

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Second Meeting of the Executive Council

April 16-17, 2002

London

Summary Record of Proceedings

*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
May 15, 2002*

ACRONYMS USED

<i>AGM</i>	<i>Annual General Meeting</i>
<i>AS & B</i>	<i>Alternatives to Slash and Burn</i>
<i>CAPRi</i>	<i>Collective Action and Property Rights</i>
<i>CBC</i>	<i>Committee of Board Chairs</i>
<i>CCER</i>	<i>Center Commissioned External Review</i>
<i>CDC</i>	<i>Center Directors Committee</i>
<i>CGIAR</i>	<i>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</i>
<i>CIP</i>	<i>Centro Internacional de la Papa</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Challenge Program(s)</i>
<i>CWANA</i>	<i>Central and West Asia and North Africa</i>
<i>EPMR</i>	<i>External Program and Management Review</i>
<i>ExCo</i>	<i>Executive Council</i>
<i>FAO</i>	<i>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</i>
<i>FC</i>	<i>ExCo Finance Committee</i>
<i>FH</i>	<i>Future Harvest</i>
<i>FPR</i>	<i>Farmer Participatory Research</i>
<i>GA</i>	<i>Gender Analysis</i>
<i>G & D</i>	<i>Gender and Diversity</i>
<i>GFAR</i>	<i>Global Forum for Agricultural Research</i>
<i>GRPC</i>	<i>Genetic Resources Policy Committee</i>
<i>IBP</i>	<i>Integrated Business Plan</i>
<i>ICARDA</i>	<i>International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas</i>
<i>ICLARM</i>	<i>World Fish Center</i>
<i>ICRISAT</i>	<i>International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics</i>
<i>ICW</i>	<i>International Centers Week</i>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>International Fund for Agricultural Development</i>
<i>IFAP</i>	<i>International Federation of Agricultural Producers</i>
<i>IPGRI</i>	<i>International Plant Genetic Resources Institute</i>
<i>IPM</i>	<i>Integrated Pest Management</i>
<i>IRRI</i>	<i>International Rice Research Institute</i>
<i>ISNAR</i>	<i>International Service for National Agricultural Research</i>
<i>MTM</i>	<i>Mid-term Meeting</i>
<i>MTP</i>	<i>Medium Term Plan</i>
<i>NARS</i>	<i>National Agricultural Research System</i>
<i>NGOC</i>	<i>Non-Governmental Organizations Committee</i>
<i>OECD/DAC</i>	<i>Organization for Economic Cooperation and</i>

	<i>Development/Development Assistance Committee</i>
<i>OED</i>	<i>Operations Evaluation Department</i>
<i>PC</i>	<i>ExCo Program Committee</i>
<i>PSC</i>	<i>Private Sector Committee</i>
<i>R & D</i>	<i>Research and Development</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Science Council</i>
<i>SSA</i>	<i>Sub-Saharan Africa</i>
<i>SWP</i>	<i>Systemwide Programs/Initiatives and Ecoregional Programs</i>
<i>TAC</i>	<i>Technical Advisory Committee</i>
<i>TAC/iSC</i>	<i>Technical Advisory Committee/interim Science Council</i>
<i>TOR</i>	<i>Terms of Reference</i>
<i>WB</i>	<i>World Bank</i>
<i>WFS</i>	<i>World Food Summit</i>
<i>WG</i>	<i>Working Group</i>
<i>WSSD</i>	<i>World Summit on Sustainable Development</i>

Contents

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session.....	1
Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report.....	1
Agenda Item 3. Program Matters	3
3.a. Challenge Programs	3
3.b Systemwide Program/Initiatives and Ecoregional Programs (SWPs)	4
3.c. International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources	5
3.d. World Summit on Sustainable Development.....	5
3.e. 2003 Planning.....	6
3.f. Recent Developments at ICARDA	7
Agenda Item 4. Governance Matters	7
4.a. ExCo Composition.....	7
4.b. Establishing SC	9
4.c. Organizing the CGIAR System Office	9
4.d. “Future Harvest” Brand Name for the CGIAR System.....	9
4.e. CGIAR Nominees on Center Boards	11
4.f. ExCo Decision Making	11
Agenda Item 5. Evaluation.....	12
5.a. Progress Report on Review of GRPC	12
5.b. CIP EPMR	12
5.c. Progress Report on EPMRs.....	13
5.d. Evaluation of CGIAR Secretariat	14
5.e. World Bank OED Evaluation of the CGIAR.....	14
Agenda Item 6. Economic Performance and Short-term Prospects of CIP	14
Agenda Item 7. Planning ExCo Business	15
Agenda Item 8. Future Meetings	15
Agenda Item 9. Other Business	16
9.a. Criteria for Assessing CPs	16
9.b. CGIAR AGM2002	16
Attachments	
Draft Agenda.....	17
List of Participants	20

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

Chairman's Introduction

CGIAR Chairman Ian Johnson opened the meeting, thanking ExCo members for their cooperation in the light of the last minute change in venue and the Government of Syria and ICARDA for their excellent preparation for the planned Aleppo meeting and the understanding they showed when circumstances required a change in venue.

CGIAR Director and ExCo Executive Secretary Francisco Reifschneider conveyed regrets of members who could not attend the meeting. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1.)

Election of Co-chair

Moise Mensah was selected co-chair.

