

**Meeting of the
Center Directors Committee (CDC)
of the Consultative Group on
International Agricultural Research**

May 5-7, 2004

**ICARDA
Aleppo, Syria**

*Summary Record
of
Proceedings*

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Attendance	3
Executive Summary	4
CDC Meeting: Opening Remarks	9
Agenda Item 1. Review of Meeting Summary Nairobi AGM03 and Next Steps.....	10
Agenda Item 2. Updates from the CDC Sub-Committees and Task Forces.	10
Agenda Item 3. Future Harvest Alliance Office.	12
Agenda Item 4. Future Harvest Update.	17
Agenda Item 5. Programmatic and Global Organizational Alignments for the CGIAR	20
Update on Regional and Country Office Survey and Results.....	23
Agenda Item 6. Implementation of CPs and Lessons Learned.....	24
Agenda Item 7. Private Sector Partnerships.....	25
Agenda Item 8. Discussion of CDDC Update on SW/EPs, WGPM and SP-IPM.....	26
Agenda Item 8b. Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU).....	27
Agenda Item 9. Discussion and Feedback on CDC Collaboration Site.....	28
Agenda Item 10. CDC Meeting with Per Pinstrup-Andersen, SC Chair.....	30
Agenda Item 11. Preparation for Meeting with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider.	32
Wrap-Up and Future Meetings.....	32
Annex 1: CDC Meeting with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider .Error! Bookmark not defined.	

Attendance

<i>CIAT</i>	Joachim Voss, Director General
<i>CIFOR</i>	David Kaimowitz, Director General
<i>CIMMYT</i>	Masa Iwanaga, Director General
<i>CIP</i>	Hubert Zandstra, Director General
<i>ICARDA</i>	Adel El-Beltagy, Director General
<i>ICRISAT</i>	William Dar, Director General
<i>IFPRI</i>	Joachim von Braun, Director General
<i>ILRI</i>	Carlos Seré, Director General
<i>IRRI</i>	Ronald Cantrell, Director General
<i>IWMI</i>	Frank Rijsberman, Director General
<i>Africa Rice Center WARDA</i>	Kanayo Nwanze, Director General, <i>CDC Chair</i>
<i>World Agroforestry Center</i>	Dennis Garrity, Director General
<i>WorldFish Center</i>	Stephen Hall, Director General
<i>FHAO</i>	Meryl Williams, Executive Officer Kerri Wright Platais, CDC Executive Secretary

Special Guests

Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Science Council Chair
Ian Johnson, CGIAR Chairman
Francisco Reifschneider, CGIAR Director

Executive Summary

The CDC met at ICARDA for two days to discuss significant topics and begin preparing for a new way of conducting CDC's business, including collective strategic planning for the Centers. The following provides a brief summary of the highlights from this meeting, including agreed upon next steps:

With respect to the important UN ***Millennium Development Goals***, the CDC took measures to respond in a more collective fashion, by taking the following decisions:

- The CDC supported the WorldAgroforestry Center's decision to host the Technical Support Center for the MDGs, as proposed by Jeff Sachs, and said that this would be a good tool for both WorldAgroforestry and the CGIAR Centers. Dennis Garrity would serve on the oversight Group of Four, and would keep the CDC informed of the program's activities.
- Under the direction of Joachim Voss, the MDG Task Force would work to streamline the participation of the Centers. The CDC Collaboration site would be used as the vehicle for a shared inventory and storage of information from the Centers. (The production of a brochure with the Marketing Group could be one possible product from the shared efforts).
- The Alliance Office would work to identify the previous surveys submitted to Pedro Sanchez two years ago, and provide these for Joachim Voss and Dennis Garrity as the basis for developing a coordinated response to what the Centers could do with additional funding for international agriculture research.

The CDC established the following ***priorities for the newly installed Executive Officer of the Future Harvest Alliance Office***:

- The first priority should be to ensure that the CDC operates more effectively and this would be the focus of work in the first year. The Executive Officer would lay the ground work for CDC on key strategic issues, such as the programmatic and structural alignment exercise.
- The CDC decided not to give priority to the line management of the System Office units in the work of the Executive Officer in the first year, although this was listed in the ToR of the position. Some members of CDC felt that the EO would add little value to the work of the units, although the majority recognized that the units currently experienced at times inadequate management oversight, due to the lack of time of the DGs managing them. The CDC would therefore not make any changes this year to the steering committees, advisory boards, etc overseeing each unit.
- The EO and ES would finalize a consolidated FHAO 2004 workplan with CDC Chair before the end of May.
- EO to develop a FHAO 2005 draft workplan for discussion and approval at AGM04 CDC meeting. This plan would include the development of an Alliance Office strategic plan for the following four years.

Where CDC funding and support were concerned, the *Future Harvest Foundation and its future*, and the arrangements for the newly transferred trademark to IFPRI were discussed in detail. Decisions and next steps included:

- The CDC deferred the decision whether to request the FHF Board to dissolve the Foundation until AGM04, in order to have additional time to explore and confirm what legal or reputational issues were at stake.
- In the meantime, the FHF Board would provide the CDC with the following:
 - Willie Dar, as FHF Board Chair, would be responsible for retrieving the 22K UK pounds currently under the keeping of the former FHF (UK) employee, and return the money to the CDC accounts.
 - The Board would continue its oversight of the 2003 FHF Tax Returns, as per agreement with AIARC.
 - The FHF Board Chair would report back to the CDC (via email consultations) regarding the nature of the outstanding liability with USAID for the US\$ 120K grant on the report on disasters, allocated through the WB. Joachim von Braun made it clear that IFPRI would not take on the name and brand, if there were any liabilities existed, particularly with a major donor.
- Joachim von Braun agreed to draft agreements between IFPRI and each Center for the use of the trademark and names, and would consult his attorneys to receive clarification on U.S. registration issues. (Note: Following the meetings, the Chair of the FHF Board, Willie Dar, confirmed that the legally registered name was Future Harvest, not the Future Harvest Foundation).
- With regards to public awareness and the media, Fionna Douglas of the CGIAR Secretariat would be given the media list to keep updated on behalf of the Centers.
- Due to the fact that maintenance of the FHF website was not cost-neutral, the CDC asked that a study be conducted by the FHAO Executive Officer, to determine whether to streamline or merge the existing site with another. This discussion would take place through virtual communications prior to AGM04.
- In addition, the CDC asked the FHAO to look into the history of the brand name and provide additional information to the Centers to help finalize the steps forward, by the time of the AGM04 meetings. Reference was also made to the Ambassadors program, with the CDC to finalize their decision on this activity as well in October.

The CDC spent time focusing on their plan of *action and response to the Programmatic and Organizational Alignments currently underway in the CGIAR*. With respect to the two Task Forces for SSA, the CDC Chair commissioned a working group, Chaired by Dennis Garrity and made up of representatives from several of the Centers to work closely with the Task Forces and provide Center input to the study. The CDC Chair said that the Centers needed to take a look at the common services as well as programmatic areas. It was agreed that it was time for the Centers to take the initiative. Plans were formulated to meet together in a July retreat for the CDC and partners in this initiative.

CDC decisions and next steps included:

- CDC should revisit organizational models for collective action.

- The initially proposed two CDC working groups would be combined into one working group, chaired by Dennis Garrity.
- The SSA Working Group would develop a ToR for its work that would provide a framework, including how forestry, fisheries, livestock, water and policy would be included.
- The CDC would revisit organization models for improving collective action through:
 - A June/July weekend (non-obligatory) retreat to address 1) the overarching issue of the framework for the Future Harvest Centers Alliance, 2) the Centers inputs into the CGIAR Programmatic and Structural Alignment exercise for SSA, and finally 3) develop a communication plan for the outcomes of the retreat.
 - The CDC working group would provide inputs on their work to the SSA exercise, including input from the CIMMYT/IRRI alliance process.
 - The FHAO would provide a substantial background paper/material two weeks prior to the summer retreat, working closely with the CDC working group.
 - The CGIAR Task Forces (TF-1 and TF-2) and Science Council would be consulted before the retreat and informed of its outcomes.
 - CBC representatives would be invited to attend.
 - An action plan and calendar of events for this exercise would be provided.
- The CDC ExCom would manage the design of the July retreat and arrange for logistics and dates immediately following the ICARDA meetings.

Following on work begun in 2003, the CDC reviewed further progress made on the ***Regional and Country Office Survey and Results***, which included an update on Post-Graduate Training at the Centers (with collaborating institutional data) from 1977-2002.

- The CDC thanked Adel El-Beltagy and the staff of ICARDA for their continued work in finalizing the Location of Centers Offices, throughout the world, and for updating the Post-Graduate Training at the CG Centers during the period of 1977-2002.
- The CDC members would check the figures and work with their staff to ensure items were factual and up-to-date, before releasing the study for posting on the CDC Collaboration site.
- The CDC suggested that, once finalized, a well developed narrative be included with the data and suggested that various audiences be considered, prior to its release. The FHAO would work (possibly in concert with the Marketing Group) to see that this information remain updated, and serve as the basis for useful public relations and educational material for the Centers.

The topic of the emerging role of the Private Sector and the potential for partnerships was discussed. Following preliminary discussion, the CDC decided they could better address during their October meetings. However, the following was decided:

- During the meeting a proposal was submitted by the EO for an additional activity involving resource mobilization in alliance with the private sector. The

recommendation made was that this would not be considered a top priority at this time, but to go slowly and share experiences on the FHAO corner of the Collaboration site.

- In addition, the CDC Chair suggested that members from the Private Sector Committee join the CDC for a discussion during the AGM04 meetings, to explore further work together.

Discussion of SW/EPs, Performance Indicators, and the SP-IPM program was also on the agenda, particularly in light of keeping the SW/EPs strong, well supported and working well for the Centers and their partners.

- The CDC appreciated the documents provided by the CDDC, and agreed they would form the basis for the Centers suggestions for performance indicators to be submitted to the CGIAR Working Group on Performance Measurement. The CDC also endorsed the CDDC preliminary proposal to develop generic and specific performance indicators for the SW/ER Programs, with some discussion towards continued modifications.
- The CDC agreed that it was in the best interest of the CGIAR that system-wide programs work effectively. If a problem was identified with host institutions, then it was for the good of the program and its' scientists that it be moved to where the program would receive the most institutional support.
- The CDC endorsed the recommendation (i.e. the rotation of the SP-IPM Convening Center) from the Steering Committee of the SP-IPM and would inform the Chair of the SP-IPM.
- Following discussions with the Chair and Director of the CGIAR, the CDC also agreed to request the CDDC to proceed with its proposal build on the performance indicators for the SW/ER programs and undertake indicator-based self reporting, evaluation of SW/ER reports and recommendations for allocation of new strategic funding.
- In addition, the CDC suggested that a list of existing SW/ERs be compiled by the FHAO in order to better follow where such programs were hosted, the names of the coordinators, etc, and post this information on the CDC Collaboration site.

