

**Consultative Group on International Agricultural
Research**

Sixteenth Meeting of the Executive Council

June 4-5, 2009

Cali, Colombia

**Summary Record
of
Proceedings**



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
June 25, 2009*

Acronyms Used

AGM	Annual General Meeting
CCER	Center-Commissioned External Review
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo
COP	Conference of Parties
CORPOICA	Corporación Colombiana de Investigación Agropecuaria (Colombian Corporation for Agricultural Research)
CP	CGIAR Challenge Program
CWANA	Central and West Asia and North Africa
DG	Director General
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ExCo	CGIAR Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FORAGRO	Foro de las Américas para la Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario
GCARD	Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
HR	Human Resources
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
ISPC	Independent Science and Partnerships Council
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PM	Performance Measurement
PSC	Private Sector Committee
SC	Science Council
SRF	Strategy and Results Framework
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa

TMT
WARDA

CGIAR Transition Management Team
Africa Rice Center

Contents

ExCo 16 Conclusions and Decisions	iv
1. Opening Session.....	1
2. CGIAR Transition.....	1
3. Evaluation	12
3.a. ICRISAT EPMR	12
3.b. IRRI EPMR.....	14
3.c. Performance Measurement System: 2008 Results.....	15
4. Financial Matters	15
5. Other Business	16
6. Closing Session.....	16
Attachments:	
List of Participants	18
Agenda	20

All ExCo 16 documents are available at <http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/exco16/index.html>

ExCo 16 Conclusions and Decisions

2. CGIAR Transition

Report on Progress: Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD)

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *ExCo encouraged an inclusive participatory approach for GCARD that draws on farmers, NARS and other civil society organizations, including consultations at events such as the Science Forum in June 2009.*
- *The process should balance the need for inclusiveness with focus on achievement of clear outcomes in order to help link research investments with development outcomes. There needs to be a visible reinforcement of the interface between GCARD consultations and development of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and mega-programs.*
- *Private sector needs to be more prominent in the GCARD process and event.*
- *ExCo requested that GCARD be mindful of costs going forward.*

Strategic Results Framework and Mega-programs Update

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *The current work on SRF is in the right direction.*
- *SRF should be an evidence-based framework that will guide the System on how to best organize and bring programmatic and managerial coherence.*
- *It is important to build trust by bringing in partners to ensure a bottom-up participatory process. The new CGIAR needs to be a learning organization.*
- *The process should provide evidence to the System on where it is going and how it should be organized.*
- *The CGIAR reform is not about closing down Centers or programs, but about eliminating duplications and inefficiencies.*
- *While recognizing it was a first draft that was presented, mock up mega-programs do not meet the expectations of the donors.*
- *There was also a level of discomfort on the number of mega-programs in the draft paper.*
- *There is a risk of re-packaging existing projects into mega-programs. Mega-programs should be balanced among the three strategic objectives. There is also a need for capacity building.*
- *Handling cross cutting issues will be a challenge.*
- *Strong support was expressed for ensuring gender in programs. However, the details of the gender platform need to be carefully analyzed and developed.*

Consortium Update

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *The sentiment, intent and substance of the presentation at the ExCo 16 Meeting reflected more closely than the draft Constitution the AGM08 decisions for a strong Consortium Board with authority and tools to set the overall strategy, raise funds, effectively lead the Consortium and manage results.*
- *However, there was a sense of shortcoming in the proposed draft Consortium Constitution document which did not explicitly reflect the AGM08 sentiments and decisions. ExCo requested the document to be redrafted with clear and consistent language, which clearly states that the Consortium Board Chair and CEO will have authority of decision on overall strategy and organizational framework.*
- *The current document gives the impression that the envisioned Members Group of the Consortium would have inappropriate power over the Board.*
- *ExCo recognized that Center Boards would remain intact and be responsible for implementation of Consortium decisions.*
- *ExCo outlined several areas of ambiguity in the draft Constitution that need to be clarified with clear and consistent language.*
- *A small advisory group of ExCo members will be formed to provide feedback on the revised draft Constitution of the Consortium. (At the meeting, members from Australia (2), Canada and Norway agreed to serve on this group. Other CGIAR Members who are interested to serve are also welcome.)*
- *The preamble of the draft Constitution should contain language on linkages with GCARD, the CGIAR Fund, and other parts of the System.*
- *It is important that the Center Boards undertake due diligence on the legal implications of the Consortium as soon as practical.*

