

# **Minutes of Informal Donor Consultation**

**1 April 2010**

### **Opening Remarks of Jonathan Wadsworth**

Jonathan Wadsworth, on behalf of the Fund Council Chair, Kathy Sierra, welcomed participants to the Consultation. The agenda had been proposed in joint discussion between the Alliance/Consortium and the Fund Office/donors. The day is intended to facilitate a substantive and interactive dialogue between donors and the Consortium about current thinking regarding the SRF, thematic areas and MPs building on GCARD outcomes. He recognized the magnitude of progress made since the launching of the CGIAR Reform, as well as the call for firming achievements and translating them into action, particularly with respect to the ambitious time line set for 2010.

### **Opening Remarks of Jean Lebel**

Jean Lebel (IDRC) also commented on the significant progress that has been made since the launching of the CGIAR Reform process. He reflected that two years ago to the day, the donors and Center representatives were in Addis, holding initial discussion on the reform. In his reflections on GCARD, he noted that there were more actors at GCARD than previously seen at AGM, which allowed many different roads to be followed in order to reach full impact pathways. In the future, he hoped to see more science woven into GCARD. In concluding, Jean suggested that trust, change of mindset, and empathy which were deemed important at the start of the reform are still just as important now, and that donors, while being frank, honest and pragmatic, must now speak with one voice.

### **Opening Remarks of Peter Gardiner (on behalf of the Chair of the Interim ISPC)**

The SRF needs additional elaboration to provide a solid basis for decision and the rationale for selected thematic areas and MPs. It should anchor the reforms and provide a clear framework for the CGIAR to articulate the results that the system would be accountable for. The thematic areas may well encompass the work that needs to be done but there seems to be some hesitation in their definition. The kind of results-based thinking of the Best Bets document coupled with new strategic thinking (e.g. as displayed in the mock MP on roots and tubers, developed earlier) is what the ISPC would like to see. The criteria for developing MPs need to be clear in order for the ISPC to conduct its independent assessment of them. The ISPC also stands ready to assist the Consortium Board as they develop the programs, as long as that support will not compromise the ISPC's ability to provide independent evaluation subsequently. The definition of platforms should come subsequent to understanding what is needed to deliver results. In the case of foresight, it is not clear that proposed studies should be organized as a Consortium platform, and the ISPC has a responsibility to the Funders in this area. There are several elements to developing a foresight function relevant to the operation of the system as a whole. The Science Council will meet in Aleppo in (14-16 April) to discuss and consolidate its views to feed to the Consortium Board for its May meeting.

### **Opening Remarks of Carlos Perez del Castillo**

Current thinking on the SRF, thematic Areas, MPs and platforms, was presented by Carlos Perez del Castillo, Chair of the Consortium Board. Carlos reminded everyone, that at its first meeting in Nairobi in

March, the Consortium Board, after careful consideration, determined the following six criteria for endorsing Mega Programs for submission to the Fund Council. MPs should:

- Build complementarities , synergies and collective action among centers in line with the CGIAR reforms, and ensure that strategic research planning is done collaboratively among centers and partners;
- Demonstrate innovation, new areas of CGIAR work with interaction among Centers and greater partnerships including outside the CGIAR Centers ) in different regions;
- Produce greater impact on the ground, with regard to reducing poverty and hunger, improving world food security and environmental sustainability. The impact pathways must be clearly spelled out and quantified;
- Demonstrate a learning process in the development of the MPs;
- Indicate a clear strategic focus and added value to the current centers and programs; and
- Contain an explicit gender strategy.

Carlos indicated that on the basis of donors' prior request for fast tracked programs, three were proposed,

**MP1** – Agriculture Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable

**MP3** – Sustainable Crop Productivity increase for Global Food Security

**MP7** – Climate Change and Agriculture

Carlos noted that GCARD was an important step in the process in that it provided an opportunity to listen to views and priorities of stakeholders. Based on what was heard at GCARD, the Consortium had a meeting and decided to make adjustments on the basis of what they heard. Flexibility will be maintained and subsequent realignment may be necessary. The following gives the current thinking on the thematic areas or MPs.

***Thematic Area<sup>1</sup> (MP1) – Agriculture Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable:*** In order to achieve greater precision and clarity on the objectives, this thematic area will be disaggregated based on agro-ecological zones, geography and research oriented to better respond to the needs of the poor and target the most vulnerable groups. It will involve the work of 13 Centers, and will have three main focii initially:

1. Dry land systems;
2. Tropical humid systems; and
3. Coastal and aquatic systems

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that MP is the expression used here for consistency with Carlos' presentation, with MP1 and MP3 referred to as thematic areas.