Noting the tremendous progress that “e-learning” was making worldwide, and in follow-up to October discussions for the further development of the *Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU)*, the CDC agreed to move forward, but carefully and with proper oversight.

- The CDC endorsed the document and the approach presented on the next steps for the GO-AFU.
- A CDC support group was formed consisting of Carlos Seré, Willie Dar, Joachim Voss and Adel El-Beltagy to assist Joachim von Braun as the project moved forward.

Keeping with the desire to find new approaches to improving their collective work and streamline operations for the CDC, the CDC agreed to open the *CDC Collaboration Site, which would serve as a place for both private and limited access CDC discussions, posting of shared documents and information, and the CDC Archives.*

- The CDC congratulated the ES on the design and development of the site and recognized the great potential for such a site in facilitating the work of CDC and maintaining its ‘institutional memory’.
- The CDC approved the Collaboration site, and asked that it be opened to the larger CDC Community of users and contributors, designated by each Center DG.
- The ES and EO, with continued technical advice from CGNet personnel, would continue to develop the site to include a library of documents for the CDC Archives, and provide a place for current discussions and documents of importance to the work of the CDC.

The CDC was delighted to engage in discussion for the first time with the new Science Council (SC) Chair, Per Pinstrup-Andersen and covered several important topics regarding the structure, organization and priority setting for the new SC.

- The CDC would give high priority to responses to SC preliminary program priorities when made available. In addition to program priority setting, the other CDC recommended priorities for SC (in order) were:
 - A definitive job on the programmatic Performance Indicators
 - Capacity building and training work
 - Research design for the Challenge Programs and lessons from the implementation phase of the present CPs
 - Impact culture and research on impact
 - How to address the program areas that are now currently given marginal priority in the System, such as forestry, fisheries and water.
- The CDC Chair reiterated the commitment of the CDC to work together with the Science Council, and said that the FHAO, and particularly the Executive Officer would help in the formulation of these responses and in strengthening their work together.
- CDC and CBC representatives would be invited to attend the May CGIAR Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Task Force meetings to be held in Rome, Italy, as observers.
- Any future papers developed by the CDC would be shared with the Task Forces.

The CDC was also privileged to have both the CGIAR Chairman, Ian Johnson and the Director, Francisco Reifschneider, present at ICARDA to discuss a wide range of topics, including the financial outlook for FY05, new possibilities for improved CGIAR/WB linkages, a new fellowship program initiated by the Japanese government for short-term training of Japanese scientists, a CGIAR leadership course planned for the end of 2004, and an update on the GO-AFU in addition to other items. (Details are contained in Annex 1)

CDC Meeting: Opening Remarks

The Chairman of the Center Directors Committee (CDC), Kanayo Nwanze, opened the meeting welcoming Stephen Hall as the new Director General of WorldFish, and Meryl Williams, re-joining the Future Harvest Centers in her new capacity as the first Executive Officer of the Future Harvest Alliance Office (FHAO).

Since January he said that the CDC had managed collectively to finalize two important activities started the year prior, under the leadership of Adel El-Beltagy, involving the submission of the World Bank requested performance indicators, and the hiring of the Executive Officer. In addition, a MOU with NEPAD had been signed, several members of the CDC had participated in the ESSD Rural Week activities held in early March at the World Bank, and the CDC had worked collectively to respond to the drafting of the CGIAR Charter. He also thanked Joachim von Braun, who, on the CDC's request had accepted the Future Harvest trademark to be held on behalf of the Centers at IFPRI. The Chair noted that other projects, such as the launching of the CDC Collaboration site, and plans for AGM04 and Centers and Members Day were well underway.

The CDC Chair thanked members who had given of their time for work on collective projects since the CDC last met in Nairobi. This included Adel El-Beltagy who chaired the search committee for the Executive Officer (along with committee members Joachim von Braun, Carlos Seré, Frank Rijsberman and the CDC Chair); Masa Iwanaga, as Chair of the Oversight Committee for the G&D External Review; Frank Rijsberman, Carlos Seré and Joachim von Braun for their work in seeing through the ICT-KM Program Investment Plan (approved in February); Meryl Williams for working "off the clock" in her new capacity with issues needing the CDC's attention concerning FHF, as well as her work with Emile Frison on Phase II of the Global Public Goods Initiative; and Carlos Seré as the new Chair of AIARC.

The CDC Chair said that several important issues were on the agenda and included: how to work with the private sector; how to work with the Secretariat to improve funding for the Centers and improve the Centers' relationship with the Secretariat; the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) including the CDC's collective response; and finally, the Regional and Global Organizational Alignments for the CGIAR and the need for the CDC to take proactive measures.

Adel El-Beltagy also welcomed the CDC to ICARDA and said that he was delighted the meetings were able to take place. On behalf of the ICARDA staff, representing 44 nationalities, he welcomed the group to Aleppo, and said that they would do everything in their power to make the meeting a successful and memorable one.

The issue of attendance at CDC meetings was brought up, and the Chair reiterated the decision taken by the CDC during their February retreat in 2003, when the CDC decided that members could send an alternate to the meetings, in the case of an emergency, and with clearance from the CDC Chair. In the case of the current meeting, the Chair said that the reason for not attending on the part of one member was not considered an emergency, and said that he hoped the member would be able to make it for part of the meeting. Members were in

agreement, and said that they wanted to follow guidelines established but did not want to see decisions taken that might appear to be ad-hoc in nature. The Chair said that he would discuss this with the CBC Chair, in order to obtain their advice and counsel. (Note for the record: The CDC was in favor of the IITA representative attending the joint CBC/CDC meeting initially, but this was later decided against after consultation with the CBC Chair).

The Chair also noted that the inclusion of the CDC Code of Conduct in the meeting binders was a means of helping the CDC to remember and reflect upon past procedural decisions taken and agreed upon by the Committee.

Agenda Item 1. Review of Meeting Summary Nairobi AGM03 and Next Steps.

The draft Summary Record of Proceedings from the CDC Meeting held October 24-26, 2003 in Nairobi, Kenya was approved on a no-objection basis, and the agenda adopted. The Chair asked that the Committee briefly review the Next Steps document coinciding with both the previous meeting and the current agenda, in order to ensure that all items were correctly recorded and up-to-date.

The former Chair of PARC, Willie Dar, noted for the record that the remaining money from PARC had been transferred to the CDC accounts, following the October decision to close PARC. Another member suggested that the idea of pursuing an international scientific symposium be taken off the future portfolio of the CDC. This was agreed to by all.

Agenda Item 2. Updates from the CDC Sub-Committees and Task Forces.

The CDC Chair said that he had not requested specific updates from the regions at this point in time, but welcomed any that were available from the Sub-Com Chairs. Adel El-Beltagy submitted a progress report from the Central Asia and Caucasus (CAC) involving a consortium of ten Centers and eight NARS from the region. The next meeting of the Steering Committee would be in Baku, Azerbaijan, 6-8 of June, 2004.

Millennium Development Goals Task Force. An update from Joachim Voss (Chair) and Dennis Garrity featured as the main information item, covering plans and a discussion regarding how to best proceed with a collective response. A CDC Task Force was formed following AGM03 and the CDC's meeting with Pedro Sanchez and Jeffrey Sachs.

Dennis Garrity reported that WorldAgroforestry had been approached by Jeff Sachs recently to help develop and host a Support Center for the MDG goals. The concept behind the Technical Support Center would be to develop the means and mechanisms for support of the MDGs and their implementation. He said that a small core team of 10-12 professionals from various U.N. agencies would work across all the task forces based at WorldAgroforestry. The core team would support the UN country teams and national endeavors. A budget of US\$ 2 million was proposed for the work. In their proposal to WorldAgroforestry, the U.N. said that there would be a Group of Four responsible for the oversight of this activity which would include the Millennium Project director, the head of UNDP (Mark Malloch Brown), the DG for UNIDO, and the WorldAgroforestry DG.

He said that the time frame involved an 18 month project with six major outputs that would include: 1) MDG assessment, 2) Long-term plans, 3) Short-term plans, 4) Increased government capacity, 5) Clear guidelines for MDG planning and, 6) The production of MDG materials to increase awareness. The initial work would focus on six pilot countries: The Dominican Republic, Cambodia, Tajikistan, Ethiopia, Ghana and Senegal.

Dennis mentioned that the Centers put together ideas for submission two years ago as to what could be done if the CGIAR would receive US\$ 1 billion for research. He said that he would like to update and resubmit these proposals to Jeff Sachs, with an outline for the final concept note.

Joachim Voss said that Center DGs currently participated in three of the ten task forces, Water, Hunger and the Environment. At this point he said it was important to determine if these were the three where the work of the Centers was best represented, or should the Centers also engage in others, such as Health and Education. He recommended that the Centers remain focused where they were currently represented. He asked for instruction from the group to better utilize the MDGs Task Force, so that it could work as an information clearing house to assist in collaborative efforts.

Discussion.

CDC members were in general agreement that it was to the Centers' advantage to have representation on the MDG Task Forces, and that there was a need for a coordinated effort.

One DG reminded the group that there were methodological issues involved as well, which were raised during the Nairobi discussions with Jeff and Pedro. He said concrete suggestions were needed that reflected experiences based on the ecoregional research and work of the Centers. Another DG said the CDC should streamline its efforts and supported the idea of WorldAgroforestry hosting the initiative to institutionalize the MDG work, emphasizing that proper linkages and integration were key to the success of the effort.

Still other CDC members voiced some degree of caution, emphasizing that it was important to make a distinction between the MDGs and the Task Forces, and to remain engaged in the process, without being subsumed. One DG stressed that an 18 month time frame was not sufficient to map out a strategy for the MDGs, nor a major reorientation of the eight goals. He said it was important that the Centers offered their services as serious academicians or peer reviewers, while remaining at "arms length". He agreed, however, that it was important to influence the debate and supported the participation of WorldAgroforestry.

