

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Fourth Meeting of the Executive Council

May 16-17, 2003

Paris

Summary Record of Proceedings



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
June 6, 2003*

New Technology Tested at ExCo4

During the Fourth Meeting of the Executive Council, members tested a new technology (called CSAPro™) allowing participants to express agreement or disagreement (on a scale from 1 to 7) with statements about the meeting or an agenda item. After each agenda item, members used the technology to provide feedback on four aspects of how the item was handled: (1) sufficiency of time allocated to that item; (2) adequacy of information provided; (3) adequacy of the discussion (i.e., whether all major substantive issues were covered); and (4) accuracy of the summarized outcome. Members also provided feedback on the usefulness of the new technology. A summary of the results is shown in Attachment 4, and more in depth statistical results are available on the web at http://www.cgiar.org/who/wwa_excodocs.html.

All documents for ExCo4 are available at <http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco4docs.html>

Acronyms Used

AGM	Annual General Meeting
CAPRi	Collective Action and Property Rights
CBC	Committee of Board Chairs
CDC	Center Directors Committee
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CIP	Centro Internacional de la Papa
CODE	Committee on Development Effectiveness
CP	Challenge Program(s)
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
DG	Director General
EMR	External Management Review
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
EPR	External Program Review
ExCo	Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FC	ExCo Finance Committee
G & D	Gender and Diversity
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
IAC	Inter Academy Council
IARC	International Agricultural Research Center
ICRAF	International Center for Research in Agroforestry (World Agroforestry Center)
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
ILCA	International Livestock Center for Africa
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
INIBAP	International Network for the Improvement of Banana and Plantain
IPGRI	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
iSC/SC	Interim Science Council/Science Council
IRT	ISNAR Restructuring Team
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MTM	Mid-term Meeting
NARS	National Agricultural Research System

NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NGOC	Non-Governmental Organizations Committee
NRM	Natural Resources Management
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OED	Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank
PA	Public Awareness
PARC	Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee
PC	ExCo Program Committee
PSC	Private Sector Committee
RM	Resource Mobilization
RO	Regional Organization
SC	Science Council
SNC	Search and Nomination Committee
SPIA	Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SRO	Sub-regional Organization
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TAC/iSC	Technical Advisory Committee/interim Science Council
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSBF	Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Program
UN	United Nations
WARDA	West Africa Rice Development Association
WB	World Bank
WG	Working Group

Contents

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session.....	1
Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report.....	1
Agenda Item 3. Governance Matters	5
3.a. Establishing SC	5
3.c. iSC/SC and Secretariat Financing	7
Agenda Item 4. Evaluation.....	8
4.a. ISNAR EPMR Follow-up	8
3.b. Appointing CGIAR-nominees on Center Boards	11
4.b. CGIAR External Reviews	12
4.c. World Bank OED Meta-Evaluation.....	13
Agenda Item 5. Program Matters	15
5.a. Pilot CPs—Progress Reports.....	15
5.b. Pilot CPs—Proposal on Genetic Diversity	16
5.c. Challenge Programs—Regular Process	18
5.d. Challenge Programs—Strategic Framework	19
5.e. Study on S & T Strategies for Africa by Inter Academy	19
Agenda Item 6. Update on WARDA	20
Agenda Item 7. Planning ExCo Business	20
Agenda Item 8. Other Business	21
8.a. CGIAR Compensation	21
8.b. CBC/CDC Joint Statement	22
8.c. Future Harvest Review.....	22
8.d. Updates on PSC and NGOC	23
Agenda Item 9. Closing Session.....	23
Attachments:	
List of Participants	24
Revised Agenda	26
Working Group on Performance Measurement	29
ExCo Member Feedback.....	30

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

Welcome by Government of France

Elisabeth Beton-Delegue, Director for Scientific Cooperation, University and Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, welcomed the ExCo to Paris. She highlighted France-CGIAR cooperation and expressed continued French support to the CGIAR.

Chairman's Introduction

Ian Johnson formally opened the meeting. New members were introduced and regrets from those who could not attend were recorded. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1)

Election of Meeting Co-Chair

Luis Arango (Colombia) was nominated and elected co-chair of the meeting.

Adoption of Agenda

The draft agenda was adopted with some changes and additions (Revised Agenda in Attachment 2).

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report

Francisco Reifschneider presented an overview on the CGIAR reform program, funding, communications initiatives, review of the Partnership Committees, and follow-up to the review of the GRPC. The first three items were for information only, and the latter two required action by ExCo.

CGIAR Reform Program, Funding, Communications

- *Reform program:* Efforts are on track for the four initial pillars of reform, and reform in other areas are moving ahead as well. This includes progress on development of a CGIAR charter, which will be circulated to the entire Group, training/orientation programs being developed in cooperation with the CBC and CDC, and establishment of a working group on performance measurement. The working group's task will be to bring options to the table, which will be discussed by ExCo and the CGIAR. (Composition of the working group is in Attachment 3)
- *Funding:* The current stable environment is expected to continue. Total funding for 2002 was \$357 million. Like last year, the 2002 Financial Report was co-produced by the WorldFish Center and the Secretariat.

- *Communications:* Several initiatives are planned in 2003, including organizing public awareness events and publications. Events for 2003 include the World Water Forum in Kyoto, and AGM03 in Nairobi, Kenya. The 2002 Annual Report is in production, as are other corporate and partnership brochures, and a redesigned e-CG News newsletter has been launched.

Review of Partnership Committees

Following the decision at AGM02 to conduct a review of the Partnership Committees (Private Sector and NGO), ExCo developed and approved terms of reference for the review to be conducted by a panel, assisted by an advisory group. Nominations for panel members were received from a variety of sources, including members of PSC and NGOC (current and former), ExCo, and System Office staff. Eight nominations were received for the Chair position, 5 nominations for panel members for private sector issues, 21 nominations for panel members for NGO issues, and 4 nominations of individuals to serve on an advisory group. The panel is expected to submit its report to ExCo by mid-September 2003. ExCo was requested to endorse the proposed panel and advisory group, made up of the following:

Panel:

Keith Bezanson, Canada, (Chair)
Sunita Narain, India
Gerhard Prante, Germany

Advisory Group:

Hans-Jochen de Haas, Germany
Ruth Haug, Norway
Hamid Narjisse, Morocco
Eliseo Ponce, Philippines

Discussion:

- The Private Sector Committee Chair stated that the PSC welcomes this review and encourages ExCo to cooperate and contribute to the review. It highly endorses the process and agrees with the proposed panel.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo endorsed the composition of the proposed panel and advisory group.*

GRPC Review Follow-up

The recommendations of the GRPC review panel were endorsed at ExCo3 and by the CGIAR at AGM02. However, there were a number of issues arising from the panel's recommendations, mainly in regard to the role and organization of a new GRPC.

To address these issues, the System Office sought the advice of a working group. The issues and recommendations are highlighted in the document, "Organization of a New

CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee.”¹ ExCo was asked to endorse the recommendations of the working group.

Discussion:

- John Vercoe asked if the omission of CBC from membership of the GRPC was an oversight. Francisco Reifschneider confirmed that it was an oversight and suggested including CBC in the proposed membership.
- One member inquired if ExCo is comfortable not having a legal expert on the committee. In its present composition, the committee seems weak without such representation because a broad range of legal issues need to be considered and oftentimes the committee may not even know when there is a legal issue that needs to be addressed. Another member countered by noting that, as this is a committee of experts, one or more of the experts identified would have a legal background.
- Several members suggested that there should be two (not one) donor representatives in the committee.
- The GFAR Chair noted that GFAR could advise on selection of the member representing national genetic resources institutions.
- It was suggested that the language used should clearly state that the experts on the Committee are “identified by” rather than serving as “representatives of” the various institutions.