It is not yet decided whether these three components will be MPs in their own right or constitute parts of a single MP.

**MP2 – Enabling Agricultural Incomes for the Poor:** There is general endorsement of this MP as initially reflected although they plan to take on board the advice to focus on poverty reduction for the poor and vulnerable. 13 Centers will be involved in this MP.

**Thematic Area - MP3 – Sustainable Food Staples for Ensuring Global Food Security:** The range of crops covered under this theme will be extended. It will now cover 7 areas including: 1) Rice, 2) Maize, 3) Wheat, 4) Pulses and Legumes, 5) Roots and Tubers, including Bananas and Plantains; 6) Millet, Sorghum and Barley, and 7) Livestock and Fish. Management of these areas and whether each will be considered a Mega Program will be determined after the 12 page description on each is prepared. However, it is clear that a proposal for rice will be prepared as one of the fast tracked MPs. 10 Centers will be involved in this thematic area. The Generation Challenge Program will be integrated into this thematic area.

**MP4 – Agriculture, Nutrition and Health:** No significant change expected. 12 Centers will be involved in this MP. The Harvest Plus Challenge Program will be integrated into this MP.

**MP5 – Water Scarcity and Land Degradation:** The Challenge Program on Water and Food will be fully integrated into this MP. 12 Centers will be involved in this MP.

**MP6 - Forests and Trees:** No major change expected and 9 Centers will be involved.

**MP7 – Climate Change and Agriculture:** The recently launched Challenge Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security will become the Mega Program. All 15 Centers will be involved in this MP.

**MP8 – Mobilizing Agricultural Biodiversity for Food Security and Resilience:** As a result of stakeholder feedback and consultation among Centers and donors, this MP will not be pursued. Some components will be integrated into other MPs. It was agreed that genebanks should not all be clustered under one MP. Given that they are an asset to the system and are global public goods, they should be supported through dedicated and sustained funding. Carlos requested that approach to funding genebanks be discussed at this meeting.

Responsible Centers for each component (whether thematic area or MP as listed above) have already been tasked to draft the 12 page descriptive documents, which will be delivered to the Consortium Board by May 10..

On the **Challenge Programs (CP)**, as noted above, the Climate Change MP will be integrated into MP 7. Harvest Plus will be incorporated into MP 4, and the Water and Food CP into MP 5. The Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) CP will require further discussion and an arrangement between the donors/ funders, FARA, and the SSA CP.

Donors had suggested that the platform of Gender and the MPs Climate Change and Rice be fast tracked. The Consortium, having considered the advice concluded the following:

On **Gender**, there was the suggestion from some donors to fast track the platform on gender. The Consortium has carefully deliberated the pros and cons of this approach, and has decided it would not be appropriate to establish a gender platform before first paying due consideration to a number of potential ways of addressing this issue. The Consortium Board would like to have more time to determine the best way to address gender. In its consideration of MP proposals the Consortium will make sure that each of them has gender incorporated into it. However, in response to the urgency of the matter, the Consortium Board will immediately commission a time bound scoping study of all that is being done on gender across the CGIAR system and will subsequently determine how to substantively move forward with a strong gender element in all CGIAR research.

**Rice** is currently a component of thematic area (MP3). The draft concept proposal entitled “Global Rice Science Partnership (GRiSP) developed by IRRI, AfricaRice and CIAT does not fulfill all the MP criteria of the Consortium Board. Sponsors of the GRiSP are engaged in consultations with other Centers and a number of partners. They must articulate further the interactions of this program with other MPs. The revised proposal will then be considered by the Consortium Board for fast tracking.

**Climate Change** will be fast tracked. The Challenge Program has agreed to manage the development of the MP. Consultation with other Centers will start immediately and there will be a stakeholder consultation in the first week of May in Nairobi on the way to convert the CP into an MP in lieu of the CCAFS’ originally planned launching conference.

Carlos noted that the Consortium is well aware of the feelings of stakeholders that MP1 is too complex for fast track action in May 2010. However, he assured the meeting that the area, as elaborated, reflects the conceptual vision and expectations of the reform process. It introduces innovation, very significant collective action, enhances synergies among Centers, and tackles difficult challenges in order to produce greater impact on poverty alleviation on the ground. The Board encourages the Centers to prepare at least one component of this MP for fast-tracking. The Board will assess whether fast-tracking of part or all of this MP is feasible by the end of 2010.