Joachim Voss, the co-chair of the MDG TF said that in the end, the Centers' would be judged by what they produced. He said that several Centers have looked individually at what they produced and how their work could more closely align with the MDGs. Several Centers' strategic plans had taken this approach. He said it was time to look at this from a system-wide perspective. He suggested that the CGIAR website be used so that each Center could list its MDG-aligned activities, in order to begin an inventory and base from which to build. (It was

later decided that the CDC Collaboration site would be a good place to hold this discussion and collection of Center information). He said that he would like to see something developed similar to the approach used for INRM.

The suggestion was made to produce a brochure, spearheaded by the work of the Marketing Group, to help in the dissemination of information and as a tool to share the MDG-focused work of the Centers.

Before ending the discussion, a DG stressed the importance of determining how the Centers would contribute to the work of other countries (beyond the six pilot projects listed) on the MDGs. One DG registered his dissent with regards to answering an approach to using US\$ 1 billion dollars, and said that this topic needed further serious consideration and should be examined in greater detail before formulating a response.

Next Steps (MDGs).

- The CDC supported WorldAgroforestry's decision to host the Technical Support Center for the MDGs, as proposed by Jeff Sachs, and said that this would be a good tool for both the Center and the other Future Harvest Centers. Dennis Garrity would serve on the oversight Group of Four, and would keep the CDC informed of program activities.
- Under the direction of Joachim Voss, the MDG Task Force would work to streamline the participation of the Centers. The CDC Collaboration site would be used as the vehicle for a shared inventory and storage of information from the Centers. (The production of a brochure with the Marketing Group could be one possible product from the shared efforts).
- The Alliance Office would work to identify the previous surveys submitted to Pedro Sanchez two years ago, and provide these for Joachim Voss and Dennis Garrity as the basis for developing a coordinated response to what the Centers could do with additional funding for international agriculture research.

Agenda Item 3. Future Harvest Alliance Office.

The CDC Chair said that this meeting would be the first opportunity for the CDC to operationalize the Alliance Office, an important concept that had been anticipated for some time. He thanked Meryl Williams for the document provided for the discussion, and reminded the CDC that it was important to also take into account the written summaries from the System Office Unit Heads, which were included in the binders, and prepared for this meeting, in lieu of personal presentations.

Meryl Williams (EO) thanked the CDC and Chair, and agreed that this was the time to organize and address together the challenges before the CDC. She reported that together with the CDC and the Executive Secretary, the formation of the FHAO had begun. She had only commenced duties on 1 May. The position, as noted in the TOR, would report to the CDC Chair and provide four critical areas of assistance: 1) Establishment of the office, 2) Support

for the CDC, 3) Work with the SO Units and 4) Potential future projects for the Executive Officer.

With regards to the first topic, Meryl said that it was her desire to take a gradual approach in defining the office, in order to make it a smooth and easy transition for everyone involved. She said she planned to provide weekly updates for the CDC Chair of ongoing projects and the work of the Alliance Office.

The topic of support for the CDC was of critical importance, and would be approached by developing a rolling agenda to better support and advance the key topics needing the attention of the Committee. One suggestion would be to help the CDC by preparing an improved set of agenda materials on which to base their discussions, in order to help make quantum leaps during meetings, and in between meeting times as well. She would also provide support for the CDC Chair at ExCo, realizing that some of this work would also blend with the CBC's work. The work of the FHAO in supporting the CBC work would require further discussion.

The topic of support for the SO Units was also discussed. She said the intention was not to create another layer of management, but to help improve the capacity of the units in working together. She said that an improved oversight role also was important, to help assist the CDC in their vision of potential new units and planning for the existing SO Units.

The special projects listed was an area for longer-term thinking, and one she suggested would be accomplished by looking into management of the central support units of well-known PVOs such as WWF, Oxfam and CARE, to see how they developed their collective actions and outreach styles, acknowledging that there were differences between these organizations and the FHAO, she considered valuable as the FHAO developed. She also referred to a private sector resource mobilization consultancy project included as an annex in the prepared paper, as an example of what could be envisioned in the future.

Discussion.

The CDC members began the discussion by congratulating Meryl on her willingness to take on this position, and expressed their pleasure that she would help define what they saw as a very important addition to the work of the CDC. Several questions were presented to the EO, in terms of how she saw her role developing vis-à-vis the collective role of the Centers, and how she would balance the many demands that could be placed on the EO, particularly as it was a new job, still undergoing growth and a clear definition of responsibilities.

One DG said that he did not see line management of SO units as a top priority for the EO, stating that clearly some SO Units responded to the CDC and others did not. Therefore, a "one size fits all" approach would not apply. Another Committee member asked how the EO saw her role developing in terms of fund raising for the System, and mentioned in particular earlier discussions that had alluded to this position being combined with the Executive Director of the FHF, and asked if this was still under consideration. Still other DGs expressed concern

that the role was too large a job for a part-time person, and supported the suggestion that the line management of SO Units would not be considered an immediate priority.

Other comments focused on the annual work plan for the EO and asked if it was structured in a way that clearly showed necessary vs. desirable areas of work. A DG said that he would expect the largest benefit of this position to focus on the CDC and what was needed to improve their collective work in support of the public goods function. Questions were also raised as to how working arrangements would be carried out and how much time would be spent on donor or stakeholder work. With this in mind, the suggestion was made the CDC should approve the workplan and provide input to the EO on an annual basis, in addition to oversight by the CDC Chair.

Another DG said that the SO and the evolutionary thoughts behind the FH Alliance came about as an attempt to define the Centers' future and put the CDC in a position of greater influence, in a time when the Secretariat was seen as ineffective in this regard. However, he acknowledged that times had changed and suggested it might be necessary to go back to the origins of this position, to clarify what was needed.

Before asking the EO to respond, the Chair reminded the group that the TOR for this position was developed months prior and agreed to by the entire CDC.

The EO responded to the questions raised (with respect to oversight of the SO units) and agreed that some units required more day to day oversight and interaction than others. When this position was originally discussed she reminded the group, an oversight component was mentioned as a means of providing more day to day guidance than sometimes busy DGs were able to provide. The position also arose partly in response to the plethora of such units that now existed and which, through mid level specialist officers, were partly reporting to the CG Secretariat. She agreed that any reporting changes would need to be handled carefully and did not want to add another layer to the overall existing structure.

She said that she did not envision the Executive Officer would represent the CDC publicly, as it needed to be clear that this was not another DG position that had been created. Similarly, she did not envision that the EO would perform the resource mobilization and communication work for the CDC, but could help by overseeing a consultancy, when deemed appropriate by the CDC. She noted that improved public communication through liaison with the Marketing Group was different and would require influence through interaction with the Marketing Group, in order to provide the CDC with stronger collective communication capacity.

The EO acknowledged the concerns raised that the role would be too large, and agreed that the line management issue should be viewed in the context of adding value to the work of the CDC and its members. With regard to travel, she did not see the job as needing too much travel beyond two CDC meetings a year and two ExCo meetings, unless specifically requested. She said that she would work from home and saw this job as a two to four year program for her personally, keeping in mind that the issue of future location and legal identity for the FHAO would need to be considered sooner rather than later as it is critical in the development of the

next phase of the Alliance Office. She welcomed the idea of having the CDC approve the FHAO workplan on an annual basis.

Other DGs noted the changing circumstances for the CGIAR, the merging of Centers and Boards and said that there was a greater need than ever to harmonize the efforts of the Centers in light of increased centralization in years to come. One DG said that the TOR was well thought out, but now needed to be translated into action.

The CDC Chair agreed that the workplan of the FHAO would be vetted by the CDC during its meetings and added that in the weeks following the meeting, the EO would take into consideration the discussions during this meeting and work to prioritize her workplan. He reiterated that the EO would add value to how the CDC operates, and agreed that it was an ambitious undertaking but one that would begin in a part-time capacity.

Other issues raised by DGs with regards to the responsibilities of the EO included the role and oversight of the Marketing Group and the merging role of the Science Council. One DG stressed the need for a stronger listening capacity on the part of the CDC, to enable more rapid response as warranted.

The EO responded that this meeting would provide the appropriate information to determine how these issues would evolve together and what was required. The CDC Chair agreed and said that the CDC needed additional help in taking time from busy schedules and responsibilities of running Centers to provide strategic thinking to critical issues. In the past this has been done by the CDC, assisted by the Executive Secretary, but needed to go to another level now, in order to accomplish the tasks at hand.

SO Units, Marketing Group and AIARC. The group then reviewed the submissions by the SO Unit Leaders and Marketing Group, to discuss any collective action required. Updates and short summaries were provided by the following programs; CAS, ICT-KM, G&D, the Marketing Group. The Gender and Diversity Program external review would be finalized during the joint meeting with the CBC/CDC (see separate minutes) and a verbal and written summary of the recent AIARC Board meeting was also provided by AIARC Chair, Carlos Seré.

With regards to the role of the FHAO, the Marketing Group had listed specific questions they asked be answered by the CDC. After further discussion, the CDC decided upon the following:

- The request by the MG to hold their meetings the week of September 13th in Washington, D.C. was denied, based on additional costs that would be incurred by the Centers, and the desire of the CDC to see MG meetings held in conjunction with AGM. All other business of the MG should be accomplished virtually, and through electronic discussions.
- With regards to governance, the CDC said that all reporting and line-management would stay the same for now, due to the fact that they did not want to overload the FHAO Executive Officer with additional responsibilities.

However, this and other issues surrounding the FHF and governance for the MG would be revisited over the course of the next several months, and during AGM04.

- For purposes of the MG, they would continue to report to the CDC Chair, with the advisory committee of three DGs still in place (Willie Dar, Dennis Garrity and Emile Frison), as established during CDC meetings during AGM03.

AIARC. Carlos Seré said that the major issues highlighted during the recent AIARC Board meeting focused primarily on the structural changes to the System, as a result of Centers closings and mergers, and what this might mean for insurance plans and AIARC.

He said that the major issues included; employees who did not qualify for continued coverage under insurance due to inability to acquire coverage elsewhere due to pre-existing conditions, age or other disqualifiers; former employees who remained on the Plan who were no longer subsidized by their former employer (becoming a cost to the remaining Centers); purchasing power and economies of scale reduced due to the decline in the number of overall employees; and fee revenue to AIARC reduced, thereby requiring the costs to be covered by fewer Centers.

Other information included a plan for AIARC to study the feasibility of a split in the plan for U.S. and international components, to enhance cost containment in the U.S. and provide conversion privileges to terminating employees. AIARC reported that the multi-national insurance pooling plan to cover NRS staff and include HIV-AIDS was completed, and that AIARC would continue to work with Centers to see where coverage was feasible and beneficial. Risk insurance for the year 2003 ended in a surplus, with US\$ 611 K returned and applied to plan reserves, to further reduce premiums next year. A pension survey would also be conducted, to determine interest in adding other investment alternatives to the portfolio. In addition, an annual external audit of the pension Plan was conducted and a clean opinion was issued.