Conclusions:

- *There was consensus on the Committee’s importance, but members expressed the need to tighten the TOR for the Committee. In forming the committee, a balance should be sought between representation of perspectives and coverage of the needed areas of expertise. At least one of the members should have expertise in legal matters.*
- *The Committee is advisory in nature, and not representative.*
- *ExCo agreed with the proposed composition, with the addition of a CBC representative and two donor representatives.*
- *GFAR should advise on the selection of members from the national genetic resources institutions.*

2002 Financial Report

Edward Sayegh presented the draft 2002 CGIAR Financial Report. The overall 2002 results confirm that the CGIAR achieved its financial targets. Total expenditures of \$369 million for the 16 centers were virtually on target. Member funding for center programs totaled \$346 million, center income was \$13 million, resulting in a deficit of approximately \$10 million. Net assets for the System declined by \$14 million to \$175 million in 2002, the result of the deficit of \$10 million and \$4 million in asset write-downs. Overall, however, the CGIAR’s financial position remained strong at the end of

¹ Available on the CGIAR website at <http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco4docs.html>

the year as liquidity indicators, such as cash, working capital, and current ratio, remained healthy.

The increase in contributions in 2002 came mainly from two member groups: Europe increased by \$16.1 million (12 percent) and North America by \$8.6 million (15 percent). In addition, multi-donors and non-CGIAR members increased their contributions by \$3 million (13 percent). These increases were partially offset by decreases in support from the Pacific Rim of \$12 million (32 percent) and a smaller reduction from developing countries.

Overall personnel costs stabilized at 49 percent of total expenditures in 2002, compared to an average of 55 percent for the years prior to 2002. However, there are still large variations among the centers in personnel costs. The total number of staff continued to decline from 8,501 in 2001 to 7,752 in 2002, an overall reduction of 9 percent.

The 2002 results confirm the continued stability of CGIAR finances in the aggregate. As in the last several years, however, there are wide differences in financial performance among the 16 centers. This suggests a need for continued vigilance at both the center and System levels. In view of recent attention to issues of corporate governance worldwide, the CGIAR finance professionals and the CGIAR Secretariat have launched a major review of the CGIAR Accounting Guidelines. This review will lead to an update of the CGIAR accounting manual for approval by the Group. The guidelines will contain scorecard indicators with targets for center-level financial indicators, e.g., on deficit, personnel costs, working capital, and equity.

Specific recommendations on compliance and accountability include the following:

- Strengthen Compliance to Established Standards
 - Establish at the System level a function for monitoring compliance to System guidelines by ALL centers, similar to the approach used in other initiatives, e.g., CIO, Human Resources, Internal Audit. This would be a quality assurance/preventative mechanism for avoiding any possible financial or management shocks in the System.
- Centers Operate at Internationally Recognized Standards
 - International standards such as ISO9001:2000 and others will give assurance and more confidence to donors, partners and general public in center management operating at certified international standards;
 - Emulating certain management practices from the business world and by creating and sharing best practices, centers can have a far greater impact on their operations and delivery of results.
- Modern approaches to Leadership and Management
 - Centers should challenge their concepts of management to ensure that they meet the best business approaches/practices.

2003 Financing Status

Ravi Tadvalkar gave an update on the status of 2003 Financing. A program of \$358 million was approved at AGM02. In addition, \$11 million was approved for the two approved Pilot CPs for a total 2003 program of \$369 million. So far, indications for increases in contributions have been received from Canada, Netherlands, and Norway.

Discussion:

- Several members commended E. Sayegh for an excellent report that paints a clear picture of the financial health of the CGIAR System.
- Sam Dryden noted that the presentation gives a sense of the magnitude of problems in the System, especially problems of individual centers and the effect they have on the whole System.
- An important point brought out in the presentation is that prudent financial management in one center is the business not only of that center, but impacts the whole System. Therefore, the System should be interested in the financial management of all centers.

Conclusions:

ExCo agreed with the following follow-up actions:

- *Establish clarity on definitions, e.g. core/non-core resources, restricted/unrestricted funds, and an analysis of minimum level of funding that is necessary to maintain a viable program on the core business of the center. The ExCo Finance Committee should examine the first two, and CDC should analyze the third and bring suggestions to ExCo for discussion before they are taken to the CGIAR.*
- *The CGIAR Chairman should write to the board of the centers under performing in financial terms and request a specific plan of action to improve the situation.*
- *Explore establishment of an appropriate compliance mechanism that can be taken to AGM03 for discussion.*
- *Address the “small donor syndrome,” (i.e., contributors of small amounts—numbering around 250 donors). Look into how many there are, what value they bring, and ways to reduce transaction costs through contracts or wholesaling.*

Agenda Item 3. Governance Matters

3.a. Establishing SC

Mohamed Hassan, Chair, Science Council Search and Nominations Committee (SNC), briefed members on the current status of the Science Council search process. At its meeting on 5-6 May 2003, it identified some excellent candidates for chair and members, but agreed the committee needs more time to seek more information for a thorough assessment of some of the candidates and fill in gaps that were identified in the mix. It agreed that the deadline for further evaluation of promising candidates and for receiving

CVs of other possible candidates should be extended to June 20, 2003. Its final meeting would be the week of 21-25 July to interview new candidates and to reach a conclusion.

Discussion:

- CBC encourages the committee to be even more proactive and aggressive in searching for further candidates. Perhaps time requirements for the Chair should not be rigid and candidates who would be available at 50-60 percent time should be pursued.
- Several members commented that, in the event a preferred candidate for SC Chair were available on terms different from those originally advertised, the CGIAR membership could be asked to approve the new terms when considering the recommended candidate.
- Other members were not convinced that the search effort should be extended in light of the comment by Prof. Hassan that “excellent” candidates have been identified. They stressed that additional time would be necessary only to reach a conclusion, not to continue the search.
- If the search effort were to be extended, the process should be completely open and transparent and the criteria applied equally to all candidates, old and new.
- FAO noted that, although the first part of the search process identified good candidates, perhaps the search wasn’t far reaching enough and took place in too much of a compressed timeframe. ExCo should help facilitate further search that broadens the scope and deepens the pool of candidates.
- iSC Chair Emil Javier pointed out that two current iSC members are to stay on for the transition. Since the process is going to be delayed and the current iSC members are very busy, he asked that the process of identifying two current members to stay on not be delayed.
- Francisco Reifschneider explained that a note on the search process sent to the CGIAR in January included a tentative timetable. Since this timetable can not be adhered to, there would be need to go back to the CGIAR for endorsement of the timetable proposed by M. Hassan on no-objection basis, and for extending the terms of the current iSC members to September 15 to ensure there would be no gaps in the transition.
- M. Hassan invited ExCo members to help the process by recommending new candidates or by convincing candidates, who had earlier declined to stand, to agree to be considered. He noted that the current gaps included women candidates and candidates from developing countries, particularly from Africa and Latin America. At the same time, other candidates shouldn’t be excluded since the Committee is looking for the best possible candidates.

