint stand on the recommendations outlined in the document. For those Chairs who did not yet have comments from their Board, he suggested they share their personal views on the proposals.

As background, Chairs were reminded that the Task Forces (TFs) hired consultants to undertake research for both groups, following the principle of “form follows function”. The consultants were to provide background information and make recommendations to the TFs. Consultants undertook a thorough study and came up with a set of proposals for programmatic alignment based on a common strategy for Africa, and developed a common program for SSA which had not been developed before. The major recommendation was on a programmatic side, which was based on the premise that a common program would be built, developed and driven by the priorities and strategies of NARS. These, in turn, would align with the priorities and strategies of Sub-Regional Organizations, and the Science Council priorities and strategies, which would then form a common program for agricultural research in Africa under the CGIAR. It was stressed, however, that not all recommendations proposed by the Consultants were accepted by the TFs.

The Chair reminded members that two papers had been submitted on behalf of the Centers: one to the Science Council Chair containing factual errors and errors in judgment, and the other to ExCo outlining the Center's initial reactions to the report.

**Discussion:**

- It was recognized it was time for the Centers to consolidate their work in order to address the problems of the poor in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). At a time when the world's focus was on Africa, and support was rising, the CBC recognized the opportunity which now existed for them to work together with partners on the continent to make a difference to the lives of poor farmers. Several Centers were ready to embark upon this process immediately, not withstanding the outcomes of the Task Force report.
- The CBC must prepare concrete response to the report, and not criticize the document as it now stands.
- It was agreed that the Task Forces had produced good work in diagnosing the problems in Sub-Saharan Africa, but concern was raised that the TFs had not followed the principle of "form follows function". Although the Chairs agreed with the content, they did not agree with the solution as outlined in the document.
- Board Chairs welcomed the concept of establishing additional groups to analyze remaining regions of the world, and suggested an analysis of two existing regional models (CAC, Afghanistan) to determine if these, with some improvement, could be used as a basis for other models to be used in other areas of the world.
- The proposal to form two regional centers in Africa might create difficulty given that they were based on geo-political alignment and not on agro-climatic groupings.
- Disagreement was voiced on the proposal for one global CGIAR – one corporate entity -- as no rationale had been presented for this major structural change. Moving to a centralized global model to focus on regional global goods did not make good sense. The report had a preconceived bias that the global entity would be made up of regional fora, ignoring the fundamental issue of global public goods. The case for structural alignment was not convincing as it did not seem possible or practical for Centers to operate under one Board.
- Concern was voiced that the report failed to recognize the ongoing efforts of the Centers to work together in an Alliance, and made no mention of the work the Alliance had undertaken to develop common MTPs for the continent. This omission propagates the sense that Centers are incapable of working together.
- Concern was raised that unless the Centers are full members of the strategic debate, a course of action could be set excluding them from the final outcome. The Centers must strategically position themselves to be the driving force of change.

- Chairs regretted the omission of fisheries, forests and water from the document – startling omissions given the importance of natural resources to the livelihoods of millions of poor people.
- A question was raised on the impact on current SSA partnership arrangements if the recommendations of the report are endorsed. Similarly, a member queried the role and responsibility of the individual Boards vis-à-vis a top-down approach to projects and programs in SSA?
- It was recognized that the emphasis is on forming alliances which add value to the system and which reduce overall costs. Alliances must be formed with African partners to move the agenda forward. The CBC goal is to be an agent of cohesion in these discussions. Centers depend upon the CBC to provide clear and proper guidance to Center management.

**Next Steps:**

- Further discussion of this topic to be undertaken in joint session with the AE.

**Agenda Item 4: Collective Action Update**

**NOTE:** Although this item was discussed several times during the meeting, for purposes of the meeting summary, the order of Agenda Items remains the same.

The Chair updated members on the work that had taken place since Mexico to prepare the draft Alliance Charter, and commended John Vercoe and Jim Jones for their hard work on behalf of the CBC. The ExComs of the CBC and AE had met in Rome in February and reviewed the first draft of the Alliance Charter, with special focus on the “Quick Wins” element of the document.

The Chair reminded members that during the Mexico meeting, the CBC supported the concept of collective action and agreed to transform itself into an Alliance Board in order to resolve conflicts between Centers when acting collectively. In light of the outcomes of the SSA TF report, he stressed the need for the CBC to support the Centers in their efforts to work together more collectively, and urged members to agree upon the governing mechanisms which would need to be created.