Discussion.

The CDC discussion focused on whether the transition of ISNAR employees to IFPRI was indeed cost-neutral and from other Centers' perspectives, what these changes would mean. Some DGs noted that the Centers should be careful in their contractual arrangements, particularly as it appeared that Americans would be getting lower benefits if they held the same contracts as other international hires. One DG mentioned that he would like to see more choices given to the consumers, something along the lines of a sliding scale, whereby you pay for more options and receive increased choices.

Carlos responded that the issue of determining the "cut-off points" for retiree benefits was the major point of contention, as not all Centers had established clear boundaries. He said Centers must also adjust their contract entitlement statements to employees, so that all were operating under the similar policies as a CGIAR System. Basically, older employees were more expensive to maintain in the System, and the burden would increase as more long-term employees retired. He anticipated that in ten years time, the CGIAR would have 300 retirees.

One DG said that it was also a point in principle and one that the CDC had debated for some time. He said other institutions such as FAO were encountering similar situations, and added that the Centers must remain consistent in their decisions.

The CDC clarified that the issue of merging was not a perceived problem, but rather a problem of a shrinking pool of participants paying into the plans. One DG emphasized the real issue was that of the Centers and their sizes, rather than the closing and merging of Centers.

The CDC Chair thanked Carlos Seré for his update, and for the good work of the AIARC staff. The ongoing studies and work program was noted, with the desire to have full cooperation from HR staff from the various Centers.

The CDC Chair in closing reminded the group that the following decisions had been taken:

- The first priority for the Executive Officer would be to ensure that the CDC operated more effectively. This would be reflected in the workplan of the EO for 2004.
- Line management oversight of the System Office units and the Marketing Group would not be done by the EO in the first instance, but the ToR of the EO position would not be changed at this stage.

Next Steps (FHAO).

- EO and ES to finalize a consolidated FHAO 2004 workplan with CDC Chair before the end of May.
- EO to develop a FHAO 2005 draft workplan for discussion and approval at the AGM04 CDC meeting. The plan would include the development of an Alliance Office Strategic Plan for the next four years.

Agenda Item 4. Future Harvest Update.

The Executive Officer, at the request of the CDC Chair, provided an update surrounding the issues for the current freeze and possible closure of the Future Harvest Foundation. She said that at the time of the freeze (during the AGM03 CDC Meeting), the CDC recognized that it was not fully aware of the outstanding liabilities of the Foundation. The CDC therefore agreed to put US\$ 225K aside in order to help finalize costs, and finish out contracts of the Executive Director for FHF and her assistant. The ED left in mid-November and Jason Wettstein continued on a part-time contract until leaving FHF in March, when office remaining equipment and materials were sent to AIARC for safe keeping.

In the meantime, Maria Guerrero, Executive Director of AIARC, was asked by the CDC ExCom to appraise the financial situation of FHF and provided the CDC Chair with a follow-up report for this meeting, which included legal advice received. Due to FHF's tax free status in the United States, the CDC was advised that the Foundation could only remain

dormant for two years, before losing its exemption status, and would still need to file tax returns, even in a dormant state.

The EO said that several options were now before the CDC. The CDC could decide to recommend to the FHF Board that FHF be either dissolved or kept inactive and secondly, decisions were needed as to which of the previous FHF activities should continue or be restarted under the Alliance Office. The issue of the trademark and logo for FHF had now been resolved, with IFPRI holding it in trust for the other Centers. However, the CDC must now decide if individual Center agreements or a collective agreement should be signed with IFPRI.

Finally, the EO reported that several other issues had come to light over the past few months that required action. These included a grant for US\$120K given to the Foundation from USAID through the World Bank, for which a final report had not been delivered, and money left in the U.K. (22K U.K. pounds) that belonged to Future Harvest, but was now held by a former employee. The issue of what to do with the Ambassadors program of the FHF also needed CDC consideration.

Discussion.

During the discussion that followed, the CDC decided that several issues needed further investigation and clarification before the CDC could take a vote on how best to proceed. Several DGs stressed the importance for the need to clarify the separation between the FHF and FH as a registered trademark. It was noted that the CDC could not dissolve the FHF, as its Board would have to take this measure. Therefore, it was decided that the CDC would make a final decision regarding its recommendation to the FHF Board during its October meetings at AGM04. In the meantime, the Board Chair said that no further money would be invested, and the Board and others would be responsible for providing further information to the CDC on or before pre-AGM meetings. (see Next Steps below)

Regarding decisions to be taken on public awareness and the media, Fionna Douglas of the CGIAR Secretariat brought to CDC's attention that the media list assembled by FHF was a very good one, and asked whether the CDC would like the Secretariat to keep this current. The CDC decided in favor of this.

Further discussion took place with regards to the FHF website and questions were raised as to whether a separate website from the CGIAR website should continue to exist, and if so, who would be responsible for its care and upkeep? Some DGs suggested that the Marketing Group would be a likely place to house the FHF website and maintain it. Others felt it needed one person for oversight, but were concerned due to past experiences whether it would best to link the FHF site to that of the Secretariat's, with specific concerns mentioned over what control the World Bank might have (with reference made to past as well as potential concerns over clearance procedures for what is placed on the site.)

Due to the fact that maintenance of the FHF website was not cost-neutral, the CDC suggested that a study be conducted by the FHO Executive Officer, to determine whether to

streamline or merge the existing site with another, and if so, which one. Therefore, the EO would undertake an assessment or study to determine how to optimize the existing website and advise the CDC how to best streamline this activity. This discussion would take place through virtual communications prior to AGM04.

Finally, some discussion was given to the history of the decision taken by some and not all Centers to 'brand' themselves as the Future Harvest Centers, and the fact that the varying degrees of affiliation sent mixed signals to the donors and others within the System. Given that the trademark was now held by IFPRI, several DGs suggested that this issue also be revisited and that the CDC then decide clearly how best to proceed. One DG suggested that a brand plan was needed, and acknowledged this would require additional work. The CDC decided to ask the FHAO to look into the history of the brand name and provide additional information to the Centers to help finalize the way forward, by the time of the AGM04 meetings.

Next Steps (FHF).

- The CDC deferred the decision whether to request the FHF Board to dissolve the Foundation until AGM04, in order to have additional time to explore and confirm what legal or reputational issues were at stake.
- In the meantime, the FHF Board would provide the CDC with the following:
 - Willie Dar, as FHF Board Chair, would be responsible for retrieving the 22K UK pounds currently under the keeping of the former FHF employee, and return the money to the CDC accounts.
 - The Board would continue its oversight of the 2003 FHF Tax Returns, as per agreement with AIARC.
 - The FHF Board Chair would report back to the CDC (via email consultations) regarding the nature of the outstanding liability with USAID for the US\$ 120K grant on the report on disasters, allocated through the WB. Joachim von Braun made it clear that IFPRI would not take on the name and brand, if there were any liabilities attached.
- Joachim von Braun agreed to draft agreements between IFPRI and each Center for the use of the trademark and names, and would consult his attorneys to receive clarification on U.S. registration issues. (Note: Following the meetings the Chair of the FHF Board, Willie Dar, confirmed that the legally registered name was Future Harvest, not the Future Harvest Foundation).
- With regards to public awareness and the media, Fionna Douglas of the CGIAR Secretariat would be given the media list to keep updated on behalf of the Centers.
- Due to the fact that maintenance of the FHF website was not cost-neutral, the CDC asked that a study be conducted by the FHAO Executive Officer, to determine whether to streamline or merge the existing site with another. This discussion would take place through virtual communications prior to AGM04.
- In addition, the CDC asked the FHAO to look into the history of the brand name and provide additional information to the Centers to help finalize the steps forward, by the

time of the AGM04 meetings. Reference was also made to the Ambassadors Program, with the CDC to finalize their decision on this activity as well in October.

Agenda Item 5. Programmatic and Global Organizational Alignments for the CGIAR .

The CDC Chair said that this discussion would be based on a document released by the Chair to the CDC in mid-April, and focused on the theme of *The CGIAR in Africa: Consolidate, Integrate or Disintegrate?* Initially, at his suggestion, two working groups were established to provide response and feedback to the CGIAR Task Forces, established during AGM03, commissioned to look at the Programmatic and Organizational and Structural alignment in Africa, but with global implications.

The CDC agreed that the Future Harvest Centers response to this exercise and the Centers collective engagement in the CGIAR programmatic and structural alignment review was an issue of critical importance requiring attention and collective action. To this end, the two CDC-Chair proposed working groups were formed.

During the course of this meeting, the decision was taken to merge the two working groups into one. The composition would include: Dennis Garrity (Chair), Hubert Zandstra, Hartmann, Emile Frison, Joachim Voss, Bruce Scott (ILRI), Dyno Keatinge (ICRISAT), Doug Merrey (IWMI) and Shellemiah Keya (Africa Rice Center/WARDA).

The following represents a summary of the discussion and key points, along with the Next Steps, established prior to the completion of the meeting:

Discussion.

As Chair for the working group, Dennis Garrity said that time was of the essence and saw this activity among the Centers as a positive step towards contributing in a pro-active manner to the changes before them. He said it was important to begin at the System level and consider once again the various models of organizational alignment. With regard to Africa, he said it was important to go beyond an inventory to include a coherent narrative that would address the CGIAR's research and overall vision for Africa. He suggested that a product of this nature would be tremendously helpful and would provide a way for the System's critics to understand better the work of the Centers. Secondly, he said it was important to develop a clear articulation of the structure of the Centers in Africa. He mentioned two levels that needed further attention: coordination and better communication with FARA, and secondly, operationally working through and in support of the regional organizations. In order to do this and become more effective, a collective and pro-active effort was needed.

While in support of further pursuing the model referred to as the "Federation Model" developed during a retreat of the CDC and CBC in 2000, several DGs said it was important to first look at the problems the Centers faced, prior to determining the solutions required. One of the more difficult issues, on DG suggested, was what the world now considers important for Africa, no longer fit easily into the commodities theme. Another issue raised was the need to

find and retain good staff. The fact that increasingly staff had lost some of the academic and intellectual freedom available to them in years past, had created a void for many Centers, and as one DG said, he did not want more “academic bureaucrats, but innovative thinkers”. Other DGs agreed and said it was important to foster environments in the Centers to empower people and create open avenues for strategic thinking.