Conclusions:

- *Extending the search process is supported, with the target date for consideration of candidates moved to June 20. The CGIAR should be informed of this window of opportunity provided by the Committee to put forward any additional names for consideration. The TOR of the Committee would remain the same. The Committee is encouraged to be flexible in order to attract the best candidates.*

- *To ensure that there are no gaps in the transition from iSC to SC, the term of the current iSC should be extended to 15 September, 2003.*

3.c. iSC/SC and Secretariat Financing

Currently, iSC/SC and its Secretariat are financed by the Co-sponsors. The Co-sponsors have asked ExCo to consider alternative financing options. Dietrich Leihner introduced the item and explained the need for FAO to have a solid, reliable basis for financing the operations of the SC and its secretariat. He noted that equal funding by the co-sponsors has proven to be difficult—if not impossible. Another option would be for the co-sponsors to share funding responsibility with other donors. FAO is open to any sensible agreement. The pool of resources contributed by donors other than FAO could be distributed by the CGIAR Secretariat to the Science Council Trust Fund administered by FAO.

Discussion:

- Kevin Cleaver observed that the overhead and management of the System should be financed by the membership. The use of a trust fund, which is already set up, should be pursued. As agreed, the World Bank would provide finance in the interim, until a new mechanism is set up.
- Rod Cooke stated that the key is to identify what is to be financed and by whom. IFAD agrees that a more reasonable and sustainable financing mechanism needs to be implemented, especially to ensure an effective SC. This should draw on overhauling of the total CGIAR portfolio.
- Klaus Winkel suggested an approximate 3 percent “tax” be imposed on all contributions to the System to be used for financing of the System’s overhead, including the costs of iSC/SC and its Secretariat.
- Other members agreed on the need for adequate and sustainable financing for an effective SC and stressed the need for developing workable financing modalities for consideration by members.
- Several members remarked that consideration of new funding modalities for SC and its Secretariat (and perhaps the CGIAR Secretariat) would necessitate re-definition of the role of the Co-sponsors in the System.

Conclusions:

- *FAO was requested and it accepted to lead an effort (in collaboration with other co-sponsors) to develop options for building a trust fund for supporting SC and SC Secretariat activities, covering:*
 - a. estimated costs of future SC operations;*
 - b. an equitable financing scheme involving members; and,*
 - c. implications for the future role of the co-sponsors.*
- *The suggestions from the Cosponsors should be considered by ExCo and presented to the CGIAR membership for discussion at AGM2003.*

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation

4.a. ISNAR EPMR Follow-up

Grant Scobie, Chair of the ISNAR Restructuring Team (IRT) appointed by ExCo, presented the report of the Team. His main points were:

- The team interprets the Group's request that ISNAR should not be phased out as a directive that an ISNAR program—but not necessarily an ISNAR center—should be preserved.
- To ensure programmatic continuity, the team recommends that a distinct ISNAR program should be operated through an alliance with IPGRI.
- ISNAR should not function as a free standing CGIAR center, and the governance responsibilities of ISNAR's Board of Trustees should be transferred to the IPGRI Board.
- The IPGRI-ISNAR program should have its headquarters in Addis Ababa or Pretoria.
- These arrangements are analogous to those agreed by the CGIAR for the merger of INIBAP with IPGRI.

At the request of Ian Johnson, Ravi Tadvalkar briefed ExCo on the financial status of ISNAR. In 2002 ISNAR was the smallest CGIAR center (about US\$8 million in total contributions). It had spent about 60 percent of its resources on personnel and had closed the year with a deficit of about US\$1 million. Its reserves were equal to about 14 days operating expenses. ISNAR had started 2003 in financial difficulty and the prospects for much improved funding did not look bright.

Discussion:

- The Chairman and several speakers commended the Restructuring Team for a well-argued, clear report. Following a rich discussion by ExCo members, several recommendations of the report were endorsed by ExCo, while no consensus was reached on the others. The agreed recommendations are noted in the Conclusions section below.
- CBC Chair John Vercoe reported to ExCo he had been informed that ISNAR had just received funding for a \$15 million program with NARS on biosafety. Franklin Moore clarified that this funding was for a very specific purpose over a five-year period and will not solve ISNAR's financial problems. Mr. Vercoe noted that the ISNAR Board should have been given an opportunity to provide a response to ExCo on the IRT report and that the Board response and the IRT report should form one document. The Chairman remarked that the ISNAR Board actively participated in the work of the IRT, having its Board chair and another Board member on the Team.
- CDC Chair Adel El-Beltagy commented that the IRT should not have considered an option that amounts to dissolving ISNAR, given the conclusions reached at AGM02. He also inquired why ISNAR had not been invited to the ExCo meeting. He urged that decisions on ISNAR be taken swiftly in order not to prolong uncertainty and suffering by staff.

- Ms. Bongiwe Njobe noted that South Africa’s headquarters agreement with ISNAR applies to ISNAR as a separate legal entity, and not as one that is to be subsumed under another center. The agreement would need to be re-negotiated under another governance arrangement.
- Several speakers expressed concern about the proposed merger with IPGRI. They noted that there was little in common in the missions and programs of the two centers. Also, the IPGRI-INIBAP arrangement had stronger programmatic rationale than the one proposed for ISNAR because of the programmatic synergy that exists between INIBAP and IPGRI.
- Concern was raised also about the location of the hubs of the two proposed program themes: the program on Organization and Management from the headquarters in SSA and the program on Institutional Change from Rome. If ISNAR is to be rebuilt, it would have a greater chance to succeed if it starts from a single location, preferably in SSA, but with a global mandate and operating in a decentralized, network mode. Given the expected small size of the future ISNAR program, critical mass considerations would also dictate operating from one headquarters location. Grant Scobie commented that the Institutional Change program would need to be built from the ground up, requiring ease of interaction with people at the cutting edge in the area of innovation systems, which Rome was better suited for. But other options could be considered.
- Several members agreed with the IRT that alliance with another organization is the only feasible option for ISNAR. However, other alliance arrangements, such as the CIAT-TSBF merger which preserves the programmatic integrity of TSBF, should also be considered. CAPRI presents another model that is worth examination.
- Some members inquired why Nairobi was not considered as a headquarters location for the program. Grant Scobie responded that the CGIAR already has significant presence in Nairobi, that the DG-Designate comes from Kenya, and that ILRI’s Addis Ababa (old ILCA) campus or a Pretoria location would bring a great number of other advantages.
- Mohamad Roozitalab stressed that the Regional Organizations would like ISNAR to maintain its identity and have it operate with close links to ROs and SROs, including those outside Africa. Grant Scobie noted that this is precisely what the IRT had in mind. An Africa base would not limit ISNAR’s coverage. Luis Arango stressed that ISNAR should continue to have a global mandate .
- Sam Dryden noted that in the private sector you cannot always pick your merger partner. Also, preserving assets, such as ISNAR’s key people and the ISNAR brand name, should be looked at separately from dissolving the corporate entity.
- John Vercoe argued that, as the ISNAR Board has the legal responsibility for the organization, it should be asked to propose a transition plan in view of the ExCo views, for consideration by ExCo and the CGIAR. Others countered that, for all practical purposes, ISNAR was in “receivership” and that the CGIAR had expressed less than full confidence in the Board and management of ISNAR with its decision at AGM2002 to appoint an *external* restructuring team. It would therefore be more prudent for ExCo to seek further advice from the same external team.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo commended Grant Scobie and the IRT for its work.*
- *ExCo reached consensus on some of the recommendations of the IRT; there was no consensus on the others. The recommendations endorsed by ExCo were the following (including amendments to the original text):*

Recommendation 1: Program

The IRT recommends that a restructured ISNAR program, with a global mandate, is built on two major themes.