**Discussion:**

- There was broad agreement that the CBC strongly supports the Alliance, although it is difficult for some of the Centers to move forward and approve the Charter in its current form without clarification of the changing relationships between Centers.
- It was recognized that the role of the CBC was changing rapidly and had evolved significantly over the past 4-5 years. However, members recognized that no governance relationship currently existed between the CBC and the AE and that the CBC is not a body that can direct the AE. However, the AE is comprised of Center DGs who, in turn, are accountable to Boards, and it is therefore very important for the Board Chairs to convey to their respective

Boards that they must be vigilant about the commitments the DGs are making on behalf of the Centers – individually or collectively. While the CBC does not have standing to compel them, Board Chairs must ensure DGs have clear authority to make commitments they are making collectively.

- Several CBC members felt they were not in a position to endorse the Charter as they had not had an opportunity to discuss this with their Boards or their Directors General. Concern was voiced as to the powers which would need to be given over from the individual Boards to the Alliance. It was recognized that the CBC must proceed cautiously to ensure entire Boards are comfortable with the decision to enter into formal collective agreement.
- One Center Board had requested their Chair to obtain clarity on the long term responsibilities of the Alliance Board. This Board also felt that it was not necessary to establish an Alliance Board in order for Centers to act collectively – this should be happening as a matter of course, and would lead to long-term success.
- The legal implications of collective action must be thoroughly reviewed and researched, and Center Boards must understand the ramifications for the decisions of DGs to act in the context of an Alliance. The DGs act as managers for the Centers and are accountable and responsible to the Boards who must, in turn, develop broad mechanisms for governance and fiduciary responsibility.
- Should the CBC decide not to endorse the Alliance, it would handicap the potential for collective action which, given the report of the SSA TF, would be perceived as stalling the effort of Centers to move forward.
- As CBC's agreement to form an Alliance Board for the purpose of conflict resolution had been communicated and approved by Center Boards, members were now wondering what had happened to require the CBC to move more quickly to endorse an Alliance Charter. Although the DGs were enthusiastic and urged the CBC to move ahead, there was danger in moving too quickly.
- It was recognized that although the DGs were taking the initiative to create an entity to work together, the legal obligations of individual Centers was not yet clear. A Board decision is required in order to commit a Center to another legal entity – and this decision has not yet been taken by any Board. Prior to authorizing Centers to work together legally, the Boards must approve.
- The governance issues surrounding collective action are very similar to those issues raised by the Challenge Programs. Prior to endorsing the Charter, all aspects of governance must be fully understood and appreciated.
- Rather than a formal charter, a first step would be the development of a concept paper which explores the nature of collective action, the forms of expression, the boundaries and limitations, etc., to set out more clearly and definitively the scope and options of collective action prior to exploring the governance and legal implications associated with this relationship. This would be a good working paper for joint discussion with the Alliance Executive and the CBC in order for them to agree on all parameters of the Alliance. From there a Charter can be developed.

- Board Chairs must request their DGs to present their ideas on the Charter to their individual Center Boards at the earliest possible occasion so as to undertake a full discussion and obtain full Board support for the Charter.
- CBC reiterated their support for collective action for the benefit of stakeholders, and their commitment to making it work. The mechanisms required to make this happen are still up for debate. The existing draft of the Alliance Charter is seen as a work in progress.

**Next Steps:**

- Further discussion of this topic to be undertaken in joint session with the AE, where it must be pointed out that, although in full agreement with collective action, the CBC will not endorse the draft Charter until ambiguities are clarified.
- CBC representatives on the Charter drafting committee to prepare a brief history of the process to date for discussion by the CBC.

**Agenda Item 5: CBC Stripe Review**

The Chair updated members on the status of the Stripe Review of Corporate Governance of CGIAR Centers. He reminded members that the CBC had agreed to commission an external stripe review during their meeting at CIMMYT and, since then, had had an opportunity to comment on and approve the Terms of Reference which had been drawn up in cooperation with the Secretariat.

The CBC Executive Committee had worked closely with the Secretariat during this period and, in addition to the TORS for the review, they had also prepared a list of nominees for the 3-member review team, and a suggested budget for the Review, which was estimated at \$200,000. The Secretariat would pay 50% of this amount, which would include providing support services for the team.

The Chair informed members that the Review Team would be led by Samuel Paul, Founder Chairman of the Public Affairs Center in Bangalore, India. Paul Egger had also agreed to serve on the team, and one other member would be selected in the near future.