#### **Time Line for Implementation and Approval by the Consortium Board**

Now until May 10, 2010 – Finalize SRF and develop 12 pages on MPs including components of MP 1 & MP3. For the fast-tracked proposals, full proposals are expected by May 10.

May 10, 2010 – The Science Task force appointed by the Consortium Board (three Board Members) will review the SRF and submission of the 12 pages of the components and MPs, including more detailed proposals for the MPs the Board has decided to fast track. They will prepare recommendations to the Consortium Board.

May 24, 2010 – The Consortium Board will make a decision on the SRF and fast tracked MPs to be sent to the Funders Forum and Fund Council. Ideally, they should also be in a position to give the green light on further development of the rest of the MP portfolio. They will conduct a process of consultation –

not only of the Centers involved but of the partners, and donors so that there will be a collective sense of ownership of the programs by all those concerned.

Carlos concluded by reminding the meeting that as agreed in the Fund Council meeting in Brussels in February, fast tracked MPs do not represent prioritization and will, therefore, not be funded at the expense of other programs and that all MPs will be considered for funding by the donors, as long as they are in conformity with the criteria and process outlined. In the process of finalizing the MPs, the Consortium would welcome the input of donors so that they (the donors) are familiar with the programs that will be submitted for their approval. The October Consortium Board Meeting will review the preparation and implementation progress of MPs and take decisions on additional MPs that will then be ready for submission to the FC.

The following gives a sense of the ensuing discussion and clarifications provided after Carlos' presentation.

Donors asked for a clarification of the terminology that we should now be using, whether thematic areas, MPs, components, etc. Carlos explained that currently, there are five Mega Programs. Those are what were previously termed, MP2, MP4, MP5, MP6, and MP7. The previously known MP1 and MP3, called thematic areas, have been broken into components, which may or may not each be considered separate MPs, except for Rice, which will be a fast tracked MP. This decision will be taken after the 12 page documents have been prepared on these components.

Donors and Center representatives voiced their appreciation for the clear thinking and progress evident in the presentation, and for Carlos' leadership and management of the current process, which has resulted in much clearer direction and clear milestones on what should be expected.

Several donors, while accepting the Consortium's proposed scoping study on gender, expressed that they would like to continue the gender discussion in order to ensure its integration into the Mega Programs, and to be able to provide input on the system level treatment of gender. Other donors noted that while the CB has taken a clear step on gender, their (the Consortium's) thinking on Capacity Building is less clear. Carlos noted that this is a pending issue. However, it was felt that a platform on capacity building was not necessary at this stage and that every MP proposal will address capacity building. Donors noted that to ensure that the mainstreaming of Gender and Capacity Building is not lost, having a platform to address each of these is something the Consortium should still consider. Carlos noted that the Consortium Board will discuss these issues as part of its broader discussion on the composition of the Consortium Office that will take place during the May Consortium Board meeting.

Donors questioned whether the iSPC will contribute to the Consortium in the development of the 12 page descriptions of MPs and whether additional criteria for the development of MPs will be introduced. Carlos responded that the process is evolving, and as it stands now, the Consortium Board will judge the 12 page documents by the already established criteria. This does not preclude the introduction of other criteria. The main function of the iSPC is to advise the donors and Fund Council with respect to the scientific quality of projects submitted by the Consortium. The Consortium Board will also have the

possibility to get scientific advice when required from the iISPC. The Consortium Board also has a task force on science which is already in discussion with those who are developing the MPs. Peter Gardiner noted that the iISPC will review the criteria and process by which MPs will be evaluated. (In the closed door meeting that followed, donors determined to provide advice to the iISPC, that these evaluation criteria, should be produced much earlier, so that the preparers of the MPs know what the evaluation criteria are, before they finalize the MPs for consideration.)

Donors also noted that the issues of food security, health, nutrition, should be embedded into most MPs and that there should be consultations with other partners. They were reassured that there would be integration. The Centers noted there will be an iteration to link the SRF to MPs. Aggregation of the MPs with clearly quantifiable target outcomes is necessary, as was done in the Best Bets paper prepared by IFPRI. On mobilizing science and the involvement of partners donors noted that in addition to local, national and regional partnerships, Advanced Research Institutions and international partners are important. It was reiterated that gender and CB should be part of all the MPs and perhaps require coordination from a platform.