- a. The primary theme should be to produce new knowledge, with strong international public good characteristics, which contributes to **institutional change** for enhancing the impact of agricultural research.*
- b. The secondary theme should be to enhance the performance of agricultural research institutions through attention to their **organization and management**, with a particular focus on Sub-Saharan Africa.*

Recommendation 2: Governance

The IRT recommends:

- a. that ISNAR should not remain as a free standing CGIAR center; and,*
- b. that governance of a restructured ISNAR program should be undertaken, as an identifiable entity, through alliances with one or more organizations.*

Recommendation 4: Location

The IRT recommends:

- a. that the ISNAR program be conducted in a decentralized manner;*
 - b. that headquarters and directorate be established in Sub-Saharan Africa, either in Addis Ababa or Pretoria;*
 - c. that the program on Organization and Management, on global matters, be led from the headquarters in SSA with appropriate linkages to ROs and SROs.*
- *ExCo agreed to ask the IRT to take on board ExCo's concerns and prepare a revised draft by mid-August 2003, focusing, in particular, on the recommendations on which there was no consensus in ExCo (i.e., Recommendations 3, 4.d and 5).*
 - *ExCo encourages IRT to revise its report in consultation with ExCo and the CGIAR members, in particular with the major donors of ISNAR. The Board of ISNAR is also encouraged to do creative thinking, keeping in mind the conclusions reached by ExCo, and share its thinking with IRT through the ISNAR Board members who serve on the IRT.*
 - *ExCo agreed to discuss the revised IRT report through a virtual meeting as soon as it is available and forward ExCo's recommendations for consideration by the CGIAR at or before AGM2003.*

3.b. Appointing CGIAR-nominees on Center Boards

At ExCo2 the Council considered a Secretariat note on the role and selection of “CGIAR nominees” to center Boards. The note argued that the current process no longer serves a useful purpose, suggested that the CGIAR and the centers should reform the process, and offered two options for change. ExCo requested more in-depth examination of the issue with analysis of data on the current state of the boards and suggested that the Secretariat revise the paper in consultation with CBC and CDC. Selçuk Özgediz presented the revised paper. He argued that the CGIAR should either discontinue the process (because the CGIAR nominees are only in name, not in function) or continue it with a different objective. A CGIAR nominee process could bring in corporate CGIAR perspectives to each board, promote greater alignment between CGIAR and center goals, and strengthen the boards’ expertise in the area of financial oversight. The CGIAR could either identify its nominees for appointment by each Board or have a short list of CGIAR-identified nominees from which a board could choose. The CGIAR nominees would continue to be briefed on System issues after they are appointed by the Board, but they would not report back to the CGIAR.

Summarizing the CBC position, John Vercoe argued that the Boards should have only one “class” of members, and that they should all serve to further the interests of the CGIAR. The members of the CGIAR should have means to directly nominate individuals to a Board. In addition, the Boards would expand efforts to identify potential Board members. All Board members should be oriented to the System and center issues through appropriate (System-, center- and regional-level) orientation programs. But, the Boards should have the final say on who becomes a Board member, as they have ultimate responsibility for the affairs of the center.

Discussion:

- A majority of the members stressed the need to have the corporate view reflected at the Board level. For this, the CGIAR nominee process should be maintained and strengthened. One member suggested that there should be at least two CGIAR nominees on each board, selected by the CGIAR, one with expertise in fiduciary management issues, and the other in program matters. Poor financial performance of some of the centers (as previously discussed at this ExCo meeting for 2002) reinforces the need for having at least one board member with solid expertise and experience in financial management.
- Several members also raised questions on the Board size, noting that some are too large (one Board having 18 members). This is an area where streamlining should be possible. One member pointed to the case of “board hoppers” and suggested that there should be a cap on the number of boards an individual could serve on. Jochen de Haas suggested that there is need for a broader discussion of the role and importance of boards by the CGIAR.
- All agreed that Board orientation programs should be deepened and strengthened. Host country representatives and ex-officio members serving on center boards should also participate.

- Agreeing with the Chairman, several speakers stressed the need for clear codes of conduct, conflict of interest, rotation policies for boards. John Vercoe noted that several centers have such policies and the CBC helps harmonize them (such as in the area of grievance procedures) and could provide a briefing to ExCo about these.

Conclusions and recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *The CGIAR should maintain and improve the CGIAR nominee process. Each center Board should have at least two members identified by the CGIAR and appointed by the Board. These members would be briefed by, but not report back to the CGIAR.*
- *The CBC should design a clear code of conduct for board membership, for discussion by ExCo. This should include, among others, policies on board size, rotation, conflict of interest, etc.*
- *The CBC and the System Office should strengthen and deepen orientation programs for all board members, not just CGIAR nominees.*
- *The current CGIAR nominee process should be suspended until an improved process is in place.*
- *A broader discussion by the CGIAR on all aspects of center governance should be planned.*

4.b. CGIAR External Reviews

This item had been added to the agenda at the request of a member who had requested information on where the CGIAR stands on external reviews, performance measurement, and evaluation in general. Francisco Reifschneider clarified the CGIAR-agreed responsibilities of various actors in the area of evaluation and impact assessment as a result of the Reform Program. He noted that ExCo is responsible for providing oversight of evaluation activities on behalf of the Group, with the Science Council responsible for commissioning evaluations of a programmatic nature and the System Office commissioning evaluations of governance and management. In the case of the ICRISAT review, which is in progress, the interim Science Council and the CGIAR Secretariat were conducting a pilot test of conducting evaluation of the centers through separate but linked external program and management reviews. The pilot would be assessed at the end of the ICRISAT reviews to determine if a similar approach should be used in the reviews of other centers.

Emil Javier briefed ExCo on the overall timetable for center and other reviews. He noted that the ICRISAT EPR provided an opportunity to the iSC to test a few innovations in the review process. Selçuk Özgediz added that, likewise, the ICRISAT EMR, by providing focused attention to governance and management, is enabling the team to test the feasibility of new techniques for assessing management performance. The overall TOR for the external review, however, remains the same and the panels are conducting their work in close coordination with each other.

Discussion:

- John Vercoe, Adel El-Beltagy and Franklin Moore objected to the idea of splitting program and management reviews in the case of ICRISAT, because the two domains are interdependent and, for investor purposes, inseparable. Franklin Moore also voiced concern that the center not allowing the Management Review chair to attend the ICRISAT Board meeting in March was not just poor practice in evaluation, but unacceptable practice and establishes an unacceptable precedent. The System needs to take steps to ensure that this does not happen again.

Conclusion:

- *The Chairman noted that this had been a frank and useful discussion.*

4.c. World Bank OED Meta-Evaluation

The World Bank's Operations Evaluation Department (OED) has conducted a meta-evaluation of the CGIAR as part of a broader Bank review of global programs. A summary of the OED Team's findings was discussed by the CGIAR at AGM02. The Bank's Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE) discussed the completed report and the management's response to it on April 23, 2003. Ian Johnson briefed the ExCo on the discussion and its outcome.