One DG said that because the Centers were in the business of producing public goods, long-term planning was required, but emphasized that the current funding system did not allow the Centers to work together, often fostering the competition and problems they had experienced in the past. Some DGs expressed caution with regard to opening up an old debate, but agreed that collective action was needed that would include binding mechanisms beyond simple “good will” to allow the group to stick to decisions taken. At the same time, the Centers must learn to be nimble and attractive, so as not to be seen as a relic of days gone by. They wanted the Centers to be attractive places to work for scientists interested in taking on big challenges.

The CDC Chair suggested that the group look at some misperceptions others had of the System as a good starting place. Carlos Seré had a compiled a list of issues that he offered as the starting point, and others were then added. The list included:

- Accountability. Each Center was managed by a Board, made up of individuals. Important to clarify “who calls the shots and what are the priorities.”
- Global agenda. What are the issues on the agenda currently, and was it time to move away from the commodity approach?
- High cost. Perceived by others outside of the System (and within) as too expensive.
- High transaction costs. Too many meetings.
- Dispersed agenda. Perceived as having too many issues on the agenda, need greater focus.
- Internal competition. Problem of having to compete between Centers, and the perception that they are returning to the same donors, wasting energies and time.
- Capacity to reform. Seen by some as something that had been tried, but not successfully.
- National partners. Lack of ability to work effectively (perceived).
- Value added in working as a System. What was the value added, and was it enough to keep Centers from spinning off to “go it alone”.
- Regional Organizations. Perception that the Centers do not work well with regional and sub-regional organizations.
- Private Sector Partnerships. Mentioned as an issue needing future attention by the Centers.

Meryl Williams was asked to provide the historical context of the idea behind the Center’s proposed move toward a Federation model, initiated during a retreat of the CDC and CBC in 2000. She said that this idea emerged in part as the CDC and CBC’s response to the follow-up from the System Review and a 1999 Strategic Paper produced by TAC that outlined seven planks within the System, and suggested that the Centers would be split by regional

lines. It was in this climate that the idea to pursue other models for organization came under discussion.

She said that the Federation plan was very comprehensive and interpreted by some as threatening, in terms of what powers would be given to the central federal unit vs. the powers retained by the individual units (Centers). For a variety of different reasons (a few due to a misunderstanding of what the Centers were attempting via the new model), the concept was voted down by the CGIAR during what was then called International Center's Week (ICW) in 2000, despite being supported by a majority of donor members in the Synthesis Group. However, in response, the CGIAR took control and formed the Change Design and Management Team (CDMT), which ultimately formulated the Reform program currently in place for the CGIAR and developed the four pillars of change: Challenge Programs, System Office, a new Science Council, and doing away with the Mid-Term Meeting to meet as a group once a year.

The CDC then discussed what could be done differently if the Centers were to choose to re-organize themselves in the future, and what would motivate them to pursue a renewed or modified organizational model. The CDC Chair suggested that all aspects of organizational alignments be considered in a combined sense, thereby including Challenge Programs as well, for purposes of a more complete and holistic discussion and approach.

A DG suggested that the political economy of organizational change was important, and would be found by allowing the Centers to reduce their transaction costs through improved service functions. Another DG suggested the atmosphere was also different from four years prior, when the Centers responded more on the defensive, as opposed to a different frame of mind now, allowing them to reconsider their own modes of operation. The suggestion was made to pursue ideas along the lines of the federation model, even going so far as to have a federal Board, or a simplified approach to Centers organization and governance. Still other DGs said that change would come through the Center's choosing to organize themselves differently, perhaps along different themes (vs. commodities).

Some DGs suggested that the Centers focus first on "mission creep" and how it was affecting their work, and in this light decide what model would best take the Centers forward. Still others returned to the role of the new Science Council, and said that it was equally important that the Centers know if the SC will be involved in the allocation of funding. The suggestion was made that the CDC needed a mechanisms by which to look systematically in the formulation of strategic vision. If such a plan or concept were to exist, the Centers would be in a place to bring strategic ideas to the table.

The CDC was in agreement that if they did not structure these changes internally, they would someday be forced upon them. Therefore, time was considered of the essence and DGs mentioned a concrete proposal should be prepared before the October meetings, whereby the Centers would have a plan of how to move forward and how to engage. The ideas expressed involved finding a mechanism by which to work together on strategic themes, so as to address donor concerns regarding finances (and by cutting costs) and addressing communication strategies to improve joint efforts.

In summary, the CDC Chair said that the Centers needed to take a look at the common services as well as programmatic areas. It was agreed that it was time for the Centers to take the initiative, before they found themselves in a difficult situation.

CDC Decisions:

- CDC Should revisit organizational models for collective action.
- The proposed two CDC working groups addressing programmatic and structural organizational alignment for SSA would be combined into one working group, chaired by Dennis Garrity.

Next Steps.

- The SSA Working Group would develop a ToR for its work that would provide a framework, including how forestry, fisheries, livestock, water and policy would be included.
- The CDC would revisit organization models for improving collective action through:
 - A June/July weekend (non-obligatory) retreat to address 1) the overarching issue of the framework for the Future Harvest Centers Alliance, 2) the Centers inputs into the CGIAR Programmatic and Structural Alignment exercise for SSA, and finally 3) develop a communication plan for the outcomes of the retreat.
 - The CDC working group would provide inputs on their work to the SSA exercise, including input from the CIMMYT/IRRI alliance process.
 - The FHAO would provide a substantial background paper/material two weeks prior to the summer retreat, working closely with the CDC working group.
 - The CGIAR Task Forces (TF-1 and TF-2) and Science Council would be consulted before the workshop and informed of its outcomes.
 - CBC representatives would be invited to attend.
 - An action plan and calendar of events for this exercise would be provided.
- The CDC ExCom would manage the design of the July retreat and arrange for logistics and dates immediately following the ICARDA meetings.

Update on Regional and Country Office Survey and Results.

The CDC Chair thanked Adel El-Beltagy and the staff of ICARDA for continuing to update the information presented and discussed during the Nairobi meetings, and compiled into a new format. He asked that the CDC members review the documents in the binder that summarized national and regional offices, as well as post-graduate training from 1977-2002.

Adel El-Beltagy suggested that this information, once reviewed and finalized be posted on the Collaboration site, and be made accessible to others within the CGIAR, including the donor community. Meryl Williams said that this valuable information would need to remain updated and suggested that once finalized, the FHAO could consider ways in which to disperse the information beyond the CDC site.

Some discussion was given to the material presented to the Committee, for purpose of clarification and correction of information in order to help finalize the documents. Some DGs suggested that once finalized, it would be important to provide a good narrative with the information, as to what the data represented and why it had been compiled, to avoid any misinterpretation. They added that this information would provide helpful information for the System's Alignment exercise, if produced and released with the right audience in mind.

Next Steps.

- The CDC thanked Adel El-Beltagy and the staff of ICARDA for their continued work in finalizing the Location of Centers Offices, throughout the world, and for the updating the Post-Graduate Training at the CG Centers during the period of 1977-2002.
- The CDC members would check the figures and work with their staff to ensure items were factual and up-to-date, before releasing the study for posting on the CDC Collaboration site.
- The CDC suggested that, once finalized, a well developed narrative be included with the data and suggested that various audiences be considered, prior to its release. The FHAO would work (possibly in concert with the Marketing Group) to see that this information remain updated, and serve as the basis for useful public relations and educational material for the Centers.

Agenda Item 6. Implementation of CPs and Lessons Learned.

As mentioned earlier, the CDC Chair suggested that much of this topic be folded into the previous discussion, in order to address the larger picture and enter into strategic planning for the CDC. In addition, Masa Iwanaga offered a few aspects of lessons learned, from the perspective of a host Center.

He said that his views were based on the experiences as one of the lead Centers for a CP, as well as a Center who participated in all the CPs currently underway. Noting that the CPs were one of the four pillars for the CG reform process there were many positive aspects, but wanted to highlight some of the areas that he stressed should be handled carefully by the System in the future. He added that many of these lessons also applied to other Systemwide Programs (SW/EPs).

The fiduciary responsibilities of the host Center topped his list of concerns. In the case of CIMMYT, he said the Board had held several discussions regarding its responsibility concerning financial issues, intellectual property management and product liability. They have also worked to address what would be the role of the CIMMYT Board vis-à-vis the CP for Genetic Resources Program Steering Committee.

Another issue was the size of the Program Steering Committee. Currently the CP hosted by CIMMYT had 16 members, and was at times a large number to manage. He said that what was unique about the CPs was the mode of operation (more participatory in focus) as

opposed to the technical content. There was also an element of “Cross CP learning” that presented itself, as there were several experiences and ideas that the CPs could share such as resource mobilization, IP management and the overall communication strategy.

The issue of competitive grants was also mentioned, and thought to be theoretically a good scheme for involving wider participation in a more transparent manner. However, Masa said that it also involved larger transaction costs, for example, scientists spent large amounts of time preparing proposals with a rather limited chance of acceptance in the end. In addition, he said that most of the funding was diverted from other sources such as unrestricted core. The grant from the Gates Foundation used to mobilize the Harvest Plus CP being the exception.

Finally, he expressed concern that the Genetic Resources CP ultimately faced the problem of social acceptance, in terms of biotechnology and the negative funding consequences that follow a controversial area of research. He noted that some donors lump biotechnology, genomics and transgenics with Monsanto, monopolies and bad science, thus translating into programs that no longer needed assistance. He said that in the future the CGIAR would need to address how to deal with social acceptance of new and promising technologies.

Agenda Item 7. Private Sector Partnerships.

Notes were distributed by the CDC Chair prior to the meeting and included in the meeting binder, highlighting a meeting he attended in February in Germany of the 19th PSC meeting and a meeting hosted by IFPRI on Private-Public Partnerships. In addition, the Executive Officer prepared a proposal for consideration to the CDC, with the aim to review opportunities and options for fundraising with private industry corporations.

Joachim von Braun added that IFPRI had prepared a document exploring why Private-Public Partnerships had not worked, looking into the history between both successful and not as successful interactions, from a research perspective. He said the paper was now posted on IFPRI’s website.

During the short discussion that followed, speakers expressed their concern that the Private Sector Committee (PSC) for the System had been relatively unsuccessful to date, but agreed that the CDC needed to find a logical starting place from which to move forward, if there were to view the PSC as an instrument they could work with in the future.