**Discussion:**

- Very important to undertake this review in the best manner possible. Results of the review must be used to improve the effectiveness of the Boards.
- Most members felt the cost of the review was too high.
- Concern was raised with the modality of the review as presently designed, and it was recommended that the ExCom investigate other possible ways to undertake the review in a more cost-effective manner. Alternative methodologies must be studied to ensure the cost-effective use of resources.
- Although it was important to undertake the review in the near future, it was also necessary to ensure the review is done in the most effective manner with the most efficient use of resources.

- A suggestion was made that rather than have the Review Panel attend just two or three Board meetings to obtain information, it would be more efficient for the Panel to visit the next CBC meeting and meet with all Board Chairs, as well as DGs, to obtain input into the review report.
- It was also suggested that the CBC should perhaps employ a professional organization to carry out the reviews, with the Review Panel overseeing the work of the professional organization. Centers would be asked to provide the professional organization with information in advance of their interviews thereby minimizing the time Board Chairs and DGs would have to wait for their interviews.
- It was vital for the Review Panel to understand that good board governance must be judged by board impact and the way in which boards are fulfilling their roles, as well as by the management of financial resources and the number of times they meet per year.

**Next Steps:**

- Alex McCalla volunteered to represent the CBC on the “Advisory Group” for the Review Panel. In the meantime, he agreed to work with colleagues to come up with modifications to the process. A note updating CBC members on the status of the Review is to be circulated shortly.

**Action Item:** Alex to circulate note.

**Agenda Item 7: Reports from Centers.**

In future, it was agreed Centers would submit their progress reports in writing prior to the meeting for posting on the CBC web site. Only burning issues, which were not covered elsewhere in the agenda, would be discussed under this agenda item.

**Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business**

**(i) CBC Budget**

With a few points of clarification, and noting that the cost of the CBC Stripe Review was deemed too high, the budget was approved. The revised CBC budget for 2005 is posted on the restricted CBC website.

**(ii) Date and Time of Next Meeting**

With the new schedule in place for the Annual Meetings, and taking the ExCo schedule into account, the Chairman informed members that there was a need to plan the dates of the committee meetings in order to provide documentation in time for ExCo distribution. A suggestion had been made to shift the dates of the two annual CBC and AE meetings to Spring (February/March) and Fall (September), respectively. The Chair stressed the importance of meeting together with the AE and said that one meeting a year needed to fit into the ExCo process in order to ensure the Centers had a strong voice at ExCo.

**Discussion:**

- Shifting the dates of the CBC meeting, would mean in effect that the Committee would be meeting three times per year (Spring, Fall and during AGM). As Board Chairs are obligated to attend AGM, concern was raised about the cost and time of holding an additional meeting.
- After a lengthy discussion of options, it was agreed that the CBC should meet twice a year, both in separate session and joint session with the AE. The meetings should be held in September and during AGM in December. The CBC ExCom could participate in an additional meeting to be held between December and September if it was deemed necessary.
- The CBC agreed to meet in separate session and in joint session with the AE prior to AGM05 in Marrakech, Morocco.

**Proposal:**

**“CBC will meet prior to AGM and in joint session with the AE at least 1 month prior to the ExCo meeting in October. If there is a need to meet between AGM and September, the ExCom of the CBC will participate in that meeting.”**

**Next Steps:**

- Further discussion of this topic to be undertaken in joint session with the AE.

**(iii) Liability Insurance**

The question was raised as to whether Board members have, or are required to have, professional indemnity insurance. Several Centers provide this insurance for their Board members, while others do not. As the cost of this insurance is very high, members wondered whether it would be possible for all Centers to obtain coverage under a blanket policy. It was agreed to ask AIARC to look into this matter and to provide an opinion to the CBC at or before the next meeting.

**Action Item:** AIARC to review the issue of professional indemnity insurance and report back to the CBC.

**(iv) Search for new Center DGs**

Two Board Chairs have commenced a search for new DGs, and enlisted the support of the CBC to identify suitable candidates for these important positions. Search Committees will be created for both vacancies and Board Chairs could expect to receive requests from both.

**(v) CBC representation on Working Groups**

An updated list of Working Groups and CBC representatives is attached as Annex 3.

**Agenda Item 9: Follow-Up from Joint CBC/AE Meeting**

**(i) Date and Time of Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the CBC will meet for 2 days prior to AGM05, December 1-2, 2005. The AE will meet for three days, November 30 – December 2, 2005.