Adoption of Agenda

The draft agenda was adopted, with the addition of the following items:

- Composition of ExCo's Program Committee (to be discussed under Agenda Item 4.a. ExCo Composition)
- World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (OED) evaluation of the CGIAR (to be discussed as new Agenda Item 5.e)

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report

Francisco Reifschneider gave an overview of developments in the areas of governance, program matters, communications, gender and diversity and finance.

- On *governance*, Reifschneider noted that the Government of Israel has expressed its interest to join the CGIAR in 2003 and that there are several other prospects for membership from the developing countries and the private sector. The reform program actions are proceeding on track, as noted in the monthly briefings to ExCo. Four new DGs have been appointed (Carlos Sere at ILRI, Peter Hartmann at IITA, Joachim Braun at IFPRI and Masa Iwanaga at CIMMYT) and there are three new board chairs (Robert Kearney at ICLARM, Benchapun Shinawatra Enkasingh at IPGRI and Angeline Kamba at IRRI). Kevin Cleaver is the new WB representative to the CGIAR. The Secretariat is working with CBC and the G&D Program in organizing this year's Board Orientation program and with iSC in organizing and backstopping the EPMRs of ISNAR and IPGRI.
- Regarding *program matters*, the CGIAR Director provided an overview of progress in implementing the CP process and of developments on SWPs, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources, and WSSD. These are covered under separate items in the ExCo agenda.
- Major developments in *communications* include the appointment of Fiona Douglas (Australia) as Communications Adviser in the Secretariat, Chairman and Director's video

conferences with center DGs and staff, boards, iSC, etc., and continuing periodic teleconferences with the Center Directors. Also, the recruitment of a Chief Information Officer for the CGIAR is in its final stages, the costs of the position to be shared between the Centers and the Secretariat and the person to be hosted at ICLARM – the World Fish Center.

- A progress report on *gender and diversity* matters covering recent data on IRS/NRS has been circulated. The G&D Program is launching an in depth survey on gender issues, the results of which are expected to be available by AGM02. This year the Women's Leadership and Management course will be held in June at CIAT. Also, a series of short HR policy notes are being developed on issues such as inclusion, diversity-friendly recruitment, etc.
- In the area of *finance*, Francisco Reifschneider noted that funding for 2001 (covered in detail below) is comparable to the 1999-2000 levels. Preliminary results indicate, however, that this stability in overall resource flows did not translate into stability for all centers. Resources available to about half the centers contracted, while they increased for seven. For 2002, the likely funding level is projected at US\$340 million.

Edward Sayegh (ICLARM) followed with the presentation of the draft CGIAR 2001 Financial Report, which, for the first time, was co-produced by the Secretariat and a Center. He noted that the overall outcome for 2001 was satisfactory. For CGIAR as whole, funding of \$337 million, 2% higher than \$331 million in 2000, supplemented by \$15 million of other revenue fell slightly short of the 2001 expenditures of \$354 million leading to a deficit of \$1.2 million for the year. Taking a longer term perspective on funding, he noted that by end of 2001, funding for the CGIAR since inception amounted to \$5.6 billion, a third of which was provided by European investors. For 2001, European share amounted to 39% followed by International and Regional organizations (20%), North America (17%) and the Pacific Rim (11%). Developing Countries provided \$14 million or 4% of the total. Expenditure allocations on a regional basis were stable with 43% of the resources being directed towards Sub-Saharan Africa. The share of spending on Personnel Costs declined, amounting to 48% of total spending, as Centers continued to trim staffing. The variation at the Center level, however, was considerable, ranging from 33-60%, with those at the higher end possibly requiring aggressive staff retrenchments to ensure operational flexibility. Cash flows were affected by payment delays and \$63 million, about a fifth of the total, was in arrears at end of 2001. Working capital at some Centers had fallen below prudent levels, judged to be about 90 days coverage of expenses.

Discussion:

- Prudent financial management is an important element of good governance. Hence, although painful, actions taken by Centers to trim staff to maintain personnel spending at reasonable levels are necessary.
- Concern was expressed that declining levels of unrestricted funding, 52% of the total funding was restricted in 2001 as compared with 46% five years ago, were seriously affecting Center operations. Donors must pro-actively work to provide their funding without restrictions.
- ExCo members hoped that declining levels of capital assets was a good indicator that Centers were beginning to operate more virtually. If that was not the case, Centers must

aggressively pursue opportunities for lowering fixed costs, including reducing physical assets and sharing services.

- Working capital declines are a serious cause for concern. These trends must be reversed by concerted actions by donors to promptly release funds and by Centers to streamline the paperwork necessary to trigger fund releases. Centers should also adopt conservative spending policies to ensure surplus, rather than deficit, budgeting.
- G & D program was producing useful statistics pointing the areas of concern, e.g. higher rates of turnover for women as compared with men. However, action is needed to address these and other broader HR concerns. Specifically, it is probably necessary to approach the whole area of Human Resources more strategically and collectively to ensure effective implementation.
- New memberships should be addressed cautiously, with adequate internal consultation.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo thanked Edward Sayegh for a lucid presentation of the 2001 Financial Report.*
- *Regular G&D status reports and increased transparency are appreciated by ExCo, but information on diversity is insufficient. Also, there is a need to go beyond descriptive statistics and trends towards analysis of their strategic relevance. It is best to see G&D trends in the context of broader HR policies. In connection with this, there is need to update the issues paper on spouse employment (Action: CGIAR Secretariat, CDC, G&D Program).*
- *In finance, more comprehensive and comparative analysis of working capital, fixed cost ratios and fixed assets is needed, in addition to linking these issues to long-term financing, to assist the Centers in managing their financial resources prudently and efficiently. CGIAR Secretariat should follow up, in cooperation with Edward Sayegh, and bring to ExCo a study on these issues.*
- *ExCo, in cooperation with CDC and CBC, should begin to move the discussion of HR (including gender and diversity) and other issues to the strategic level. It would be desirable to address these issues at a future joint session between ExCo and CDC.*

Agenda Item 3. Program Matters

3.a. Challenge Programs

Francisco Reifschneider provided an overview of the pilot and the regular process. Emil Javier summarized iSC actions and experience to date.