The DGs said that it would be important to define the boundaries of any new study they might embark upon. In closing, and due to time constraints, the CDC recommended the following:

Next Steps.

- During the meeting a proposal was submitted by the EO for an additional activity involving the private sector. The recommendation made was that this would not be

considered a top priority at this time, but to go slowly and share experiences on the FHAO corner of the Collaboration site.

- In addition, the CDC Chair suggested that members from the Private Sector Committee join the CDC for a discussion during the AGM04 meetings, to explore further work together.

Agenda Item 8. Discussion of CDDC Update on SW/EPs, WGPM and SP-IPM.

The CDDC was asked to follow up on several issues from the AGM03 meetings, including the performance indicators exercise, submitted to the World Bank in January of 2004, and submitted to the CDC a preliminary proposal to develop generic and specific performance indicators for the SW/ER programs. In addition, the CDC considered the response of the SP-IPM to the report of the CDC Arbitration Panel on the Rotation of the convening Center.

Discussion.

The CDC briefly discussed the proposal, which was viewed by some as still requiring additional work. Questions were raised as to whether this message should be sent back to the CDDC. The focus of the discussion centered on the timing for disbursement of money for SW/EPs earmarked for FY04. It was decided that this should be covered during the discussions with the CGIAR Chairman and Director, in order to clarify the timeframe and submission schedule before taking a decision.

With regard to SP-IPM, the CDC considered the response from the SP-IPM to the report of the CDC Arbitration Panel on the Rotation of the Convening Center of the SP-IPM program. The CDC discussed the arbitration panel process, as this was the first time arbitration had taken place. As such, the CDC agreed it was important to set guidelines and establish clear processes to be followed in the event of future examples, and to set a precedent for joint and shared programs. The communiqué submitted to the CDC stated that the program had been reorganized following the procedures recommended through arbitration, and was now requesting that the CDC review the institutional hosting arrangement for the SP-IPM program.

During the discussion, and because of the absence of the IITA DG from the meeting, the CDC engaged in an electronic discussion with IITA (Hartmann) during the course of the meeting, in order to receive his reaction to the 2004 SP-IPM Steering Committee Report. After having received his input, the CDC decided:

- It was in the best interest of the CGIAR that system-wide programs work effectively. If a problem was identified with host institutions, then it was for the good of the program and its' scientists that efforts be made to ensure the program operate effectively, and this might involve moving the hosting arrangements to where the program would receive the appropriate institutional support.
- Therefore, the CDC endorsed the recommendation (i.e., the rotation of the SP-IPM Convening Center) from the Steering Committee of the SP-IPM.

In addition, the CDC recognized when system-wide programs were established, it was on the basis of agreeing to establish certain principles involving hosting policies, powers of the steering committee, location of secretariats, staffing issues, etc. It was equally important that such programs and their host institutions should not deteriorate to the level of challenging or disrupting the smooth operation of a program to the point that the CDC must be called upon to arbitrate over administrative issues.

With respect to the follow-up of evaluations of SW/ERs and possible submission of a new strategic proposal for further support, discussions with the Chair and Director of the CGIAR indicated that the World Bank would be prepared to consider a further proposal when the CDC was satisfied with a new submission.

Next Steps.

- The CDC appreciated the documents provided by the CDDC, and agreed they would form the basis for the Centers suggestions for performance indicators to be submitted to the CGIAR Working Group on Performance Measurement. The CDC also endorsed the CDDC preliminary proposal to develop generic and specific performance indicators for the SW/ER Programs, with some discussion towards continued modifications.
- The CDC agreed that it was in the best interest of the CGIAR that system-wide programs work effectively. If a problem was identified with host institutions, then it was for the good of the program and its' scientists that it be moved to where the program would receive the most institutional support.
- The CDC endorsed the recommendation (i.e. the rotation of the SP-IPM Convening Center) from the Steering Committee of the SP-IPM and would inform the Chair of the SP-IPM.
- Following discussions with the Chair and Director of the CGIAR, the CDC also agreed to request the CDDC to proceed with its proposal build on the performance indicators for the SW/ER programs and undertake indicator-based self reporting, evaluation of SW/ER reports and recommendations for allocation of new strategic funding.
- In addition, the CDC suggested that a list of existing SW/ERs be compiled by the FHAO in order to better follow where such programs were hosted, the names of the coordinators, etc, and post this information on the CDC Collaboration site.

Agenda Item 8b. Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU).

A preliminary discussion of the GO-AFU took place prior to the Joint Meeting with the CBC/CDC (see separate minutes, Agenda Item 5). Joachim von Braun provided the CDC with an update of changes that had occurred in the proposed program since discussions at AGM03.

He reminded the group that a draft proposal was submitted to the CBC and CDC in Nairobi, followed by an open forum session at AGM03. He wanted to receive the CDC's feedback during the present session of CDC, prior to the larger discussion in the joint meeting.

Three key points had been modified or changed in the document since Nairobi and included:

- The GO-AFU would be designed to deliver academic training programs in first Master's and later in PhD programs.
- The institution would not grant degrees.
- The GO-AFU would be designed as an open source university and would not substitute but rather serve to strengthen existing programs.

Joachim von Braun reported that strong interest had been expressed from the Director General of FAO and the Chair of the CGIAR that the programs developed reflect a strong agricultural component. Most current open university programs did not cover agriculture. In addition to reporting at these meetings, he would also present the program's evolution to ExCo VI, in Montpellier, France. An international workshop was being planned to launch the initiative in Washington, D.C. on August 25-26, 2004 with the CGIAR Chair and CDC Chair in attendance. He asked that the CDC endorse the approach and support the August meeting by ensuring participation of the Task Force members for the GO-AFU from the participating Centers.

Discussion.

A brief discussion took place with the group in general agreement to endorse the document and the approach taken. Some discussion was given to the level of continued involvement of other DGs in the initiative. The decision was taken not to establish a co-committee to exist in parallel to the already existing Task Force, but Joachim von Braun welcomed a group of DGs to function as a support group in the GO-AFU's development.

Some concern over the development of the initiative had been raised in past communications since the Nairobi meetings, and the CDC Chair asked if these concerns had been satisfactorily addressed. Joachim answered that he did not want to gloss over the possible pitfalls of a program of this nature, but stressed the tremendous progress that had been made to date with this type of "e-learning" and wanted the CDC to see this as an opportunity, and one that should not be missed. It was his hope that the process would move forward, but carefully and with proper oversight.

Next Steps.

- The CDC endorsed the document and the approach presented on the next steps for the GO-AFU.
- A CDC support group was formed consisting of Carlos Seré, Willie Dar, Joachim Voss and Adel El-Beltagy to assist Joachim von Braun as the project moved forward.

Agenda Item 9. Discussion and Feedback on CDC Collaboration Site.

During the meeting of the CDC at ISNAR in May, 2003, the CDC asked the Executive Secretary to work in concert with the CIO in developing a Sharepoint or Collaboration site for

the CDC. Due to work constraints and other priorities in her work program, the CIO arranged for the Executive Secretary to work with CGNet personnel to design and implement the site. During the Nairobi CDC meeting, funding for the development of the site was given and work began in early 2004.

At the request of the CDC Chair, the site was designed to include a consolidated calendar of Centers Events (with information provided by each Center), a complete list of contact information for former DGs, and also contains the ability to house a future Archive Project for the CDC, to capture important documents of historical as well as current importance for the group.

The CDC Executive Secretary, Kerri Wright Platais, presented a short presentation of the existing CDC Collaboration site, which was compiled with the help of Tim Haight (Vice President Marketing and Client Services, CGNet International) and at the time of the meeting opened only to the CDC. She requested that after receiving feedback from CDC members regarding alterations and changes to the site, that the site be opened to designated Center staff, as part of the larger CDC community. She reminded the CDC that the site contained two private access areas available only to the CDC (the CDC Corner and the FHAO area). Three categories of users were currently available: CDC members, “authors” (people able to submit components, post information and add/delete documents and information) and “browsers” (people with “read only” permission). The designation of access levels for Center staff would remain the decision of each CDC member.

Discussion.

The CDC Chair thanked the Executive Secretary for the creation of the site, and asked for feedback from the CDC. One DG said that he would like to be able to access more historical information and documentation for the CDC, and asked if CBC minutes and documents could be included as well on the site. Another DG asked how easy it would be to search for various documents by given categories, while others said the importance of this site as a tool for the CDC would be found in its use and through member participation.

The CDC congratulated the ES on the design and development of the site and recognized the great potential for such a site in facilitating the work of CDC and maintaining its ‘institutional memory’.

Next Steps.

- The CDC approved the Collaboration site, and asked that it be opened to the larger CDC Community of users and contributors, designated by each Center DG.
- The ES and EO, with continued technical advice from CGNet personnel, would continue to develop the site to include a library of documents for the CDC Archives and provide a place for current discussions and documents of importance to the work of the CDC.

Agenda Item 10. CDC Meeting with Per Pinstrup-Andersen, SC Chair.

The CDC met with Per Pinstrup-Andersen, as the new Science Council Chair, to hear his views and plans for the System's programmatic priorities, donor and future funding strategies, and the priority areas for the early days of the new Science Council.

Setting Program Priorities. In the context of the System's program priorities, the CDC sought an update from the SC Chair on whether the issue of ecoregional versus global Centers would likely come up in the context of the programmatic and organization alignment task forces for SSA, noting that generally there was a strong need for projecting the System's capabilities. With respect to priority setting, the CDC was interested to learn more about the SC and SSA Task Forces views on priorities across commodities, and on natural resources as well as work in the regions.

The SC Chair responded that the SSA Task Forces had not yet worked out their approaches but would not exclude the discussion. By definition, the Task Forces would be asked to look at regional priorities, and the SC Chair expected that the SSA TFs work would show how the work of SSA linked with that of other regions, and how the best of global science and innovation could be brought to bear on a particular ecoregion. The Task Forces would also look at geographic as well as ecoregional priorities, and possibly link to global priorities. He emphasized that the Task Force members would be expected to do their homework with regards to past studies.

The approach to funding allocations to System programs was addressed by CDC members, particularly with regard to competitive grants and whether or not they were able to fulfill what the Challenge Programs were originally designed to provide. The SC Chair said that it was important to accept that donors wanted to give money to programs, and wanted to control how that money was spent. He said that donors defined core as money going into well-defined programs. If the System could agree on a small number of System priority areas that donors could buy into, and ensure that the programs included full overhead, then Centers should consider the program funding as core, even for multi-center programs. He said it was important to move into a slightly different definition of core money, in order to have greater buy-in without the specific restrictions.