## **Agenda Item 10: Preparation for ExCo8, Berlin**

At the end of the meeting, the Committees revised the statement to be presented to ExCo8. The CBC Chair felt it also important to discuss how the Alliance would be structured, to address some of the issues raised in the joint session. He also stressed the importance of moving forward and not spending too much time on the obstacles along with way. The draft statement was to be prepared prior to ExCo8 and approved virtually by the two groups. The final document as presented to ExCo8 is attached as Annex 3.

### **Closing Remarks**

The Chair thanked the CBC for the interesting and challenging session, and looked forward to continuing the important discussions in the CBC Retreat.

He closed the meeting bidding a fond farewell to Richard Musangi, former WARDA Board Chair, wishing him well in his future endeavors and hoping their paths would cross in the not too distant future.

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

## ANNEX 1

*Meeting of the Committee of Center Board Chairs (CBC)  
Agenda  
May 4-6, 2005  
WorldFish*

Time	Agenda Item	Director(s) or Person(s) Responsible
<b><i>Wednesday, May 4 (Meeting in WorldFish Board Room)</i></b>		
9:00	Opening Remarks and Welcome	Chair, T. Bjorndal
09:10	Agenda Item 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and Approval of Draft Agenda</li> <li>• Formal Approval of Minutes of Mexico Meeting, October 2004</li> </ul>	Chair
09:20	Agenda Item 2: Follow-Up from October 04 CBC meeting and working groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRPC</li> <li>• Board Nominee process</li> </ul>	Chair
09:40	Agenda Item 3. SSA Task Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of Task Force report</li> </ul>	Chair
<b><i>10:30 Coffee Break</i></b>		
11:00	Agenda Item 3: SSA Task Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of Task Force report (continued)</li> </ul>	
<b><i>12:30 Lunch (Block J, Tilapia Room)</i></b>		
13:30	Agenda Item 4: Collective Action - Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBC/AE ExCom Report: CGIAR Changes, Opportunities and Challenges for the Future Harvest Centers. Reactions from various Boards.</li> </ul>	Chair Godfrey
<b><i>15:30 Coffee Break</i></b>		
16:00	Agenda Item 5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBC Stripe Review</li> </ul>	
16:15	Agenda Item 6. Discussion and preparation for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Videoconference meeting with Ian/Johnson Francisco Reifschneider</li> <li>• Joint Meeting with Alliance Executive (CDC)</li> <li>• Videoconference meeting with SC</li> <li>• Audio conference meeting with SSA-TF Co-Chairs</li> </ul>	Chair
17:00	Agenda Item 7: Reports from Centers (5 minutes each)	Chairs
17:45	Wrap-up of the Day	
<b><i>17:50 Depart WorldFish for CBC Dinner hosted by CBC Chair, Restaurant Siriwan</i></b>		

Time	Agenda Item	Director(s) or Person(s) Responsible
<b>Thursday, May 5</b>		
09:00	Agenda Item 7: Reports from Centers (continued) and discussion	Chair
10:00	Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBC Budget</li> <li>• Date and Time of Next Meeting</li> <li>• Liability Insurance</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	Chair
10:10	Continuation of SSA Task Force Report (if required)	
<b>10:30 Coffee Break (followed by joint meeting in Chambo/ Makumba Room)</b>		
<b>Joint Meeting of CBC and Alliance Executive (AE) Please see separate agenda</b>		
<b>Friday, May 6 (CBC meeting cont.)</b>		
<b>Joint Meeting of CBC and Alliance Executive (AE) continues.....</b>		
<b>10:30 Coffee Break (Committees resume separate meetings for rest of day)</b>		
11:00	Agenda Item 9: Follow-up from Joint CBC-CDC meeting	Chair
12:00	Agenda Item 10: Preparation for ExCo Meeting, Berlin	Chair
<b>12:30 Lunch (Block J, Tilapia Room)</b>		
14:00	CBC Tour of WorldFish facilities	
<b>15:30 Coffee Break</b>		
16:00	Wrap-up of Meeting	Chair
17:00	Special Session: AE ExCom (possible joint CBC/AE ExComs)	
<b>19:30 Dinner WorldFish night at Pearl Island Restaurant</b>		

**Thursday, 23 February 2006**

**CGIAR  
CBC Message to ExCo Berlin Meeting  
Response to the SC Priorities and Strategies Document.**

Chairs of the Alliance of Future Harvest Centers of the CGIAR, meeting in Penang in May 2005 have carefully analyzed the statement of Science Council on Priorities and Strategies for the CGIAR system. The Board Chairs warmly welcome this contribution, but have an overriding concern which we believe to be sufficiently serious to warrant our drawing the attention and consideration of the wider system to this matter.