Discussion:

- Many proposals did not seem to satisfy the criteria for CPs; it may be necessary to clarify definitions. It would be useful for iSC to be more transparent about its quantitative assessment.
- 9 out of 10 pilot pre-proposals lacked any meaningful NARS participation. ISC should not accept proposals that do not involve stakeholders in their preparation.
- The period allowed for pre-proposal development under the regular process should be extended to allow time for consultation among stakeholders.

- Discussion of iSC recommendations on full proposals will probably require a face-to-face meeting of ExCo.
- The CGIAR is not obliged to fund all three proposals that are being developed. Some CGIAR members will face difficulty in supporting CPs focused on genomics.

Conclusions:

- *Pilot CP Process.* This should be maintained as agreed and implemented. As it is a pilot, lessons should be drawn from it to help improve the regular process. iSC should prepare a paper on lessons learned for ExCo and the CGIAR.
- Request iSC to contact proponents preparing proposals to ensure that there is full and thorough stakeholder consultation, a research plan reflecting strong scientific integrity, and a realistic business plan, including indications of commitment.
- *Regular CP Process.* It should be made clear to all that pre-proposal development is an open and competitive process based on the agreed concepts. The current schedule should be extended to allow interested parties to form meaningful partnerships. The CGIAR Secretariat, in consultation with iSC, should modify the schedule accordingly and widely communicate the call for pre-proposals.
- The CGIAR Secretariat should prepare a briefing paper, following the approval of pilot CPs and in consultation with CDC and iSC, reflecting, in broad orders of magnitude, the likely numbers of CPs that could be developed over time, along with an indication of how CGIAR resources may be allocated in the future to center core programs, systemwide program and CPs.

3.b Systemwide Program/Initiatives and Ecoregional Programs (SWPs)

Francisco Reifschneider and Meryl Williams introduced this item. They noted that Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs are of critical importance to the CGIAR and require specific attention. In particular, there is need to bring funding stability to the “core” of SWPs, as argued by Hank Fitzhugh and Lukas Brader in the background paper on this item.

Discussion:

- Six of the ongoing SWPs have been proposed as CPs. One should study their management as SWPs, before approving them as CPs.
- The management experience of all SWPs should be extracted for the benefit of the CP concept and procedures generally.
- Both SWPs and CPs should have a place in the CGIAR research agenda. In the long term strong and effective SWPs should move to become CPs.
- A SWP should be approved only if funding is available for covering the costs of coordination. Donors should contribute to the funding of the core costs of coordinating the SWP.
- If a SWP is to become a CP, the differentiation between SWPs and CPs is blurred. There must be clear differences between the two.
- There are many inter-center activities that are not SWPs. One should clarify what differentiates SWPs from these activities and how an inter-center activity could become a SWP.

- The CDC role in nurturing the effective SWPs need to be better defined but there was agreement that a stronger role by the CDC is supported.

Conclusions:

- *The Fitzhugh-Brader paper was useful in highlighting the benefits of SWPs and the problems with SWPs and pointing to possible ways of addressing the latter. The paper should be revised, taking into consideration the ExCo discussion, inputs from CDC, and the paper on the same subject by iSC tabled at ExCo2. Greater clarity should be brought to definitions and typology, especially with respect to differences between center core programs, SWPs and CPs. The revised paper should be circulated to ExCo for comments.*
- *CGIAR members are encouraged to fund the core of SWPs they support. The World Bank and other donors are encouraged to make funding available for program facilitation activities in order to ensure the sustainability of these programs.*

3.c. International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources

At the invitation of ExCo, Geoff Hawtin provided a briefing on the treaty, the conclusions of the CGIAR's Genetic Resources Policy Committee, and the outcome of a CGIAR workshop on the treaty held at IRRI in January 2002. He also provided an update on the establishment of the Global Conservation Trust.

Discussion:

- CGIAR member countries should be informed of discussions going on at the center level on the treaty.
- The planned review of GRPC should consider the implications of the treaty for the CGIAR and the role of GRPC.
- The roles and funding sources for center genebanks, genebanks of NARS, and IPGRI would need to be assessed carefully when the Global Conservation Trust becomes operational.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo thanked Geoff Hawtin for an informative briefing.*
- *The strategy of launching the Global Conservation Trust at WSSD should be carefully assessed in the light of the confirmed level of funding then (preferably if it reaches \$100 million) and ability to create a high-level profile.*

3.d. World Summit on Sustainable Development

Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider provided an overview of actions taken/planned by the CGIAR during the preparatory process for the summit and WFS+5 (activities, publications, exhibits). Bongiwe Njobe briefed the members about the concerns of the South Africa delegation during the prepcom meetings and the current plans for hosting the summit in Johannesburg.

Discussion:

- WFS+5 and WSSD present excellent opportunities to put agriculture back on "the map." Significant progress has already been made on this matter, especially in the U.S.A.

- WSSD presents an opportunity to showcase the programs of the CGIAR, including the CPs. The System is actively engaged with the preparatory processes.