One critical factor of the proposed approach would be a SC trusted by the donors. This would also have the benefit of pre-empting parallel efforts for monitoring. Currently, the EC and WB were hesitant. The SC role in CGIAR programmatic performance measurement and monitoring would be more accurately reflected in the next draft of their working paper.

Work Priorities and Structure of the Science Council. CDC members discussed their views on the priorities for the work of the new SC, noting that the SC currently has a long list of activities. The CDC priorities were:

- Program priority setting at the System level
 - This task should also include how to construct a manageable number of programs that are few enough and large enough to be funded as block grants yet incorporate the legitimate commodity and other programs of the Centers.

- A definitive job on the programmatic Performance Measurement System.
- Capacity building and training work.
- Future research design for the Challenge Programs and lessons from the implementation phase of the present CPs.
- Impact culture and research on impact.
- How to address the program areas that are now currently given marginal priority in the System, such as forestry, fisheries and water.

Within its area of competency, the SC would need to define its role with respect to research management matters that were increasingly important in designing and delivering research. The Program Committee of the ExCo was set up partly to fill in the gap considering research/science management.

The Chair of SC confirmed that the first three priorities suggested by CDC were also those of SC. With respect to impact assessment, the SPIA of SC was partly independent as appropriate for an evaluating body.

He informed the group that through a consultant, and using all presently available materials, the SC would shortly be preparing a preliminary list of priorities. However, the overall priority setting tasks would not be completed by AGM. In some respects, setting the new System program priorities was for the sake of presentation, but real change would still occur when some areas were excluded. Excluded program areas could still be included in the proposed minority area of exploratory and opportunistic research.

Biotechnology and Genetic Resources. The SC Chair suggested that the most productive approach in convincing most stakeholders, including European donors, about the need for biotechnology (especially transgenics) was to present the matter in terms of solutions rather than problems. We should also recognize that some groups, such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth, were unlikely to be convinced by any arguments given their advocacy positions. The SC panel on Mobilizing Science will help work on this, along with the CGIAR Secretariat. CDC noted that product liability, regulatory regimes and biosafety have overtaken IPR as key issues in the Centers relationships with the private sector.

Programmatic and Structural Alignment in SSA. Following discussions at the teleconference today, CDC and the SSA TFs would establish good access to one another. To this end, key CDC and CBC representatives will be invited to the May TF meetings as observers. Any papers developed by the CDC would be welcomed by both TFs. The Centers inputs would be very important for many reasons, including the large body of past work such as the Meeting of the Minds Africa initiative and the implementation of its outcomes.

Next Steps.

- The CDC would give high priority to responses to SC preliminary priorities when made available. The CDC Chair reiterated the commitment of the CDC to work together with the Science Council, and said that the FHAO, and particularly the Executive Officer

would help in the formulation of these responses and in strengthening their work together.

- CDC and CBC representatives would be invited to attend the May Task Force meetings to be held in Rome, Italy, as observers.
- Any future papers developed by the CDC would be shared with the Task Forces.

Agenda Item 11. Preparation for Meeting with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider.

The CDC Chair led the discussion and preparation for the meeting with the CGIAR Chair and Director, Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider. A meeting agenda had been formulated prior to meeting at ICARDA and distributed to the CDC for comment.

The CDC briefly discussed a range of issues to include, in addition to topics identified earlier. These included how to handle the SW/EPs for this year, the MTPs, and issues raised during the discussion on the CGIAR reform process.

Several DGs stressed their desire to see the meeting begin on an upbeat note, highlighting the progress and achievements of several of the Centers and their programs, since last meeting. (See minutes of the meeting, Annex 1)

Wrap-Up and Future Meetings.

The CDC reviewed the preliminary Summary and Next Steps provided prior to the end of the meeting, and provided edits for inclusion in the final Minutes of the Meeting.

The CDC Chair reviewed dates for planning the July retreat, noting that a meeting was already planned in Ethiopia on July 4, with possible interaction with NARS, SROs and FARA leaders on July 7th. A preliminary count of who might attend was taken. Carlos Seré mentioned the possible availability of the ILRI compound outside of Addis Ababa as a possible site. The Chair thanked the CDC for their work on this, and said that final decisions would be taken by the CDC ExCom immediately following the meetings. Dennis Garrity said that the ToR for the working group would be circulated to the CDC following the meeting as well.

AGM04. With respect to meeting in October, prior to AGM04, Masa Iwanaga extended an invitation for the CDC, CBC (and possibly CDDC) to meet at CIMMYT. The CDC Chair said that he would like to begin the meetings mid-week, and asked that the CDC reserve time from the 20th onwards, noting that two and a half days might be required for the CDC meeting, and would include a full day meeting with the CBC. (Masa informed the group that his Board would meet at CIMMYT on the 24th).

The request to take into account the amount of time needed for pre-AGM meetings was made, noting that increased time of the CDC members was spent this year on CDC and system-wide consultations.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned to begin the final session with the CGIAR Chair and Director.

Prepared by: Kerri Wright Platais
Executive Secretary, CDC

Annex 1: CDC Meeting with Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider

Summary of Meeting Center Directors Committee (CDC) with Ian Johnson, CGIAR Chair and Francisco Reifschneider, Director, CGIAR

Friday, May 7, 2004

ICARDA

Aleppo, Syria

Opening Remarks. The CDC Chair, Kanayo Nwanze, opened the meeting by welcoming Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider, thanking them for joining the group at ICARDA. He noted that a preliminary agenda had been distributed prior to the meeting. He suggested that the meeting be split into two segments, to allow for informational updates and more in-depth discussion.

Briefly the CDC Chair summarized the highlights of Centers' events that had taken place since last meeting collectively in Nairobi. The list included:

- January submission of WB Performance Indicator exercise.
- The signing of the MOU with NEPAD in Johannesburg in March, as a collective effort for the Centers to enhance both individual and collective activities with NEPAD.
- Collective planning and presentations for ESSD Rural Week (March 3-5) in Washington, D.C.
- Working together to more actively engage in MDG activities.
- The Africa 2020 Conference held in Uganda was the first time a Center organized an activity where three Heads of State were present (Presidents from three countries in Africa – Uganda, Nigeria and Senegal).
- Fifth time in recent years that a CG staff member had received the World Food Prize.
- Three DGs consulted in preparations for the G8 summit and provided information pertaining to the global agenda for development.
- The trademark for Future Harvest had been transferred to IFPRI.
- The creation of the FHAO which would serve to optimize and streamline collective performance of the CDC through the recent hiring of a part-time Executive Officer.
- Early planning underway for Centers and Members Day at AGM04.

In addition, the CDC wished to thank both Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider for their visits to CIMMYT, ICRISAT, CIP and CIAT in recent months, and appreciated the money that had been allocated from the World Bank for the ICT-KM program, currently underway.

Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider thanked the CDC Chair, with special thanks to Adel El-Beltagy for hosting the meetings, and mentioned they were pleased the meetings

were held despite earlier travel bans, and were grateful for the chance to come to ICARDA. They added that the trips to the various Centers had gone very well, including the meeting with the IDB in Lima, Peru, where the CGIAR was working to foster an improved working relationship with the IDB.

Adel El-Beltagy welcomed both the Chairman and Director to ICARDA, and said he and his staff were disappointed that the WB training activity had to be postponed due to the travel ban, but reiterated that it would be held in June, and that ICARDA looked forward to hosting a fruitful meeting at that time.

Updates and General Information.

New Members and Financial Updates for the CGIAR. Francisco Reifschneider said that there were no new members to report at this time, although plans were underway for a June 30 policy makers/S&T representatives meeting to be co-hosted by the government of France and the CGIAR, specifically targeting the new members of the EU. Additionally, CGIAR membership was likely to expand, with discussions in both Latin America and Asia.

The financial scenario for 2003 was one of an all time high of around US\$ 380 million, with Canada's strong additional support and a strong exchange rate both playing a role. In 2003 he reported that the U.S., WB and the EC were the three largest donors and mentioned there were some positive indications that the Secretariat would be able to speed up disbursement from the EC and Japan this year.

With regard to the WB, the situation looked very good, in that it was highly likely that the US\$ 50 million would be maintained in FY05. Francisco Reifschneider mentioned that this was under threat earlier due to the various new demands placed on DGF funding, but said that the performance of the CGIAR was seen as outstanding and appropriate response was being given to the multiple recommendations made by the WB, including those related to performance measurement. He added as the CGIAR moved closer to the US\$ 400 million mark, this would be considered a major threshold. The recent increases in CGIAR total funding meant that the leveraging of the World Bank funds would therefore move from less than 7:1 to over 8:1, thus crossing a major threshold which would help us with resource mobilization.

Discussion.

The group noted that somewhere beyond US\$ 400 million, and probably closer to US\$ 500 million would be considered an optimal funding position for the System. One DG asked for further clarification for the coming year, regarding a breakdown of the World Bank's US\$ 50 million.

Francisco Reifschneider responded that the US\$ 50 million would have the same basic distribution as the year prior, with about half to general support and the other half going to the reform program, a similar distribution to FY04. This he said followed the strategy endorsed by the rural sector board of the Bank.

In terms of a breakdown for General Support, this included 75 percent of the allocation going to the Centers, with 25 percent linked to their indicators. In 2003-04, there was also the added cost of close-down for ISNAR, which would come in around US\$ 4 million, lower than reported at AGM03.

Reform Activities represented the larger umbrella of system-wide activities, Committees and Task Forces, and included the Global Goods Programs such as the work on the Genebanks and ICT-KM funding.

The timetable for a final decision from the WB FY05 funds would be the end of June, as the new fiscal year would begin July 1st. Ian Johnson added that they usually knew for certain by the second or third week of June, and added this was not a pro-forma decision (in one year the Board had even reversed a recommended drop in CGIAR funds), but that they had not received information to the contrary.

Agriculture S&T Assessment Update. The CGIAR Chairman reported that when the money was initially approved for this activity he was concerned where it would come from, but so far this program had not been funded from the same monies as the CGIAR. He said the first meeting would be held in 2004, and mentioned when opportunities were presented, he encouraged the Centers to participate, but emphasized that their participation was not mandatory.

The CDC Chair reported that Bob Watson had met Adel El-Beltagy at a meeting in Nairobi, and that he was invited to attend the ICARDA meeting to discuss Center involvement, but had not responded. Ian Johnson said that he was delighted to hear this response from the CDC and would follow-up with discussions with Bob Watson, in terms of possible Center involvement.