Within the categorization and description of system priorities, we strongly question the relatively low importance accorded to capacity building, product delivery and knowledge dissemination vis a vis that accorded to research and technology generation. We find that this is not consistent with either the highest goal of the system to alleviate poverty, and lead to wealth creation and improvements in living standard. We question the consistency of this approach with the primary importance we accord in being able to respond to the real and actual needs of NARS (the cornerstone of our system), and the constant pressure from all parts of the System – in particular from the Science Council - to evaluate Center performance based on impact. Capacity building and knowledge dissemination complete our research mission. In many areas of the world there are no other entities which will take on the transmission of IPGs to those who can use them. The pressure which would be put on Centers by the proposed 80/20 system which leaves a substantial part of these activities outside the 80% would drive the system away from these important goals.

The system must give serious consideration on how the Priorities and Strategies paper will actually be interpreted.

As the CBC has only just met, we request circulation of this paper to the ExCo and onward transmission to the Annual General Meeting in Morocco.

## ANNEX 3

### CBC WORKING GROUPS As of JUNE 2005

<b>Committee/Working Group</b>	<b>CBC Lead Chair</b>	<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>AE Reps.</b>
Performance Measurement	Mort Neufville	Jim Jones	Adel El-Beltagy
Board Orientation Program	Alex McCalla	Uzo Mokwunye Jim Godfrey	Meryl Williams
Compensation	Uwe Werblow		Kanayo Nwanze
Board Nominees			
Gender & Diversity	Isher Ahluwalia		Frank Rijsberman
GRPC	Tony Gregson		Emile Frison
Challenge Programs	Remo Gautschi	Eugene Terry	Masa Iwanaga Adel El-Beltagy
Alliance Charter	Jim Jones	John Vercoe	Emile Frison Meryl Williams
Contracting & Conflict Resolution	Jim Godfrey Angela Cropper		Joachim Voss Kanayo Nwanze Meryl Williams
FHAO Executive Officer Search Committee	Remo Gautschi Kei Otsuka		Willie Dar Joachim Voss IFAD Rep. Meryl Williams

**Alliance of Future Harvest Centers' of the CGIAR  
Response to the Sub-Saharan Africa Task Force Report**

*Short Version  
Executive Committee Meeting in Berlin*

The Alliance agrees that the issues that were raised in the report relating to coordination and effectiveness of the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the recommendations made in the report, deserve serious consideration.

The Report was discussed at the meetings of the CBC and AE in Penang last week and the view we present represent a consolidated and consensus response.

**Addressing the Problem Areas**

The Alliance believes that the problem analysis contained in the SSA Task Force report offers the CGIAR system a good basis on which to move forward. The Alliance agrees with the diagnosis of the issues raised by the report with regard to the Centers' research priorities, programs, and modes of operation in SSA. These included:

- Insufficient connections between the priorities of the NARS and those of the Centers
- Weak mechanisms for effective and constructive interaction among Centers
- Competition among Centers and duplication of efforts, and
- Lack of a cohesive strategy for CGIAR work in SSA.

**Moving toward a better future for Sub-Saharan Africa**

**The Alliance declares that it will move forward with urgency and together with our partners and stakeholders to implement the following five fundamental changes in its operations globally and in Sub-Saharan Africa.**

**1: Need for global CGIAR vision and strategy**

**The Alliance urges the CGIAR Members and other parts of the System to immediately move to develop a global vision and strategy for the CGIAR, and from it derive a vision and strategy for sub-Saharan Africa.**

The Alliance believes that the CGIAR needs such a vision and strategy to guide its contributions, future actions, and decisions over the next 10-20 years. This vision and strategy will assist all stakeholders in their investment decisions, and will help all of the CGIAR elements, including the Centers, to change effectively and adjust to the evolving terrain and challenges that confront the system. This requires that the strategy identify the

synergies between the global research priorities established by the SC and the demands for regional public goods originating from African institutions.

The challenge to develop such a vision and strategy is not as daunting as it might appear as many ingredients already exist from useful sources. The exercise will provide a firm foundation to put in place a process to improve the structural alignment of the Centers' work at the global and regional levels.