It was noted that while GCARD spent four days on partnerships, the discussion in the CGIAR still reflected distinct project thinking, without much on development partners, who must be engaged at an early stage rather than later in the game in order to avoid blockages in the impact pathway. Current efforts in formulating the GRISP are a good example of this type of engagement with development partners.

The meeting then discussed in small groups the following two questions:

**What are the reactions to the Current thinking regarding the MPs? Are they compelling and exciting?**

**Given the inherent limits of research, how far down the impact pathway should the MPs go to enable success?**

There was an overall sense that the current thinking on the MPs was compelling and most donors were pleased with the new direction outlined. The most pressing issues to be addressed relate to poverty alleviation, food security and climate change. There was widespread support for the way the eco-regional dimensions were handled in the first thematic area. The meeting participants questioned whether there would be the opportunity for other MPs to benefit from a similar eco-regional development focus. Donors supported the separation of different crops, and livestock and fisheries under MP3.

Private sector involvement should be specified and partnerships engaged at an early stage. However, there is a tradeoff in defining the MPs and their research impact, with the necessary accommodation of partnerships. Donors agreed that the genebanks should not be put under one MP.

There is still a desire for more information on the MPs, in order to stimulate excitement. However, what is already exciting is that the scope of the CGIAR portfolio is now broadened to conduct research in new

domains and address the challenges of our times. The meeting noted the importance of ensuring that there is the stewardship capacity in the system to manage these MPs. Also that at the MP level, the number of Centers involved in any one MP, could lead to management challenges. Management Centers (i.e., leads for each MP) must have the responsibility and accountability for program delivery in order to ensure desired results are achieved. There still is a lot of work to be done by June. The criteria must be clear enough and sufficient to ensure that the MPs address real and pressing issues. There was mention that the term Mega Program, was not particularly exciting.

Report out from second question:

Development pathways must be defined in order to determine impacts, and partnerships need to enable delivery of development outcomes and impact. The delivery of research outputs is related but not equal to the delivery of development outcomes and impact. While the linkages with partners are critical for development impact, the CGIAR will always be constrained by resources to support the uptake of its research outputs. As such it must think through how to leverage funding and how to develop strategies that will help partners to directly leverage funding. There are more options to leverage additional funds at the regional level. This is why having a regional dimension to or even regionally-based MPs can be a strategic way to leverage additional resources with partners to deliver impact. There was widespread agreement that despite its shared responsibility to deliver outcomes, the CGIAR's limited resources must focus primarily on research.

The CGIAR is part of the international research community. To improve the impact of our work, capacity building at the national and regional levels is crucial. This calls into question the need for inclusiveness in programs and clarity on the scope, degree and depth of partner involvement. Having effective feedback loops is also important. The CGIAR must recognize differentiated impact pathways and non linear pathways, which have clearly defined quantified and time bound objectives for development impact. It should be possible to demonstrate how the CGIAR's research will be used by an organization such as BRAC, even if the CGIAR is not accountable for the use of the research by BRAC. The CGIAR also needs a mechanism for sharing knowledge across the MPs. The Consortium Board and Office have a specific responsibility to facilitate this knowledge sharing.

The second session of the "Table Top" discussions focused on the following questions:

1. What should be the overarching strategy in 2011 for funding "fast tracked" MPs, Center work outside the fast tracked MPs, blue sky research, and genebanks?
2. What are some important considerations regarding accountability and the governance for MPs, given the inherent limits of research?

Summary of Discussion:

When the CG fund is fully operational, the donor contribution should be harmonized around the SRF. The Fund Council needs to ensure stability and continuity in funding across all three windows. There should be an explicit strategy on how new batches of MPs will be considered for funding. Once funded, MPs should be assured funding for the life of the program, even if disbursements to the program come in annual tranches. Donors are encouraged to provide an indication of their funding levels as soon as possible and to get an overall financial plan for all MPs. The funding of a Center must be mapped both for project funding and core funding activities, then gaps in overall funding identified. Donors cautioned that while there was a call for a doubling of CGIAR funding, there needs to be realism in that aspiration, given today's global financial environment. Fast tracked MP funding cannot be seen as completely additional to the current program and funding levels of Centers. For Centers not participating in the initial fast tracked MPs, funding through windows 1 would be important. Overall the research strategy should have some flexibility built into it to allow for new programs to be integrated into MPs, or for funds to be redirected if programs are to be phased out, or modified.

It is less clear what could be the acceptable percentage of blue sky research and where it should be funded from, but it should be funded. Perhaps each MP could have as a line item in the funding proposal called 'blue sky' research. There was agreement that genebanks needed separate funding, but the mechanism for funding was not clear. Suggestions included as a line item in MP proposals, or through window 1, or as a line item in window 2.