Conclusions:

1. *Part of AGM2002 should be devoted to outcomes of WFS+5 and WSSD and their implications for the CGIAR.*
2. *Pilot CP proponents are encouraged to draw support to the CPs at the events.*

3.e. 2003 Planning

At AGM01 the CGIAR agreed that, with the switch from two meetings to one CGIAR meeting per year, the two-step financial planning calendar (approval of medium term work plans at MTM, followed by approval of financing plans at ICW) should be replaced by simultaneous approval of the medium term work plans and financial plans at each AGM, with major revision of a MTP requiring review and recommendation by the interim Science Council. It also asked the CGIAR Secretariat to prepare guidelines for 2003 planning under the oversight of the Executive Council. The Secretariat was also asked to provide more detailed figures in future CGIAR Financing Plans in terms of both programs and finance.

Francisco Reifschneider gave an overview of planning guidelines and the outline for 2003 planning. He reconfirmed the process to be used as follows:

- 1) The Secretariat will issue 2003 planning guidelines in June 2002, which confirm the continuation of existing documentation requirements for submission of the 2003-05 MTPs and 2003 financing plans by the Centers.
- 2) In financial terms, the starting point would be the actual funding outcome for 2001.
- 3) Centers would be expected to submit their MTPs to the System Office by September 9, 2002. The System Office will consolidate the Center proposals and prepare a financing plan for 2003 by AGM02. The consolidated financing plan will be issued by September 30, 2002.

It was noted that the World Bank had decided, consistent with its objective of providing stability to Center finances, that it would allocate about half of its total 2003 support on a matching basis, the other half would be largely allocated to Challenge Programs. This translates into a “matching rate” of 8% of all other contributions to individual Centers as compared with 10% in 2002.

Discussion:

- Concern was expressed about the negative impact of the planned reduction in WB matching funds on the availability of unrestricted funding.
- There are new opportunities for deepening and broadening the substantive linkages between the CGIAR and the WB (e.g., distance learning, knowledge management, investment strategies related to R&D, etc.). This is likely to be the case as well with regional development banks and IFAD.
- Close linkages should be maintained between the longer term science perspectives expected to be provided by the Science Council, once it is appointed, as Planning Context, and the more frequent medium term planning activities.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo endorsed the planning guidelines outlined by the Secretariat.*
- *WB, FAO, IFAD and regional development banks should explore ways of creating greater synergy between their programs and the Centers. An exploratory discussion could take place at the margins of the next AGM.*

3.f. Recent Developments at ICARDA

Adel El-Beltagy gave an overview of developments, opportunities and challenges at ICARDA and expressed his regrets that ExCo could not meet in Aleppo as planned. He also extended an invitation to ExCo to meet in Aleppo as soon as possible.

ExCo thanked Adel El-Beltagy for the informative presentation and congratulated ICARDA for the leadership it showed in mounting the CGIAR System-led consortium on Afghanistan.

Agenda Item 4. Governance Matters

4.a. ExCo Composition

ExCo discussed four separate sub-items under this agenda item:

- i) representation of civil society perspectives in the CGIAR and ExCo;
- ii) representation of Regional Development Banks in ExCo;
- iii) chairmanship of ExCo/FC; and
- iv) composition of ExCo/PC.

Representation of civil society perspectives in the CGIAR and ExCo

At its first meeting ExCo agreed that GFAR should be requested to examine the options for the most appropriate representation of civil society perspectives, including farmers' perspectives, in CGIAR deliberations. A paper prepared by GFAR was discussed. Options suggested included: (a) adding one more seat to ExCo; (b) alternating the civil society slot between NGOs and Farmers Organizations (with one serving as alternate for the other); (c) having GFAR, through its chair who is a member of ExCo, represent the views of farmers.

Discussion:

- The Global Farmers Science & Technology Committee, if and when formed through the auspices of GFAR, could represent the views of farmers in the CGIAR.
- The CGIAR should first aim at having the perspectives of farmers represented within the CGIAR stakeholder forum before considering the possibility of including a seat for farmers in ExCo. However, given the desire of the CGIAR to maintain ExCo as a small committee (expressed at AGM 01), increasing the size of ExCo should be approached very cautiously.
- Larger farmers are part of the private sector and could be represented in the CGIAR PSC.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo records its appreciation to GFAR for an excellent paper.*
- *The Secretariat should invite IFAP and via Campesina to the next AGM to start a process of engagement with them.*
- *GFAR Chair should report to ExCo on the status of setting up of a farmers science & technology committee.*
- *NGOC, PSC and GFAR/Regional Fora should consider how varying perspectives could best be covered in their committees (e.g., perspectives of small farmers, large farmers, indigenous peoples groups, consumer advocacy groups, etc.).*
- *The Stakeholder Meeting during the next AGM should include a discussion on the issue of representation of perspectives.*

Representation of Regional Development Banks in ExCo

Ian Johnson and Francisco Reifschneider clarified that, due to an omission, the regional development banks were not shown explicitly in the constituency groupings from which ExCo members are drawn. The Secretariat is asked to correct the record on this. Ian Johnson thanked Jacques Eckebil for bringing this to ExCo's attention.

Chairmanship of ExCo/FC

At the request of Jonathan Conly, ExCo discussed whether the chairmanship of ExCo/FC should be held by "the representative of the leading provider of funds to the regular budget of the CGIAR" (as stated in the current TOR for the committee) or by the World Bank.