To demonstrate its willingness to reform, the Alliance wishes to inform the CGIAR that during the past year it has made rapid and substantive progress at the system level to create mechanisms to effectively govern all aspects of collective action.

- The Center Directors-General have constituted themselves as the Alliance Executive.
- The Center Board Chairs have been developing the basis for constituting themselves as an Alliance Board to govern the Centers' collective action in an effective and responsible manner.
- An Alliance Charter has been drafted, covering all important aspects of Alliance governance through vigorous decision-making procedures, a set of guiding principles for collective action, and enforcement modalities.

## **2: Formal consultation with partners and all Centers**

**The Alliance will implement formal and regular multi-center priority setting consultation exercises with all relevant Sub-Saharan African partners.**

The CGIAR recognizes that in order to be effective it needs to complement and add value to the programs of African institutions. Thus the Alliance will coordinate its future programs in this context. The multi-center programs of the Alliance in SSA will emanate from regular planned consultations among all Alliance members and the relevant priority setting organizations, including the sub regional organizations, the national agricultural, forestry, and fisheries research organizations, with linkages to universities, civil society organizations, professional associations and governmental and inter-governmental bodies.

## **3: Create sub regional MTPs with partners**

**The Alliance will create cross-centre sub regional Medium-Term Plans to integrate and streamline the research activities of the centers in line with the new CGIAR system-wide priorities and the priorities of our SSA stakeholders.**

To open up the System and to engage a wide variety of partners, the Alliance has initiated action to create two Medium-Term Plan (MTP) documents that encompass all center activities in SSA. One MTP is being created for eastern and southern Africa, and another MTP is being formulated for western and central Africa. These documents will include a section dealing with cross-cutting continental issues. The regional MTPs will initially be based on an inventory of the existing activities being implemented, and will be geared

toward adjustments that address the priorities of our SSA stakeholders. The regional MTPs will be submitted to the Science Council for review on an annual basis.

Although some may view these MTPs as a ‘soft option’, let us assure you that they are not – never before has such a move been contemplated in the CGIAR, on such a scale. The MTPs will be the platform for streamlining the entire portfolio of all Center work in SSA in relation to the new system priorities and the identified needs of stakeholders in SSA.

#### **4: Alliance will be responsible for Centers’ part of MTPs**

**The Alliance will develop a mechanism to oversee the MTP implementation process, and will appoint a director to be charged with the implementation of the above undertakings in 2006.**

The MTPs will have ‘teeth’. Through the Alliance, the Centers fully commit themselves to fulfill their programmatic obligations under these integrated regional MTPs. A director will be appointed to coordinate the plans. The Alliance Board will have oversight responsibility of the Centers’ commitments in the plans and will enforce compliance of this commitment by all Centers.

The MTP oversight mechanism will include our partners in SSA and will coordinate closely with the Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program, CAADP and other Africa-led initiatives. Costs will be minimized by having the director supported by one of the centers located in the region.

The Alliance expects that the oversight mechanism, and the director charged with implementation, will operate under either one of two institutional options for implementation: A consortium model or a joint-venture model. The choice of model will draw upon the considerable experience to date with these models for effective collective action.

The Alliance observes that consolidation of Centers’ headquarters in Africa is not the fundamental solution. Rather, it is the integration of all the centers’ MTPs that is really at the heart of the matter. In order to ensure progress toward these objectives the Alliance Board will periodically review the structural issues that the Alliance faces in SSA, with a view toward further changes and adjustments, including the development of clusters of centers and/or consolidations.

#### **5<sup>th</sup>, Regional hubs for research support**

**The Alliance will move expeditiously to integrate research support and corporate services in the ESA and WCA regions, working toward the concept of regional hubs to provide both integration and cost-sharing in research services.**

Intercenter working groups will be established in ESA and WCA immediately, and will be mandated to provide, by early 2006, plans for integrating services across the centers working in each region.

Lastly, the Alliance supports the idea that the CGIAR commission other task forces to identify programmatic and structural alignment needs and opportunities globally and in the other regions. It urges that this work be done with recognition that the great diversity of conditions among the regions suggests that it is unlikely that one – size – fits –all solutions for all regions will be optimal.

#### **Short Version of the SSA-TF Responses from the Centers**

- 1: Need for global CGIAR vision and strategy**
- 2: Regular consultation with partners and all Centers**
- 3: Create sub-regional MTPs with partners**
- 4: Alliance will be responsible for Centers' part of MTPs**
- 5: Regional hubs for research support**