On governance and accountability, there needs to be clarity of roles between the Consortium and lead Centers, Consortium Board and Center Boards, and between lead Centers and participating Centers as well as with other scientific and development partners for ensuring proper impact delivery from MPs. The Harvest Plus governance structure could be an interesting model for consideration. Participants felt that if the governance structure is correct, accountability would fall into place. They also urged the system to avoid complication and layering, and to remove duplication to achieve efficiency. A monitoring program should be designed and given attention so that the Centers have this information as they develop the programs.

Closing Remarks by Carlos:

Carlos noted that he was very encouraged by the day's discussion. In this crucial state of the new CGIAR, these opportunities for engagement with donors are really important. At the Fund Council meeting in Brussels, he stressed the need to build up both informal and formal communication channels and to avoid silos at all cost. He suggested holding back-to-back Fund Council and Consortium Board meetings, where possible.

Carlos asked donors to consider and respond to the following questions/issues in the donor-only session to follow:

1. Financial Plan – At center level, there is considerable effort to produce 12 pagers and then rapidly finalize fast tracked proposals for CB consideration. Scientists working now on papers would need to know if there is a financial plan to help in meeting these challenges. They also need to know from donors the levels of funding that will be generated through the different windows of the Fund.
2. Science Council Work Program – They would like to know urgently the evaluation criteria for MPs that the Fund Council will use. In addition, the Consortium would like to know what other activities the FC envisages for 2010 and 2011 and the implications for the Centers. If the iSPC has bright ideas that involve the Centers, they would like to know soon
3. Harmonized reporting – what is the plan for how this will be achieved?
4. Full Cost Recovery – How will donor policy align with this in order to avoid free rider scenario.

Carlos also provided the following additional information:

Other than decisions concerning the MP, the Consortium Board have taken decisions to create 4 task forces (TF), as follows:

1. TF on headquarters location: The Consortium has narrowed the selection of possible Consortium Office locations down to five countries from a list of 15 possible candidates. The five shortlisted sites are Addis Ababa, Delhi, Montpellier, Nairobi, and Rome. Letters are in the process of being sent to each country's Head of State for them to re-affirm their interest in hosting the Consortium and to designate focal persons with whom the Consortium can negotiate.
2. TF on the CEO Recruitment: Four consulting firms have been contacted to bid on the selection engagement and their proposals were due April 1, 2010. In the next weeks the selection is expected to be announced in the press. Carlos would welcome suggested candidates from donors and Centers. Suggestions should be sent to the selected consulting firm once it is identified.
3. TF on relations between the Consortium Board and the Fund Trustee: On the Performance Contracts, there are a number of legal issues to be discussed, to ensure that the legal documents reflect the interest of both sides. Kathy designated persons from the Fund Council who will engage in discussions at the technical level.
4. TF on Science: Composed of 3 eminent scientists (members of the Consortium Board) they will analyze the proposals from the Centers before submitting them with recommendations to the Consortium Board.

The meeting concluded at this point, and the donors continued in a closed session which focused on the questions posed by Carlos to the funders. What follows is a summary of that discussion.

**Question 1:**

**Financing** - Is there a financial plan to meet the challenges of developing the MPs. What is the expected level of funding for each window?

**Discussion:**

While there was a call for a \$1 billion CGIAR by 2013, there is considerable uncertainty about whether this level of funding can be achieved by 2013. Thus, there is a need to manage the expectations of the Centers. Given the cost of partnerships, as described at GCARD, and capacity building, financing to the CGIAR must be dedicated primarily to research.

There was a discussion about donors being able to trace their funding to the MP component or even subcomponent level. The guidance from the meeting was that earmarking at the sub-Mega Program level is what the entire reform was designed to move away from. One suggestion was that while this is true, the donors may still want to consider that if new donors are allowed to fund subcomponents, it would allow for greater flows, and the buy-in from new donors, who over time could gain greater confidence in the performance of the Fund. At that point, they may be willing to contribute to windows 1 and 2. The advice from the trustee was that designing programs that are too small could be difficult to manage, from an operational perspective, as earmarking defeats the purpose of having pooled funding in the new CGIAR TF. The system must build on the trust to date and avoid cherry-picking. Donors will be accountable for the promise to channel more resources through the Fund. National governments also have access to other pots of funds, largely from the same donors, which should allow for greater engagement with development partners.