He noted that, overall, the OED report was positive, as was the CODE discussion. Many on the Committee praised the CGIAR and what it had achieved over the past 30 years. He was asked by CODE to brief ExCo and seek its advice on the key issues highlighted in the report and discussed by the Committee. These included primarily the following:

- Adequacy of the reform program currently underway and the need for a new reform program;
- Need for a Bank-led effort to promote unrestricted funding;
- Need for slowing down implementation of Challenge Programs;
- CGIAR's focus on productivity vs. NRM research;
- Need for a written charter for the CGIAR and for establishing the CGIAR as a legal entity;
- Need to appoint a strong, independent Science Council; and
- Need for a results-based performance measurement system.

Ian Johnson noted that, on an internal matter, the report suggested that current assignments to Bank managers on CGIAR matters reflected a conflict of interest. The Bank Management strongly disagreed with this conclusion and argued that, rather than a conflict of interest, there is a confluence of interests. In the end, Management agreed that the Bank's Chief Economist would provide oversight on CGIAR matters on behalf of the Bank.

Discussion:

- *Need for a new reform program.* The overall sentiment of ExCo members was that the CGIAR has "no appetite" for a new reform program. The priority should go, instead, to consolidating the current reforms. One member pointed out that

- the current reform program may accomplish a lot more than the OED study suggests. Another pointed out that smart institutions are constantly reforming and looking for ways to improve.
- Denmark and the Rockefeller Foundation voiced two dissenting views. Klaus Winkel supported the OED recommendation that a management review of the CGIAR, focusing on structural issues, should be conducted by management professionals. A major objective of the review should be to consider more cost effective ways of delivering on the CGIAR's mission. He announced that Denmark was prepared to commission one itself if there is no interest by others. Peter Matlon argued that the reforms conducted by the CGIAR over the last decade have not gone far enough. The key question is, if the CGIAR was being created today, would the \$350 million be spent and the System structured the way it is now? The foundations believe there is a structural problem in the CGIAR. Peter Matlon noted that the Rockefeller Foundation is willing to convene a meeting of the ExCo/PC and ExCo/FC in Bellagio to consider the OED report if there is general agreement to move in this direction and an appropriate time identified.
 - *Restricted vs. unrestricted funding.* Members agreed with the OED recommendations to reverse the trend towards restricted funding. However, several pointed out that there are various degrees of restriction. There is also the question of how much unrestricted funding is necessary to keep a center functioning. These point to a need to clarify definitions and further analyze the need for unrestricted funding. ExCo's Finance Committee could be tasked to study this issue and offer recommendations. John Vercoe pointed out that if the core resources required by each center could be identified, that could act as a trigger for donor response when the danger level was approached by a particular center.
 - *Challenge Programs.* ExCo members pointed out that the CPs constitute a key pillar of the Reform Program and should be continued. The CP process could be slowed down to take stock of lessons learned and introduce improvements.
 - *Productivity vs. NRM research.* Overall, ExCo members disagreed (some very strongly) with narrowing down the focus of CGIAR research to productivity improvement. One pointed out that NRM and productivity research could not be separated, especially in marginal areas where poor people live.
 - *Written charter and legal entity.* Francisco Reifschneider reported that a CGIAR charter is in preparation, as this is part of the Reform Program. Dietrich Leihner supported the OED recommendation for a unified legal entity for the CGIAR. Franklin Moore and Kevin Cleaver suggested that options between a legal entity and the present informal status should be explored (such as forming a federation).
 - *Need for a strong, independent Science Council.* There was no specific discussion of this point as the view is shared by ExCo and the entire CGIAR.
 - *Need for results-based performance measurement system.* This was also not discussed as a Working Group had been appointed to develop options at the request of ExCo.

Conclusions:

- *The Chairman should report the outcome of the ExCo discussion to the Bank's Board..*
- *The ExCo Finance Committee should examine definitions of restricted and unrestricted funding, and core resources required by each center.*
- *The entire CGIAR should be given an opportunity to debate the OED report at the next AGM, along the lines of the 12 major recommendations.*

Agenda Item 5. Program Matters

5.a. Pilot CPs—Progress Reports

The CGIAR approved the Pilot Challenge Programs on Water and Food and Biofortified Crops in October 2002. The two CPs are currently in their first year of implementation. The lead proponents updated ExCo about progress that has been made in program implementation.

Water and Food

Frank Rijsberman reported that the Water and Food CP is being implemented vigorously. Development is on track, funding prospects appear good, however a cut in funding from Netherlands is a set back. A key question for this CP is how to enter into multi-year commitments (i.e., contracts spanning 5-6 years) while most of the funding is essentially single-year. He sought help or guidance from ExCo/CGIAR on this issue.

Biofortified Crops

Joachim Voss noted that the focus of the Biofortified Crops CP is on *better* food, not only on *more* food. He suggested that this is a new paradigm that represents a whole diet approach for nutrition. He stated that with a \$40 million investment, biofortified iron and zinc staples could be provided to 1 billion people over 10 years. Funding for the CP is promising. A major potential contributor, the Gates Foundation, has shown great interest and will make a decision in or after July. He went on to brief members on progress to date, including events completed and planned, governance and management arrangements, and the work plan for 2003.

Discussion:

- Several speakers observed that both CPs seem to incur significant transaction costs. This is an issue that should be watched closely as these are pilot CPs the System should learn from.
- Some members also observed that one should be mindful of not “cannibalizing” funding that would otherwise finance core activities of the centers.
- Several members remarked that the presentations focused too much on process and little on goals, targets, expected impact, program content, etc.
- Regarding the *Water and Food CP*:

- Klaas Tamminga clarified that Netherlands contribution to the Water and Food CP would be clarified in a matter of weeks.
- Ian Johnson noted that the competitive grants approach that is being used represents a huge learning opportunity for the CGIAR in running such schemes. Franklin Moore pointed to the challenge of getting a targeted research program out of a competitive grant system.
- Frank Rijsberman responded that the Water and Food CP contains more than just competitive grants and it and other funds do contain goals and targets. Also, the CP has attracted additional funding, e.g. funds from France are not from CGIAR allocated money, but from other parts of the budget.
- Regarding the *Biofortification* CP:
 - Sam Dryden noted that the private sector could contribute in significant ways to the Biofortification CP, but it appears that the private sector research institutions have not been sufficiently drawn into the consortium so far.
 - The Chair man noted that reaching a billion people requires a very sophisticated delivery process. He asked if the proponents have considered this issue in estimating likely program impacts. In connection with the delivery process, Franklin Moore inquired if the CP would examine regulatory systems in countries.
 - Dongyu Qu inquired what role the NARS were to play in the CP.
 - Franklin Moore observed that the leadership structure of the CP appears to be too top heavy.
 - Joachim Voss noted that it is clear that goals and targets are essential to undertake fundraising efforts. He also noted that potential funding from the Gates Foundation shows that the CPs are attracting new money to the System. On impact analysis, linkages to existing delivery mechanism can be used, but ex ante impact analysis will also be needed. In addition, it is necessary to study what people eat in a given country and then to determine what combinations of food fortification could ensure an increase in nutrition. Also, the proponents would welcome private sector involvement and in fact plan to have a representative from the private sector on the policy advisory committee as a partner to the CP.

Conclusions:

- *The Chairman thanked the presenters for the briefing they provided and encouraged the proponents of the CPs to address the concerns raised by ExCo members while managing the program.*

5.b. Pilot CPs—Proposal on Genetic Diversity

At ExCo3 the Council asked the proponents of the Pilot Challenge Program proposal on Genetic Diversity to develop the proposal further, taking into account issues identified by ExCo and the CGIAR, and re-submit it to ExCo. The proposal was re-submitted in February 2003. Most ExCo members were in favor of endorsing the full proposal, but there were several substantive concerns raised including focus, targets, lack of private sector involvement, and funding. These were communicated to the proponents, who

provided a response, which was included in the documentation for the meeting. ExCo is asked to discuss the concerns raised and reach a conclusion on next steps (i.e., further guidance to the proponents for revising the proposal, or recommendation for endorsement by the CGIAR.