Discussion:

- The WB plays a special role in the CGIAR. Because of the nature of its funding it should chair ExCo/FC. This would also ensure continuity.
- It is also important to avoid a misalignment between the chairmanship of ExCo/FC and the level of contribution to the CGIAR.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo should recommend to the CGIAR that the WB should be asked to chair ExCo/FC on a two-year renewable basis, with the chairmanship subject to review at the end of each two-year period. The TOR for ExCo/FC should be modified accordingly.*

Composition of ExCo/PC

Francisco Reifschneider informed ExCo that members of the CGIAR had raised a concern about the proposed and ExCo-endorsed composition of ExCo/PC—in that it did not include representation from SSA and other stakeholder groups. To address the issue an *ad hoc* working group was formed from within ExCo to review the issue and make a suggestion. The recommendation of the working group was endorsed by the ExCo.

Conclusions:

- *The composition of the inaugural ExCo/PC should be as follows: FAO, United States of America, Norway, Colombia, India, Nigeria, Egypt, representative of civil society organizations (currently NGOC Co-chair).*
- *CDC chair should attend the meetings as resource person. Other resource persons could be invited on as necessary.*
- *ExCo/PC composition should be submitted to the CGIAR for approval.*

4.b. Establishing SC

Francisco Reifschneider briefed ExCo on the status of establishing the ExCo working group which will provide advice on the transition from TAC to Science Council. A list of names of individuals nominated by ExCo members for the WG was distributed along with an indication of their availability and interest, along with a draft slate prepared by the Secretariat.

Discussion:

- It would be desirable to have perspectives from various regions reflected in the WG.
- Potential conflicts of interest should be assessed carefully in identifying WG members and resource persons.

Conclusions:

- *Mohamed Hassan should be asked to chair the WG.*
- *The WG Chair and CGIAR Director would jointly appoint the remaining members of the WG from among the candidates already identified by ExCo, taking into account comments made at ExCo2. ExCo members were asked to nominate additional names for consideration as WG members by April 24, 2002.*
- *The WG could invite the iSC Chair and other advisers as resource persons, when needed.*

4.c. Organizing the CGIAR System Office

Francisco Reifschneider, Meryl Williams and Emil Javier briefed ExCo on the progress in developing an integrated business plan (IBP) for the System Office. The outcome of the workshop held with the component units of the System Office was outlined, as well as the further work conducted by McKinsey & Co., the consultants engaged to assist with the process, to develop an IBP composed of a “business case” and an “integrated operating plan” for the System Office. A Steering Group was formed (with Ian Johnson, Francisco Reifschneider, Meryl Williams and Emil Javier as members) to lead the exercise. The CDC will discuss the progress and the draft plan at its meeting in May.

Conclusions:

- *Draft 1.0 of the System Office Business Plan should be circulated to ExCo members for their inputs.*

4.d. “Future Harvest” Brand Name for the CGIAR System

Meryl Williams introduced this item. She prefaced that the issue under consideration is about

developing a shared concept of a brand for the System—not to the organization called Future Harvest which is established as a foundation. She outlined why updating the image is needed (e.g., the name CGIAR is a “mouthful,” sounds bureaucratic, it would be good to have a new vigor for the new image of the CG, etc.) She also noted the risks of change (e.g., “CGIAR” is well known to traditional partners, there is resistance to change in the conservative agricultural research community, many formal agreements include the name CGIAR, short-term costs of change, etc.) She stressed the need for transitional arrangements which helps maintain the CGIAR name as well as preserve the momentum within parts of the System to shift to the use of “Future Harvest.”

Williams illustrated possible transitional options which combine the use of “CGIAR” and “Future Harvest” and, over time, shift completely to “Future Harvest.” This would parallel the transition ICLARM engineered in introducing “World Fish Center” as the brand name for ICLARM.

Discussion:

- Several members liked the idea of shifting to a user-friendly name, but cautioned that the name “CGIAR” should not be dropped (and no plans should be made to drop the name CGIAR.) If any decision is made on this, it should be to use both names.
- At the Group level the CGIAR has to remain with that identity.
- The brand name cannot be discussed separately from the organization called Future Harvest (the FH Foundation) because of the confusion between the two. If the name of the System were changed to “Future Harvest”, the System will face political difficulties in some international circles because of the erroneous attribution of the System’s coordination to a private U.S. foundation.
- None of the centers is willing to change its name to Future Harvest (e.g., Future Harvest—Rice, or Future Harvest—Fish).
- The Future Harvest name, since it doesn’t reflect the cultural diversity of the CGIAR (e.g., Chinese, Arabic, Latin languages and cultures) and its geographical fields of activities, could create problems for some donors and partners.
- There is great inconsistency among the centers in terms of the way they convey messages about the System and their participation in it (e.g., annual reports, publications, etc.).

Conclusions:

- *ExCo commended Meryl Williams for a lucid and compelling presentation.*
- *ExCo should not go to AGM unless something concrete can be agreed and suggested by ExCo on the brand name question.*
- *The centers and the Secretariat should first develop a uniform set of words through which the CGIAR System and its units are portrayed to the general public, building on the Johannesburg fact sheets prepared by a task force for the System. A small group could be set up to develop a proposal.*
- *If there is agreement to change the brand name for the System, it should be transitional, leading to the use of both names.*
- *The name of the Consultative Group should remain “CGIAR”.*

4.e. CGIAR Nominees on Center Boards

Selcuk Ozgediz introduced a paper which argued that a reform is needed in identifying CGIAR nominees appointed to center boards. He noted that change is needed in four areas: (1) in the objectives of the process—from a “repair mechanism” for improving member quality and diversity of perspectives, to fostering synergy among the objectives and policies of the components of the System; (2) in the way the CGIAR nominees are recruited; (3) in the way the nominees are selected; and (4) in the way the CG nominees are oriented to the CGIAR.