CGIAR/WB Operational Linkages. The CGIAR Chairman reported that there would be an increase in the hiring of specialists in agriculture and rural development within the next year, as these areas were now considered understaffed. At headquarters they would be appointing livestock and fisheries specialists. In the Africa region of the Bank there would be a major push, under a new Director, John McIntire, who would be responsible for pushing the agenda in Africa forward.

The CGIAR Chairman asked the CDC to consider ideas and opportunities for increased interaction between the Centers and WB staff. He emphasize that he would like to see a more structured debate take place within the Bank and new opportunities developed. One idea was a "Friends of the CGIAR" meeting held annually, in which participants from all regions were included. He said the last meeting of this nature drew 42 people.

Ian Johnson mentioned that it was also important to begin to think along the lines of more strategic issues related to the work of the GPGs, and what the Bank's role might be over the longer-term. He mentioned the Open University as one example of a huge opportunity and asked the CDC to provide him with additional areas of potential joint interest.

Discussion.

One DG mentioned that his Center would like to work with the Bank on more Economic Sector Work (ESW), and another mentioned that more joint training programs would also be helpful. Another DG said that the inclusion of the Centers at ESSD week had provided excellent opportunities for interaction, and suggested following-up with ideas for more liaison participation from the Centers with Bank staff.

Ian Johnson answered that one way to get Bank staff involved was through their placement on Center Boards. He said current rules stated that each Board could only have one Bank staff member. He agreed that ESW would be a good way to increase interactions.

Another DG said that at the country level the CG Centers provided knowledge that could be useful to other programs, but that this was not always captured by the Country Offices. He said it would be helpful if signals were sent to countries where Centers were involved, so that Resident Reps could be better informed, as well as Country Directors. Secondly, he mentioned capacity strengthening (broadly defined) was another way in which the Centers could partner with the WB. The Centers could also be engaged as partners when working on lessons learned through strategic alliances. He said that the Bank could help on training activities (something core money used to go for), as a new cadre of people were in need of training, so as to not miss a generation. The suggestion was made by another DG that a more structured “marketplace” could be put together, whereby Centers would come to ESSD with specific ideas for the funding of collaborative projects.

The CGIAR Chairman thanked the DGs for their suggestions and said it was an area for further discussion, needing more structure in order to be pursued further.

CGIAR-Japan Fellowships. The CGIAR Director introduced this update by informing the CDC that the Japanese government had provided money for activities they considered important, from the Ministry of Agriculture, with JIRCAS as the implementing agency. The amount would be approximately US\$ 1 million over the next four years.

The initial fellowship program would provide the chosen scientists with a pre-orientation seminar, and had identified two areas they would like to support: Sustainable Production and Environmental Conservation. He distributed a draft program, and realized that the time frame was very short, as the suggested deadline would be the 24th of May. He said that ten fellowships would be supported this year, costing US\$15,000 for a two month training period.

Discussion.

The CDC was happy to hear of this development, but noted that two months was a costly enterprise, as there was little time to really engage and begin to reap some of the benefits from the joint interaction. The DGs realized this was more like an internship, with the idea to expose Japanese scientists to the CGIAR.

Francisco Reifschneider said that this was part of the increased interaction by the Ministry of Agriculture, with a reform program that would be launched formally the end of July. Ian Johnson added that the work extended to the Japanese government (in response to the 25 percent cut from a few years ago) was finally paying off, and said it was important to demonstrate the good will of the CG for increasing interaction with Japanese scientists, while acknowledging that it was more work for the Centers during the initial start-up phase.

Next Steps.

- Francisco Reifschneider asked that submissions come to him by the 24th of May, along the specific themes mentioned in the draft proposal.

Global Public Goods Update. Meryl Williams, on behalf of Emile Frison, who was unable to attend the meeting, reported that the Centers (through the CDC) would be sending GPGI reports to the Bank, and that Center scientists had been working on a GPGII proposals as well. The second round would build on the GPGI projects and also incorporate the new landscape surrounding both the genebanks and the information databases, e.g., the implementation of the ICT-KM strategic projects.

Francisco Reifschneider responded that they would look forward to receiving the proposals and said that they would be considered as part of the FY05 funding package. A question was raised as to when the proposals should be sent, to which he replied as soon as the CDC was comfortable in submitting.

CGIAR Leadership and Change Management Course 2004. The CGIAR Director said that the planned course would take place in December 5-10, 2004, and was part of the broader initiative in support of Strategic Advisory Services. He thanked Frank Rijsberman for his support in the initial phase of the discussion and planning for the course. Initially three proposals were submitted (information distributed during meeting) and the Harvard Business School was chosen.

He asked for the strong support of the CDC in attending this course, as they were planning for 30 participants, and would include DGs, CP coordinators and possibly some donors as well. The CGIAR Chair and Director said that they would also attend.

A DG added that he was convinced the Centers needed to do more of this type of training, and suggested that perhaps some of the Board Chairs might also wish to participate. Ian Johnson said that he would also like to see some of the “young stars” of the System identified for attendance as well, as a means of building confidence and providing good training, and another DG added several DDGs would fit into that category.

Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU). The CDC reported that a good discussion had taken place both within the CDC and with the CBC on this topic and that based on the further work of the 20 experts identified as members of the working group, the project would now move forward into the implementation phase.

Funding was briefly discussed and the CDC Chair said that he looked forward to learning what the WB would support in this venture, as well as other key donors. Ian Johnson responded that he remained cautious of involving too many UN groups initially, and thought it wise to pursue the Swedish government, the U.K. and a few bilateral donors. He congratulated the CDC and said that this was a fabulous project that the CGIAR was well positioned to do well, if designed and implemented correctly.

Future Teleconferences and Planning. This item was briefly referred to and the CDC Chair said that he would take it up further with the Director in planning for a schedule for the remainder of the year.

In-depth Discussion Topics.

Due to time constraints, many of the in-depth items received less time than originally envisioned, but would be continued as necessary through electronic and subsequent conversations over the course of the next few months.

Systemwide Programs (SW/EPs) Follow-Up. This item was added to the existing agenda following discussion at the CDC meetings. The CDC Chair asked when they should submit the programs for FY05, with the response of as soon as the CDC was ready to do so.

Charter of the CGIAR. Francisco Reifschneider said that this had been discussed as well during their meetings with the CBC, and said that it was important to remember that this would be a document that reflected consensus of what the CGIAR is. One of the ideas established during the meeting with the CBC was the formation of a drafting committee to finetune the draft document. He said at this time the Charter was still in draft form and that contributions received to date were posted on the CGIAR website.

The CDC Chair acknowledged it was a work in progress and was pleased to hear that some of the concerns would be addressed before moving onto the next version. Ian said that it had been a healthy exercise in attempting to define the System. He said it was important to get it right in a way that all would feel ownership. He agreed with the idea for a drafting committee in seeing how best to handle some of the controversy and best address it. One DG mentioned that the crux of concerns for the Centers was in how the Centers were described.

Future Harvest Alliance Office. The CDC Chair said with the hiring of Meryl Williams as the part-time Executive Officer, a new unit (FHAO) was formed and consisted of two part-time people (EO and ES). The sentiment of the CDC was to strengthen the productive relationship with the Secretariat and determine how the CDC's contribution could best be used. He said that the FHAO would continue to support the work of the CDC Representative to the System Office, who this year was Adel El-Beltagy.

Ian Johnson said that the role of the CDC vs. the role of the FHAO was not clear in his mind, regarding the architecture. Kanayo Nwanze responded that the FHAO would support the CDC, but would not add another layer. Francisco Reifschneider asked if the FHAO was for the support of both the CDC and CBC, and if any time would be shifted from the

Secretariat's provided support for the CBC in their Executive Secretary. Kanayo answered that this work would not subsume the support given by the Secretariat for the CBC.

Private Sector. The CDC brought this issue to the table as they were concerned over the possible membership to the CGIAR of private sector companies and wanted to know if a standard agreement would exist in the type of guidelines that might need to be put in place if private sector companies were to become contributing members of the CGIAR.

Francisco Reifschneider responded that one company, Monsanto, had requested information along these lines, but had not applied for membership.

Plans for the ExCo discussions. The CDC Chair asked for clarification of a few items with respect to ExCo meetings. He said that the CDC was concerned that Center representatives should be present at ExCo when EPMRs were discussed, and said that further clarification regarding the use of MTPs in the System was desired, in terms of whether or not donors interpreted them as financing plans.

The CGIAR Director responded that no EPMRs would be discussed at the upcoming ExCo meeting, and that he was of the understanding that DGs of Centers could attend. The CGIAR Chairman suggested another way would be to include additional participants during the discussion, via an audioconference, or attend if they prefer to be there in person.

Francisco Reifschneider said that the new Science Council would be looking at the review of the MTPs and Ian Johnson added that the funding situation should improve with the fact that there were now 15 Centers, which was something critics of the System said could not be done, that the CG could not change, but this was proof that change was possible.

Planning for AGM04. Francisco Reifschneider said that a somewhat different model would be used this year, and the AGM would be co-funded by the Mexican government. He said a good team was in place to ensure that communications were working well, and said they would follow a similar approach as used in the Manila meetings to ensure that all elements of civil society were included. Ian Johnson referred to concerns raised regarding anti-GMO demonstrations, and said that this would be addressed as well in the pre-planning phase.

Closing Remarks. The CGIAR Chairman said in closing that there were several areas still in need of the CGIAR's attention, but that he was encouraged with the changes and programs underway. He said that there was room for improvement where the processing of the Challenge Programs were concerned and said more could be done. With regards to Performance Monitoring, he said it was important to look at accountability on all levels within the System, and said that this was also discussed with the CBC.

He suggested that perhaps it was time to have a retreat whereby together the various groups within the CGIAR could focus purely on the issues and look ahead to the future to anticipate what was changing in the environment. He said he would prefer a retreat focused on strategic thinking and not just process. He said that there were several projects he had heard about recently that might prove useful for CGIAR involvement (mentioning the work of UK charities

working on an International Commission for Africa, the work of the Global Carbon Fund, Climate Change, the issue of trade and the role of agriculture, the emerging agenda with the environment, and the post-conflict agenda). The CGIAR had a potential role to play in all of these issues, and it was time to think strategically as to how it would respond, and where it was best equipped to participate.

The CDC Chair thanked everyone for the discussion, noting the limited time, and said that follow-up and a continued dialogue would take place over the next several months.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Prepared by: Kerri Wright Platais
Executive Secretary, CDC