Masa Iwanaga, DG of CIMMYT which is a leading proponent of the proposal, noted that the proponents welcomed the comments from ExCo members, which were all favorable, but reflected the fact that the proposal was not “perfect.” The proponents recognize that there is a danger of the CP diverting funds from the core programs of the centers. He also noted that the funding situation would not be clear until after the CGIAR endorsement of the CP, because many potential donors are not able to express their intentions until after the CP proposal is endorsed and the proponents have a “hunting license” to raise funds.

Discussion:

- Kevin Cleaver said that the World Bank favors endorsing the CP proposal, which would enable the proponents to address the issues that have been identified and raise funds. On diversion of funds to CPs from center programs, Cleaver stressed that the centers have no entitlement to the World Bank resources. If a CP presents a better value, the WB would be inclined to fund it. And as a strong supporter of the Reform Program, the Bank would continue to channel part of its resources to the CPs. With regard to multi-year commitments, unfortunately, like many other donors, the World Bank is able to commit funds only on an annual basis.
- Rodney Cooke noted IFAD also endorses the proposal, but cautioned that the CP needs to pursue business-like partnerships both with the private sector and NARS. It is not enough to say a particular entity has been invited to join the CP, but to demonstrate that a fruitful partnership is being developed and nurtured.
- FAO believes the CP is ready for endorsement. However, it is unfortunate that animal genetics can't be included in the CP. The proponents should make sure that the CP's intellectual property management plan is in line with the guidelines of the International Treaty on Genetic Resources.
- Mohamad Roozitalab argued that, as proposed by the CDC, at least 50 percent of the resources devoted to a CP should be “additional”, i.e., not diverted from funds which would otherwise go to the centers.
- Klaas Tamminga expressed support to endorse the proposal. He noted that it is at the heart of CGIAR's work, but that the amendments suggested in the comments of ExCo members need to be addressed. That funds may be diverted is inevitable but the process shouldn't be stopped because of this since there is no entitlement to funds in the CGIAR.
- Franklin Moore echoed earlier statements that centers aren't entitled to funds, but the point of CPs was to generate new funds. He noted that structural changes have been addressed to the point that the CP should be endorsed for a “hunting license,” however the proponents need to come back for a reassessment to determine if new partners have been added, if new funds have been generated, etc.
- Emil Javier supported endorsement and providing funds so the proponents can address some of the concerns that still remain.

- Sam Dryden stated that the PSC will only mobilize resources and become involved once the design is acceptable. Objectives are worthwhile for the PSC to pursue and meaningful in terms of achievable public goods. However, he made clear the PSC is prepared to work with the proponents to address these concerns.

Conclusions and recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *The ExCo endorsed implementation of the CP for a one-year “inception phase.”*
- *During the inception phase the proponents would respond to the issues raised by ExCo, in particular the linkages between public and private goods production, and the generation of new funds. The World Bank and others will fund the program during the inception phase.*
- *There would be an assessment at the end of the inception phase to determine next steps regarding the implementation of the CP.*

5.c. Challenge Programs—Regular Process

Status Report: Proposal Development on SSA CP

Based on a recommendation from iSC, ExCo endorsed the pre-proposal “Improving Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management in sub-Saharan Africa: Securing the Future for Africa’s Children” for full proposal development. A brief status report on activities and preparation of the full proposal was presented by Bongiwe Njobe. The full proposal will be submitted to ExCo following its discussion at the FARA meeting.

CP Pre-proposals “semi-endorsed” by iSC

As part of the regular CP process, the iSC identified four pre-proposals as “promising” but “not quite ready for full proposal development.” During a virtual discussion earlier this year, ExCo was unable to agree on whether any of these pre-proposals should be revised and re-submitted (as pre-proposals) for further consideration by the CGIAR. It was agreed that further discussion would take place at ExCo4 to determine next steps

Discussion:

- Several members argued that the importance of the issues to be tackled by these CPs should not be questioned, because the CPs are closely associated with international conventions. They are perfect vehicles for “elevating the game” for the CGIAR.
- Others contented that lack of an agreed strategic framework for the CPs makes it difficult to make decisions about individual CPs. If these are approved, the CP process would drive the strategic agenda of the CGIAR. The more rational approach would be to have the strategic agenda drive the CP process. Therefore, giving green light to these four would be imprudent.
- Emil Javier summarized iSC’s logic in half-endorsing these four CPs. He encouraged ExCo not to lose interest in these four CPs. The iSC is advanced in the priority and strategy formulation process which could, when completed, guide decision-making on these CPs.

- Most members stressed that the process should be slowed down to take stock of what has been learned thus far in the process.
- ExCo should give a clear signal to the proponents of whether to move ahead or stop, rather than giving a “yellow” signal.

Conclusions:

- *There was broad agreement that, with the exception of the SSA CP which is in full proposal development stage, the regular CP process should be “frozen” until: (1) a strategic framework is in place; and (2) the new Science Council begins its work.*
- *In the interim, the experience with the pilot CPs should be reviewed to draw lessons that can help with the regular CP process.*
- *The CP process should be adjusted as necessary based on the strategic framework, lessons from pilot CPs, and views of the new Science Council.*

5.d. Challenge Programs—Strategic Framework

At AGM02, the CGIAR asked iSC to prepare a note outlining a strategic framework for CP development. iSC has undertaken a two-stage process to develop and implement a strategic framework for assessing priorities in the CGIAR. Stage 1 was carried out through consultation with stakeholders, and a workshop, etc. Outputs of the panel will be placed on the web and further iterations will take place. Outputs from the first step will be handed over to the incoming SC, which will continue with Step 2 of the process.

Discussion:

- Several members expressed concern that since ExCo had agreed with “freezing” the processing of new CPs, the iSC should not stop at the conclusion of step 1, but should continue with Step 2 until the end of its term in September.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo agreed that iSC should continue the process of developing the strategic framework until the end of its term in September.*

Financial Criteria for CPs

The CDC has developed a proposal of suggested criteria for consideration by ExCo and the SC for evaluation of Challenge Programs and funding. CDC Chair Adel El-Beltagy presented the committee’s suggestions. The Chairman observed that if the core resource needs of each center could be identified, as recommended by ExCo earlier, this would clarify the issue and provide more accurate financial guideposts for the donors.

5.e. Study on S & T Strategies for Africa by Inter Academy Council Study Panel

Rudy Rabbinge briefed the ExCo on an Inter Academy Council-commissioned study to develop a strategy for the mobilization of science and technology for improving agricultural productivity and food security in Africa. The study addresses the enabling

social and economic environment necessary to activate the effective use of science and technology and focuses on strategies and policies, rather than research agendas and priorities. It mainstreams gender, cultural and environmental perspectives, and includes a communications strategy. The progress report presented summarized the panel's activities to date.

Discussion:

- Several members observed that there are several initiatives similar to the Inter Academy Council Panel's, focusing on science and technology strategies, especially for Africa. These included the S&T Assessment being carried out by the World Bank (led by Robert Watson), the MDG Hunger Task Force (led by Jeffrey Sachs and Pedro Sanchez), the CP proposal on SSA being developed by FARA, and CGIAR iSC analysis of priorities and strategies. There is need to ensure that these initiatives are aligned.
- The basic issue ExCo is concerned with is knowing what is doing what, how the CGIAR could avoid overlaps, and what is the best way to finance the various initiatives.