**Follow-up:** The Fund Office was requested by the donors to manage the process of drafting a financing plan or strategy for 2011 and beyond through the three funding windows, which will address the Consortium's request:

- It will approach each Center to get a sense of their financing needs in 2011 and aggregate that so there is an understanding of the overall expected level of funding needed, as well as canvas donors to get a sense for the level of funding they expect to provide in 2011. Donors noted that it would be easier to provide an unrestricted/restricted breakdown, rather than in terms of the Fund windows.
- The FO will convene a small group of volunteers from the donors to discuss the issues around a financing plan/strategy, and will draft the document for further discussion by the Fund Council in July, 2010.

**Question 2: Science Council Work Plan** – What are the evaluation criteria that will be used to evaluate programs?

**Discussion:**

Donors were aligned that the Science Council will need to provide the evaluation criteria for Mega Programs by the end of the Aleppo meeting, at the latest. This would allow for the donors to provide inputs and for the Consortium to benefit from them as Mega Programs are developed. Donors also agreed to provide input/feedback individually to the Consortium on the criteria which they've articulated. At the aggregate level, consideration will be given to the consistency with the SRF. They

will also consider the relativity, coverage and fit of the various MPs, and review them against the established criteria for MPs. Any additional criteria, will be identified and shared with all concerned.

**Follow-up:**

1. The FO will convey donors' request to the iSPC ASAP.
2. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation promised to share their criteria for evaluating proposals with the funders.
3. The Fund Office will re-circulate the work plan of the iSPC to the donors.

**Question 3:** Harmonized Reporting: What is the plan?

**Discussion:**

All donors need to indicate their minimum requirements for reporting, so that this can be aggregated into an acceptable base line. With respect to indicators, the vehicle for achieving harmonization in reporting will be through the MP proposals themselves.

**Follow-up:** There will be a joint effort organized by the Fund Office to develop the harmonized reporting guidelines and use of indicators, which should be fed into the design process of the MPs. This will be done after the appropriate level of legal discussions have taken place with and among the donors and Consortium. Donors volunteered to serve in an informal working group to work with the FO included the World Bank, IFAD, BMGF and USAID.

**Question 4:** Full Cost Recovery. How will donor policies be aligned on this?

**Discussion:** Full cost recovery is one of the basic tenets of the reform. It involves all funding to the system, whether through the Fund or bilaterally. The burden to ensure that this is implemented rests on the Centers, who must ensure reporting and record full costs in program proposals, and the donors who should comply with requests to provide funding at full cost. It was noted that also the cost of the Consortium may be imputed into the cost of MPs so that it becomes a direct cost. The Fund council will also review the soundness of the funding proposal that accompanies each MP. Issues raised included: 1) the need to discuss burden sharing between window 1 and windows 2 & 3. Some donors, though comfortable with the principle of full cost recovery wanted to ensure there was no double counting. A full cost proposal from the Centers needs to be developed at the soonest.

**Follow-up:** The Fund Office will produce a memo on full cost recovery and share this with the funders and Consortium

**Additional Discussion/Questions:**

How will GFAR be funded? While this issue was raised, the discussion did not yield an answer. Donors noted that the Fund will pay for the FO, but that all other system costs should be covered from a levy on all funding to the system.

On the funding of genebanks, the donors will wait to receive the Consortium's revised proposal to address this issue. Donors noted that the Crop Diversity Trust was established to support the CGIAR's genebanks but it is unclear how many of the genebanks receive funding from the Trust. Overall the Trust covers only 20% of the genebanks' costs. It is possible for the annual request from the Consortium to the Fund to include a genebank request, which can then be funded from window 1. A corporate approach for funding genebanks will need to be developed.

**Discussion on April 13, 2010 meeting in Berlin:**

Ulrich Hess, World Bank, explained the proposed legal document architecture that would underpin the new CGIAR and the purpose of the April 13 meeting in Berlin. He also distributed two draft documents for donor review and comments to prepare for the Berlin meeting: 1) the Fund governance framework; and 2) the contribution agreement. Electronic copies of these documents were also sent to the donors. Donors were asked to provide comments to the trustee by April 9. No revised drafts will be shared prior to the April 13 meeting, but comments will be reflected in the discussion in Berlin. The third key part of the new legal document architecture, the joint agreement is expected to be distributed by April 9.

**Overall Conclusion:**

Donors felt this was a productive day. Now that the Consortium has outlined its strategy, the donors must also work quickly and be responsive to the follow-up requests from the Fund Office, so there is no undue delay.