CGIAR Fund Update

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *ExCo expressed a desire for a balance of representation on the Fund Council from the South and North and from stakeholders using appropriate financial thresholds to ensure this. In the spirit of inclusiveness, engagement of private sector and foundations also needs to be explored.*
- *Composition of the Fund Council needs to be balanced, consistent with the AGM08 decision. Regarding the size of the Council, the Chair noted that, while inclusiveness is an objective, this should not be at the expense of losing efficiency by having a large Council.*
- *Stakeholders should also participate in decision making process on the Fund Council. Decision rules (consensus vs. voting) should be revisited and options for the latter explored.*
- *The first/inaugural meeting of the Fund Council should be open to all funders.*
- *ExCo expressed satisfaction with the role of the Fund Office as described in the Fund Framework document.*
- *Discussion on the role of the ISPC will be deferred until the task group that has been constituted has completed its work and made recommendations.*

- *A new draft will incorporate ExCo's feedback and circulated to the advisory group for the Fund and other interested CGIAR Members.*

Accountability Update

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *ExCo acknowledged that significant progress has been made in developing an accountability framework. The challenge going forward is to combine it with the managerial simplicity envisioned in the AGM08-approved reform proposal, i.e. a well-managed organization, consisting of a series of Centers, with appropriate and effective accountability tools in place.*
- *An addendum to the current paper should be included to state that new or additional tools should not be added to the accountability mix.*
- *The document should include the table of contents expected in the Consortium annual report. This will help the Alliance to see what reports will be necessary and how to best manage themselves.*
- *The document should also include a performance contract template. This will provide Members with an idea of what is expected, and help the Consortium determine the minimum set of tools needed to fulfill the contracts.*
- *A section on external beneficiaries should be included to demonstrate links to GCARD, and accountability to beneficiaries through surveys, transparency of documentation, and other tools. This can also be used as a marketing tool for donors.*
- *Further work is needed on M&E in terms of what independent evaluation will be needed in addition to what the Consortium will do. Clarity on who does what is also needed.*
- *A table on existing and on expected M&E mechanisms should be developed to ensure something is not being added.*
- *ExCo agreed on the suggestion that the Fund Council will be the locus of System oversight responsibility for the Consortium to report to, and the Fund Council in turn will report to the Funders Forum.*
- *ExCo requested a dispute resolution or other mechanism be developed and built into the framework in the event of a severe disruption (or worst-case situation) to the System.*
- *ExCo agreed with the suggestion to set up an editorial advisory panel for the accountability framework document. It will also help synthesize the document with other transition documents to ensure coherence. Australia, Canada and Ireland agreed to serve on the panel; other CGIAR Members are welcome to join. ExCo requested a beneficiary point of view to also be included on the panel.*

Transition and Next Steps

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *A final ExCo meeting (ExCo 17) will be held on November 2-3, 2009, in Rome.*

- *The final CGIAR Business Meeting will be held December 7-8, 2009, in Washington, DC. (December 8th will be either an inaugural Fund Council meeting or an informal meeting of donors.)*
- *There are two alternatives for the first Funders Forum: 1) to be held either immediately following the first GCARD (on April 1, 2010), or 2) in conjunction with another international event later in the year. Timing of this event will depend on progress of the transition and a decision taken at the Business Meeting.*
- *Documents for the final ExCo and Business Meetings should be made available for posting to the web within the statutory time deadlines.*
- *ExCo reinforced the importance of the regional consultations to development of the Strategy and Results Framework. ExCo requested the TMT and the Alliance to consider the possibility of consultations with donors outside the ExCo environment to ensure a level of comfort prior to the final ExCo/Business meetings.*
- *TMT will discuss the financing plan for the transition and filling funding gaps of the Change Initiative Facility.*