Conclusions:

- *The Chairman thanked Rudi Rabbinge for taking time to brief ExCo about the IAC Panel study and encouraged all to be mindful of the need for integrating the various ongoing efforts.*

Agenda Item 6. Update on WARDA

A member of the ExCo requested an update to be provided on the current status of WARDA. Franklin Moore (USA) stated that he had asked for the update to get a clear picture of the center's situation, given the turmoil in Cote d'Ivoire. Francisco Reifschneider informed ExCo that updates on WARDA have been made available by WARDA management and are on the web ("Managing the Ivoirian Crisis: A Summary Report" submitted by WARDA DG Kanayo Nwanze.) He and Adel El-Beltagy noted that when WARDA faced operational difficulty, inter-center cooperation helped alleviate the challenges—in this case through a collaboration with ICRISAT to share ICRISAT facilities in Bamako. Members expressed appreciation for the update.

Agenda Item 7. Planning ExCo Business

ExCo Business Agenda and Rotation of ExCo Members

Francisco Reifschneider reviewed the timetable of ExCo's business agenda. In response to questions from members, Reifschneider clarified the status of some follow-up items on the ExCo agenda:

- A report on gender issues will be presented when new data become available from the staff survey;

- The System Office Business Plan is on the web (http://www.cgiar.org/who/wwa_systemoffice.html);
- The CBC is developing a process for handling staff grievances and will report to ExCo the outcome.

Reifschneider also reviewed the members' eligibility for membership in ExCo. He noted that rotation would take place at the conclusion of AGM03. Some members expressed concern about having significant turnover in the membership of the ExCo after AGM 03. Francisco Reifschneider noted that some rotation had taken place already and that several members attending ExCo4 are here for the first time. The Chair suggested that ExCo monitor this situation and develop guidelines for rotation of members.

Assignments to Finance and Program Committees

In addition to tasks agreed to in prior agenda items, ExCo agreed to have the Committees take on the following tasks:

- PC to help develop a strategy for following up the outcomes of CSD-11 and other task forces;
- FC to examine and further develop the scorecard system that was highlighted in the 2002 Financial Report; and
- FC, PC and iSC chairs to discuss how the strategic issues being raised in the OED report, the CGIAR priority and strategy exercise, and in related strategic exercises being conducted by other actors (such as IAC, World Bank, and FARA) could best be considered by ExCo and the CGIAR (e.g., through a retreat or similar event).

Future Meetings

ExCo agreed to conduct a virtual meeting on the ISNAR follow-up the first week of August, and if necessary, a face-to-face meeting the second week of September. The Secretariat will look at the calendar and get back to ExCo on specific dates and arrangements.

Agenda Item 8. Other Business

8.a. CGIAR Compensation

Klaus Winkel introduced the item, stating that the perception in Denmark is that much CGIAR research is relatively expensive and perhaps not as cost-effective as it could be, and that the level of compensation is high. Presently there is little transparency in the System in compensation matters. There is no reason why the CGIAR should not have an open and transparent system like that of the UN. He suggested that the Secretariat should prepare a paper on compensation structure in the centers (including non-salary benefits) for staff, center managers and board members.

Discussion:

- John Vercoe noted that the CBC is currently conducting a study on compensation.
- Several members expressed surprise that this information is not publicly available and stressed that it should be. As centers are spending public monies, transparent data on compensation need to be available at all times to meet legal requirements of some donor agencies.
- The complexities arising from differences among internationally-, regionally-, and locally-recruited staff were noted, as was the competition between NARS and IARCs for attracting qualified local staff.
- Such information is necessary also for comparing where the CGIAR stands *vis-à-vis* similar other international initiatives.

Conclusions:

- *The Secretariat, working with CBC, should prepare a paper on compensation structures and levels and mechanisms for ensuring transparency. (Phase 1)*
- *Compensation data on the CGIAR should be compared with those from appropriate comparator organizations. (Phase 2)*
- *The CGIAR data should be enriched with the expansion of the study to include compensation packages for locally-recruited staff. (Phase 2+)*

8.b. CBC/CDC Joint Statement

The CBC and CDC Chairs presented a joint statement prepared following their meeting on May 14, 2003 in The Hague, Netherlands. The statement was made available to ExCo members at the meeting (the statement is available at: <http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco4docs.html>)

Adel El-Beltagy noted that the centers are very keen to improve operational effectiveness and have agreed to form a new center alliance. The alliance will have an Executive Secretary which will be part of the System Office and will ensure harmonization of all units associated with the centers. The CDC endorsed a code of conduct to govern relationships between centers when developing CPs. CDC and CBC are keen to have an independent, credible SC and to avoid a vacuum between iSC and SC transition. The role of the ExCo Program Committee should also be clarified as it should be distinct from that of the Science Council.

John Vercoe noted that, with the elimination of the MTM, the centers feel a strong need to have a major public awareness event in order to communicate more fully with donors.

The Chairman thanked CBC and CDC for providing this perspective.

8.c. Future Harvest Review

Adel El-Beltagy mentioned that the CDC had discussed the review of the Future Harvest Foundation and would like to introduce reforms in the organization of PA/RM activities. In this connection, the CDC has agreed to restructure the Future Harvest Foundation.

The Future Harvest name is legally owned by the centers and the Future Harvest Foundation will be granted permission to use the name under certain conditions. In addition, the Future Harvest Foundation's Board would be chaired by the Chair of PARC. The aim is to integrate efforts and generate uniform messages from the centers and the CGIAR Secretariat, harmonized by the Communications Advisor at the Secretariat.

ExCo asked the CDC Chair to have the review of Future Harvest Foundation made available to CGIAR members.

8.d. Updates on PSC and NGOC

Sam Dryden will update ExCo on the status and activities of PSC through a note.

NGOC, which has frozen its relationship with the CGIAR for a year, is planning to conduct an external review of its activities and role. The report will be shared with members when it becomes available.

The ExCo-commissioned external review of partnership committees would bring recommendations to the CGIAR on future strategies for strengthening partnerships with private sector and civil society organizations.

Agenda Item 9. Closing Session

The Chairman thanked members for their cooperation and contributions. ExCo members assessed various aspects of the meeting through an electronic tool. Assessment results are summarized in Attachment 4.