Moise Mensah noted that CBC will discuss the objectives and options and will report to ExCo on its view.

Discussion:

- The issue is broader than just selection. The role of the boards in the System requires study, as does the role and accountability of the Board Chair. Issues of conflict of interest also need to be explored, as well as recycling of members.
- The issue of transparency needs to be explored as well. Many public sector boards are moving towards this in terms of casting a wide net for pool of talent through public and open recruitment of some board members.
- Option 3 is not the way to go. The likely recommended option would be Option 2, but there are many details that need to be worked out (such as who covers the extra costs associated with CG nominees).
- The Secretariat’s Candidate Information Service database has not been yielding useful names for nominating committees of boards.
- Coherence of perspectives is important. A business case argument should be made to identify the perspectives that should be brought to bear on each board.

Conclusions:

- *The Secretariat should revise the paper in consultation with CBC and CDC. The paper should be broadened to include analysis of data on the current state of the boards. The revised draft should be discussed by ExCo before it is taken up by the CGIAR at the next AGM.*

4.f. ExCo Decision Making

Francisco Reifschneider sought advice from ExCo members on two key questions:

1. How can the Secretariat best support ExCo decision-making in a “virtual” mode?
2. What is the most efficient way for ExCo to appoint individuals to panels, committees and working groups?

With respect to the first question he noted that the Secretariat had been differentiating among degrees of consensus by using the terms “full consensus” and “broad consensus.”

Discussion:

- The virtual mode has worked well and should be continued.
- ExCo should shy away from defining consensus in a numerical way (e.g., “consensus minus one”).

- One or two people should not have a veto power. Otherwise ExCo (and the CGIAR) will not move forward with its agenda. Some degree of pragmatism is essential.
- Sometimes (especially when a member is traveling) there is insufficient time to respond. In these cases alternates should have the authority to respond. When there is adequate time to respond, silence should generally be accepted as consent.
- It is better to have consistency when decisions are made. One option is to frame each decision case in a common format, e.g.: “the issue is ‘a’, our recommendation is ‘b’, the pros and cons of the recommendation are ‘c’ and ‘d’, if you have an objection, send it by date ‘e’. The outcome could then be stated as, e.g., “the recommendation has been endorsed by consensus, but two members had reservations” or as “ there is no consensus decision as two members had strong objections.”

Conclusions:

- *ExCo should continue conducting much of its business through the virtual mode. It is important to maintain transparency and make progress towards a decision.*
- *If a member finds it impossible to discuss an issue in the virtual mode, he/she could suggest to have that item discussed in a face-to-face meeting.*
- *Members should be provided at least two weeks for comment/objection.*
- *ExCo members should inform the Secretariat about who their alternates are. Alternates should have the option to receive the same information as the ExCo members. But only one (either the member or the alternate, but not both) should speak for the constituency in ExCo discussions (virtual or face-to-face).*

Agenda Item 5. Evaluation

5.a. Progress Report on Review of GRPC

At its first meeting ExCo extended the term of the GRPC through 2002 and agreed to commission an external review of the Committee as a basis for further action. A two-person panel has been appointed (Carlos Corea, Chair, and Ian Bevege) and a terms-of-reference have been agreed. ExCo was pleased with the progress made on this item.

5.b. CIP EP MR

Francisco Reifschneider noted that this is the first time an EP MR report is being brought to the ExCo. iSC had discussed the report the week preceding the ExCo2 meeting. Discussion of the report (and decision-making on its follow-up) is scheduled for AGM02. The questions to be addressed by ExCo at this stage are (1) adequacy/quality of the EP MR for meeting the needs of the CGIAR, and (2) program and management questions of systemwide relevance raised by the Panel. The iSC also expressed its concern that CCERs were not bringing down the cost and time of EP MRs.

Emil Javier summarized the reactions of iSC to the EP MR. He noted that, in general, CIP is commended for its past achievements. Of the 19 recommendations made by the panel all but one were accepted by CIP. CIP needs to clarify its institute-wide vision, its priorities, and position in

the research-development continuum, in close collaboration with its stakeholders. The high global demand for roots and tubers is not reflected in CIP's funding that has been falling. Some NARS are finding that the flow of the CIP germplasm is being hampered by quarantine requirements and a question was raised as to whether CIP could use its regional offices to free up the flow.)

Selçuk Özgediz reported on the findings of the EPMR on governance and management . He noted that several of the recommendations of the previous EPMR are repeated in this EPMR, pointing to a need for closer follow-up of the recommendations.