3.a. ICRISAT EPMR

ExCo Conclusion and Decision:

- *ExCo congratulated ICRISAT for a positive review and thanked the panel for its report and the Center for its response.*
- *ExCo endorsed the EPMR panel's recommendations and Center response, and agreed that ICRISAT should develop and share a detailed plan to implement the recommendations.*

3.b. IRRI EPMR

ExCo Conclusion and Decision:

- *ExCo was pleased with the results of the review and congratulated IRRI for the positive assessment of its performance. It also expressed appreciation to the panel for its report and the Center for its comprehensive response.*
- *ExCo endorsed the EPMR panel's recommendations and Center response.*

3.c. Performance Measurement System: 2008 Results

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the SC and CGIAR Secretariat for their work on the PM System and looks forward to the final report.*

4. Financial Matters

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo thanked IRRI and the CGIAR Secretariat for the report.*

- *ExCo requested the CGIAR Secretariat to prepare a short report for discussion at ExCo 17 on the financial status of the SSA CP and its connection with FARA.*
- *Centers were requested to provide an update on expenditures and forecasts for funding for the year so far that show donor breakdowns, so that the forecast for 2009 may be updated.*
- *It is important for the new Consortium to build a real-time financial reporting system so donors and others in the System can get a clear picture of finances at any given time.*

1. Opening Session

CGIAR Chair Kathy Sierra opened the meeting and welcomed ExCo members to Colombia and ExCo 16. She thanked the Government of Colombia and the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) for hosting the meeting, and for the support provided. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1.)

Welcome by Host Country

Arturo Vega, Executive Director of CORPOICA (Corporación Colombiana de Investigación Agropecuaria), welcomed ExCo to Colombia on behalf of the Government of Colombia. He stated that it was an honor for the meeting to be held in Colombia and highlighted the history of CIAT and Colombia's membership in the CGIAR. He wished ExCo a fruitful and productive meeting and expressed gratitude to CIAT and the CGIAR Secretariat staffs for organizing the meeting. He formally declared the meeting open.

Gordon MacNeil, CIAT Board Chair, welcomed participants on behalf of CIAT. He noted the appointment of new CIAT Director General (DG) Ruben Echeverria, and paid tribute and thanks to former interim DG Geoff Hawtin by commending his stewardship of the Center during a very difficult time. G. Hawtin was instrumental in leading the Center and helping to turn it around. He highlighted CIAT's support to the change process and the desire of all Centers to add value to an already productive System.

K. Sierra thanked A. Vega and G. MacNeil for their remarks, and reiterated thanks to G. Hawtin for his leadership of CIAT. She also acknowledged the appointment of R. Echeverria as DG.

Election of Meeting Co-Chair

Ruth Haug (Norway) was nominated and elected Co-chair of the meeting.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with the following modification: an update on organization of the Science Forum was added under Agenda Item 5. Other Business (see Attachment 2).

2. CGIAR Transition

K. Sierra introduced the item by thanking the Transition Management Team (TMT) and all involved for the significant amount of work they have put into the effort. She noted that the transition framework was agreed to at AGM08; however, many details remain and ExCo was tasked with decision making authority on transition. Discussion on the items was an opportunity to take stock of progress to date, to "stress test" the ideas and

plans developed so far, and to provide feedback and guidance to the TMT as the transition continues.