List of Participants
Fourth Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chairman:</i>	Ian Johnson	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Dietrich Leihner	FAO
	Kevin Cleaver	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>CDC:</i>	Adel El-Beltagy	CDC Chair
<i>CBC:</i>	John Vercoe	CBC Chair
<i>iSC:</i>	Emil Javier	iSC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Mohamad Roozitalab	GFAR Chair
<u>OECD/DAC:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Franklin Moore	U.S.A.
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Toshinori Mitsunaga	Japan
<i>Europe</i>	Jochen de Haas	Germany
	Klaas Tamminga	Netherlands
	Klaus Winkel	Denmark
<u>Developing Countries:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Luis Arango Nieto	Colombia
<i>SSA</i>	Bongiwe Njobe	South Africa
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Dongyu Qu	China
<i>CWANA</i>	Noureddin Mona	Syria (could not attend)
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Abel Al-Nabi Fardous	AARINENA (could not attend)
<u>Foundations:</u>	Peter Matlon	Rockefeller F.
<u>Partners:</u>		
<i>Civil Society</i>	Temporarily Vacant	
<i>Private Sector</i>	Sam Dryden	PSC Chair
<i>Executive Secretary, ExCo:</i>	Francisco Reifschneider	
<i>CGIAR Secretariat:</i>	Fionna Douglas	
	Selçuk Özgediz	
	Ravi Tadvalkar	
	Jason Yauney	
<u>Speakers:</u>		
Elisabeth Deton-Delegue		
Mohamed Hassan		

Roelof Rabbinge
Frank Rijsberman
Edward Sayegh
Grant Scobie
Joachim Voss

Observers:

Robert Bertram
Robert Bordonaro
Denis Despréaux
Emile Frison
Masa Iwanaga
Luigi Monti

USAID
FAO
Government of France
IPGRI
CIMMYT
IPGRI

Revised Agenda

May 16, 2003, Friday

1. Opening Session

- Welcome by Government of France (E. Beton-Delegue)
- I. Johnson's Introduction
- Election of Meeting Co-Chair
- Adoption of the Agenda

2. CGIAR Status Report (F. Reifschneider)

- Highlights
- Reform Program
- Communication Initiatives
- Follow-up to Review of GRPC
- Review of Partnership Committees
- Other Matters
- Discussion
- 2002 Financial Report (E. Sayegh/R. Tadvalkar)
- 2003 Financing Status
- Discussion

3. Governance Matters

3.a. Establishing SC

- Overview of Status
- Discussion

3.c. iSC/SC and Secretariat Financing

- Overview of Options (Co-sponsors)
- Discussion

4. Evaluation

4.a. ISNAR EPMP Follow-up

- Recommendations of the ISNAR Restructuring Team (G. Scobie)
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

May 17, 2003, Saturday

- 3.b. Appointing CGIAR-nominees on Center Boards
 - Proposals from CBC and the Secretariat (S. Özgediz/J. Vercoe)
 - Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

- 4.b. CGIAR External Reviews
 - Overview of Status (E. Javier/S. Özgediz)
 - Discussion

- 4.c. World Bank OED Meta-Evaluation
 - Briefing on Status and Outcome (I. Johnson)
 - Discussion

- 5. Program Matters**

- 5.a. Pilot CPs—Progress Reports
 - Water and Food CP (F. Rijsberman)
 - Biofortified Crops CP (J. Voss)
 - Discussion and ExCo Guidance

- 5.b. Pilot CPs—Proposal on Genetic Diversity
 - Consideration of ExCo Member Comments made during Virtual Discussion of the CP Proposal
 - ExCo Guidance on Next Steps

- 5.c. Challenge Programs—Regular Process
 - Status Report: Proposal Development on CP on SSA
 - CP Pre-Proposals “semi-endorsed” by iSC (F. Reifschneider)
 - Discussion and ExCo Decision

- 5.d. Challenge Programs—Strategic Framework
 - iSC Priority and Strategy Exercise (E. Javier)
 - Financial Criteria for Challenge Programs (A. El-Beltagy)
 - Discussion

- 5.e. Study on S & T Strategies for Africa by Inter Academy Council Panel
 - Briefing (R. Rabbinge)
 - Discussion

- 6. Update on WARDA**

- 7. Planning ExCo Business**

- Review of ExCo business agenda and timetable
- Review of Membership Rotation
- Assignments to PC and FC and Future Meetings

8. Other Business

- CGIAR Compensation (K. Winkel)
- CDC/CBC Update from Joint Meeting
- Future Harvest Review
- Update on PSC and NGOC

9. Closing Session

Working Group on Performance Measurement

Composition:

- Kevin Cleaver, Chair ExCo/FC, Co-chair
- Luis Arango Nieto, ExCo/PC, Co-chair
- Michael Cernea, TAC/iSC
- Adel El-Beltagy, CDC
- Mortimer Neufville, CBC
- Stephan Krall, EIARD
- Selcuk Ozgediz, System Office designate
- Two experts on performance measurement
 - Flavio Avila, EMBRAPA/Yale University
 - Another expert (being identified)

Resource Persons:

- Ruben Echeverria, Inter-American Development Bank/SPIA
- Douglas Horton, ISNAR
- Sirkka Immonen, iSC Secretariat
- Maria Iskandarani, CGIAR Secretariat

Attachment 4

ExCo Member Feedback on the Handling of Agenda Items at ExCo 4

Feedback on each Agenda Item* (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

ExCo4 Agenda Item	The time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.	ExCo was given appropriate information to facilitate the discussion.	ExCo adequately discussed all major substantive issues involved with this agenda item.	The outcome as summarized accurately reflects the discussion.
	Average (Standard Deviation)	Average (Standard Deviation)	Average (Standard Deviation)	Average (Standard Deviation)
2. CGIAR Status Report	5.57 (1.59)	5.83 (1.57)	5.5 (1.26)	6.29 (0.96)
3.a. Establishing SC	5 (1.70)	5.63 (1.49)	5.64 (1.76)	6.2 (0.91)
3.b. Appointing CGIAR-nominees on Center	5.63 (1.45)	5.75 (1.25)	5.53 (1.26)	5.93 (1.48)
3.c. iSC/SC and Secretariat Financing	5.07 (2.05)	5.07 (1.57)	5.5 (1.30)	6.13 (1.32)
4.a. ISNAR EPMR Follow-up	4.44 (1.94)	5.56 (1.27)	4.56 (1.90)	5.93 (0.85)
4.b. CGIAR External Reviews	6.06 (0.75)	5.2 (1.28)	5.07 (1.16)	6 (0.94)
4.c. World Bank OED Meta-evaluation	4.8 (1.72)	6.53 (0.50)	4.18 (1.54)	5.82 (1.15)
5.a. Pilot CPs--Progress Reports	6.38 (0.48)	5.63 (1.17)	5.8 (0.83)	6.27 (0.68)
5.b. Pilot CPs—Proposal on Genetic Diversity	5.75 (0.83)	5.53 (1.02)	5.47 (0.96)	6.27 (1.06)
5.c. Challenge Programs—Regular Process	5.23 (1.58)	4.85 (1.41)	4.62 (1.60)	5.17 (1.77)
5.d. Challenge Programs—Strategic Framework	5.58 (1.04)	4.85 (1.51)	5 (0.78)	5.54 (1.78)

*The average number of members providing feedback was 15, with a range of 12 to 17.

Member Feedback on ExCo4 Meeting and the Use of the New Technology

	Average	Standard Deviation
The use of this technology was helpful in conducting ExCo business.	5.92	1.07
The conference facilities were appropriate and satisfactory.	6.23	0.89
The hotel facilities were appropriate and satisfactory.	4.67	2.01
Overall, the ExCo meeting was a valuable use of my time.	5.77	1.48
The format of the ExCo meeting allowed for appropriate level of discussion and debate.	5.23	1.31
The documentation and materials received for the Exco meeting provided enough information to enable me to engage in and/or have a full understanding of the discussion.	5.92	0.64
I would prefer that all documentation be available on the web two weeks prior to ExCo meetings and then that I receive hard copies of ALL documentation when I arrive at the meeting. (current situation)	6.17	1.21
I do not need hard copies provided at the meeting.	3.23	2.45
Overall, the decision making process at the ExCo meeting was effective, and we were able to make decisions in a timely and effective manner, therefore facilitating the work assigned to ExCo by the CGIAR.	5.08	0.83

(1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)