Discussion:

- The Board's performance in oversight of budget and finance matters appears to have been less than satisfactory—at least judging by the declining levels of working capital.
- Grievance procedures and transparency of compensation systems are two areas that may need to be addressed at the System level.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo took note of the EPMR and expressed concern about the rejection of the Panel's recommendation on restructuring the potato breeding work at CIP, although it noted that CIP had recently restructured and does not want to do so again. The CCER planned by the Board should not wait until 2006.*
- *Issues such as follow-up of review recommendations, mechanisms for handling grievances, and transparency of information on compensation are systemwide concerns and should be taken up separately from this review.*
- *As ExCo members had not studied the full report, the Council's recommendations for follow-up action by the CGIAR regarding this review will be formulated subsequently.*

5.c. Progress Report on EPMRs

Emil Javier briefed ExCo on the scheduled EPMRs and external reviews of SWPs. He noted that the ISNAR EPMR is in mid-course and its report would be ready for discussion by the CGIAR at AGM02. The IPGRI EPMR, to be chaired by Michael Gale, is in an advanced planning stage. These would be followed, in 2003, with the program review of ICRISAT, to be chaired by Paul Vlek. Among the reviews of SWPs, the review of the SWP on IPM was just completed and that of CAPRI is ongoing. ISC is in the planning stage for the reviews of AS & B and FPR & GA. A stripe study of training is also in process. Regarding review processes, Emil Javier noted that iSC is working on a paper on the guardianship of science quality and relevance which describes its views on how planning and reviews should be approached in the CGIAR.

Selçuk Özgediz added that, with the completion of the IPGRI EPMR, joint program and management reviews of centers would come to an end.

Discussion:

- While reviews of past performance are important from the standpoint of accountability, the SC should place greater emphasis on forward looking activities.

- Reviews conducted on behalf of the CGIAR are a big asset of the CGIAR. They are indispensable for small donors who cannot afford to mount their own reviews.
- The WGSC should examine the role of the future Science Council in the area of evaluation and make recommendations.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo took note of the progress in EPMRs. Lessons learned from ongoing EPMRs should be used in planning future reviews, including reviews of CPs.*
- *ISC should bear in mind the balance between reviews and forward looking activities.*
- *The Secretariat should bring to ExCo recommendations on how reviews of governance, management and finance could be handled most efficiently in the future.*

5.d. Evaluation of CGIAR Secretariat

ExCo is one of the primary “clients” of the CGIAR Secretariat. For greater transparency and accountability the Chairman sought views of ExCo members about the service provided to it by the Secretariat (quality, accuracy, timeliness, consensus building, etc.) This was discussed by ExCo in the absence of ExCo Executive Secretary and staff from the CGIAR Secretariat.

The members of ExCo conveyed a generally very positive appreciation of the service being provided by the Secretariat to ExCo. The Chairman summarized by indicating that it would be useful to design quality standards to be expected from the Secretariat and also to undertake structured feedback as part of the annual evaluation process. The World Bank’s system held standard forms for this.

5.e. World Bank OED Evaluation of the CGIAR

Ian Johnson noted that this “meta” evaluation of the CGIAR is being carried out as part of the Bank’s examination of global public goods programs it is engaged with (the CGIAR being the largest among these.) The OED team, led by Uma Lele, is expected finish its work in 3-4 weeks.

Agenda Item 6. Economic Performance and Short-term Prospects of CIP

Francisco Reifschneider noted that this item was included at the request of CIP, which would like to inform the Executive Council on the economic performance and the short-term prospects of the center. In a letter to ExCo, the DG has summarized the funding problems faced by CIP and requests the Executive Council to allocate US\$ 0.7 M to allow CIP to cope with the downsizing process and allow it to get back in financial health.

Discussion:

- There are other centers that are experiencing similar difficulties. Singling out CIP for emergency assistance would not be appropriate, especially since CIP had sought and received similar assistance in 2000.
- The previous EPMR recommended that the Board monitor liquidity and operating fund levels and to attain prudent and reasonable levels, which the Board had agreed with. It is

disconcerting to see that prudent targets have not been attained over five years, especially since the Chair of previous EPMR is presently serving as the Chair of CIP Board.

- One should distinguish between crises that emerge from external shocks (such as fluctuations in currency) from those that appear to imply inadequate planning and supervision of financial resources . The latter should not be rewarded. Specifically, it is difficult to understand why CIP does not yet have adequate reserves, despite existing policies encouraging Centers to build reserves and the decade long tenure of current CIP management.
- The letter states that the assistance will help CIP to increase its future income, which could be interpreted as “growing your way out of a problem.” The need may be for a structural solution, not for emergency relief.
- ExCo has no funds to allocate. There will be a need to develop guidelines for handling cases like this if this were to become a recurring phenomenon.

Conclusions:

- *The Chairman should convey the sentiment of ExCo’s discussion to CIP.*
- *Additionally, the Chairman should write to all centers stressing the need to follow CGIAR recommendations on reserves. This has become increasingly important as the data presented in the 2001 Financial Report indicate dangerously low levels of working capital at some Centers, requiring prompt remedial action.*

Agenda Item 7. Planning ExCo Business

Francisco Reifschneider reviewed the ExCo business agenda and timetable, including progress made in oversight of the CGIAR Reform Program. He noted that tasks added to the ExCo business agenda would be reflected in a revised timetable and forwarded to members.

The draft record of ExCo2 is likely to be sent to members on April 26, 2002. Comments are due by May 10, 2002.

ExCo/PC and ExCo/FC had been scheduled to have an organizational meeting during ExCo2, attended only by members who are from within the ExCo. In view of the changes in ExCo PC’s composition, and the desire to have the initial meetings with full membership, the planned meetings were cancelled.

Agenda Item 8. Future Meetings

ExCo agreed to continue conducting its business in a virtual mode. The next meeting of ExCo is scheduled to be held just before AGM02. Provided the CGIAR approves ExCo recommendations on ExCo FC/PC, the inaugural meetings of these committees would be held at ExCo3.

In case the business requires a face-to-face meeting to discuss papers to be forwarded to the CGIAR at AGM02, the next ExCo meeting will take place September 23-24, 2002 at a venue to be identified.

Agenda Item 9. Other Business

9.a. Criteria for Assessing CPs

Emil Javier clarified that the notes circulated to ExCo members on criteria for assessing CPs at the start of the ExCo meeting on April 16, 2002 reflect only a re-categorization of the CGIAR-endorsed criteria and not a revision. ExCo agreed that the CP process should be steered using the CGIAR approved guidelines and criteria. It would be useful to brief the CGIAR at AGM02 on what was learned during the first year of the CP process that should be taken into account in planning the next stages.

9.b. CGIAR AGM2002

Francisco Reifschneider informed ExCo that AGM02 would be held in Manila at the invitation of Philippines and IRRI. The AGM is scheduled for three days during the week of October 28-November 1, 2002, preceded by a "Philippines Day ." A detailed schedule will follow.

Meryl Williams issued an invitation to ExCo members to visit ICLARM after AGM02. A program is being organized tentatively for Monday and Tuesday following the AGM (November 4-5, 2002).

Draft Agenda

1. Opening Session

- I. Johnson's introduction
- Election of Meeting Co-Chair
- Adoption of the agenda

2. CGIAR Status Report

- Report from F. Reifschneider (overview of developments in governance, finance, communications, gender and diversity)
- 2001 Financial Report (E. Sayegh, ICLARM)
- Discussion

3. Program Matters

3.a. Challenge Programs

- Report from E. Javier and F. Reifschneider
 - Pilot Process: Progress report, lessons learned, next steps
 - Regular process: Progress report, call for pre-proposals, next steps
- Discussion

3.b. Systemwide Programs/Initiatives

- Reform proposal developed by CDC/System Office
- Discussion

3.c. International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources

- Briefing by G. Hawtin
- Discussion

3.d. World Summit on Sustainable Development

- Briefing on CGIAR involvement and desired outcome
- Discussion

3.e. 2003 Planning

- Introduction (F. Reifschneider)
 - 2003 Planning Guidelines
 - Outline of 2003 CGIAR Financing Plan
- Discussion

3.f. Recent Developments at ICARDA

- A. El Beltagy

4. Governance Matters

4.a. ExCo Composition

- Representation from Civil Society/NGOs/Farmers' Organizations (GFAR paper introduced by R. Paroda)
- Representation from Regional Development Banks (introduction by J. Ekebil)
- Chairmanship of FC (introduction by USAID)
- Composition of PC
- Discussion

4.b. Establishing SC

- Progress report on establishing the WG
- ExCo guidance to Working Group

4.c. Organizing the CGIAR System Office

- Progress report (F. Reifschneider, M. Williams, E. Javier)
- Discussion and ExCo guidance

4.d. "Future Harvest" Brand Name for the CGIAR System

- Introduction (M. Williams)
- Discussion

4.e. CGIAR Nominees on Center Boards

- Review of Status and Options (S. Özgediz, M. Mensah)
- Discussion

4.f. ExCo Decision Making

- Review of experience to date (F. Reifschneider)
- Discussion of ways of improving the process

5. Evaluation

5.a. Progress report on review of GRPC

5.b. CIP EPMR

- Briefing on outcome (E. Javier)
- Discussion and ExCo guidance to PC/FC

5.c. Progress report on EPMRs

- Introduction (E. Javier, S. Özgediz)
- Discussion

5.d. Evaluation of the CGIAR Secretariat

5.e World Bank OED Evaluation of the CGIAR

6. Economic Performance and the Short-Term Prospects of CIP

-- Discussion of letter from the Director General of CIP

7. Planning ExCo Business

-- Review of ExCo business agenda and timetable

-- Assignments to PC and FC

8. Future Meetings

-- Date and venue of next meeting

9. Other business

9.a. Criteria for Assessing CPs

9.b. CGIAR AGM02

10. Closing Session

List of Participants
Second Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chairman:</i>	Ian Johnson	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Jacques Eckebil	FAO
	Shawki Barghouti	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>CDC:</i>	Meryl Williams	CDC Chair
<i>CBC:</i>	Moise Mensah	CBC Vice-chair
<i>TAC/SC:</i>	Emil Javier	TAC/SC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Raj Paroda	GFAR Chair
<u>OECD/DAC</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Jonathan Conly	U.S.
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Tishinori Mitsunaga	Japan
<i>Europe</i>	Gilles Saint-Martin	France
	Ruth Haug	Norway
	Klaus Winkel	Denmark
<u>Developing Countries</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Marcio Porto	Brazil
<i>SSA</i>	Bongiwe Njobe	South Africa
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Longyue Zhao	China (could not attend)
<i>CWANA</i>	Issam El-Zaim	Syria (could not attend)
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Mustafa Yaghi	AARINENA (could not attend)
<u>Foundations</u>	Robert Herdt	Rockefeller F. (could not attend)
<u>Partners</u>		
<i>Civil Society</i>	Ann Waters-Bayer	NGOC Co-Chair
<i>Private Sector</i>	Sam Dryden	PSC Chair
<i>Executive Secretary, ExCo:</i>	Francisco Reifschneider	
<i>Secretariat Support:</i>	Selçuk Özgediz	
	Ravi Tadvalkar	
	Jason Yauney	
<u>Invitees</u>	Adel El Beltagy	ICARDA
	Geoff Hawtin	IPGRI
	Edward Sayegh	ICLARM
<u>Observers</u>	Rob Bertram	USAID
	Robert Bordonaro	FAO
	Shantanu Mathur	IFAD
	Shellemiah Keya	iSC Secretariat
	Amir Kassam	iSC Secretariat