TMT member Jonathan Wadsworth (UK) opened discussion by noting the composition of the TMT: Kathy Sierra (Chair), Steve Hall (Alliance), Mark Holderness (GFAR), Jonathan Wadsworth (UK), Ren Wang (CGIAR Director). He also reminded members of the guiding principles of the CGAIR transition agreed to at AGM08:

1. Clear strategic focus;
2. Increase research output, outcome, and impact;
3. Greater efficiency, effectiveness and relevance;
4. Simplicity and clarity of governance;
5. Enhanced decentralized decision making; and
6. Active subsidiarity to capitalize on complementarities of the Centers.

He concluded by showing an overall timeline of the transition activities.

Note: Presentations on the CGIAR Transition have been posted to the ExCo 16 website (<http://www.cgiar.org/who/structure/executive/exco16/index.html>).

Report on Progress: Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD)

M. Holderness presented a progress report on the latest thinking on GCARD, and solicited input on progress. As agreed at AGM08, the GCARD process will culminate in a biennial global conference on agricultural research for development to be organized by GFAR in collaboration with the Consortium and Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC).

The aim of GCARD will be to develop a new global agricultural research system that directly impacts the poor, resulting in a tighter connection between research institutions and delivery partners. Research will reach farmers faster and more effectively and there will be increased coherence between development needs and institutional research. The process seeks to align CGIAR research towards national and global development goals and increase the speed and scale of development impact from CGIAR investment. It will be a six-year learning and feedback cycle, incorporating global and regional reviews through a series of consultations that are synthesized at the biennial GCARD event.

A GFAR Task Force was established earlier this year to develop the process, and global and regional reviews will be launched soon. A series of consultations will be held later in the year and feed into development of the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework and mega-programs. The process will also draw on ideas and knowledge from the upcoming Science Forum. The first GCARD event is scheduled to take place March 28-31, 2010, in Montpellier, France. The event seeks to inform policymakers of investment needs, clarify agricultural research for development priorities and roles of key players, and find ways forward to address key challenges.

Discussion:

- It is essential to bring partners and stakeholders into the process to strengthen national systems and inter-regional cooperation to make better use of CGIAR research investments. The voice of partners and stakeholders also needs to be well reflected in the Strategy and Results Framework.
- GCARD will be an important locus of ideas for the CGIAR System to support national systems, and for the mission of the CGIAR. Without strong national systems in developing regions, the mission of the CGIAR can not be achieved. The process should also seek to integrate emerging systems into the international research agenda.
- Incentives to attract partner participation in GCARD will be an important issue going forward. What is in it for them needs to be clearly articulated.
- The mode of operation seems to be more of a problem than alignment of research. NARS have noted that there is often a lot of competition with CGIAR Centers and overlap, and not an optimum partnership. This needs to be avoided in future.
- It would be useful to have a fuller understanding of the health of national systems and what it takes to translate high-end CGIAR research into results on the ground.
- Broad and inclusive consultation is essential; however, it is also important to focus on the end result and to have a strong outcome orientation, which isn't presently clear.
- GCARD must feed into development of the Strategy and Results Framework and mega-programs; however, concern was expressed about the quality of these due to the tight schedule of the process.
- Private sector needs to be more fully engaged in the process, particularly the input industry. It was pointed out that the private sector has been heavily involved in India which has realized very large productivity gains.
- Concern was expressed regarding cost of the process. Given the current financial climate, creative ways of conducting consultations must be explored in order to keep costs down.
- M. Holderness responded to some of the questions raised. There has been significant engagement with the group developing the Strategy and Results Framework and mega-programs. This is only one piece of understanding the global agricultural research for development framework. There are other pieces that the process focuses on where CGIAR is not involved. These other elements are essential to a fuller understanding and to help identify partners CGIAR should engage. Understanding clients and beneficiaries needs is essential to make the GCARD process a success. He noted that the Science Forum will be an essential input as are other events and documents such as the IAASTD and 2008 World Development Report on agriculture. The challenge is to translate all pieces into a coherent practice. The process is seeking to hold costs down, but he noted the trade-off of keeping costs down with achieving adequate consultations and input. Incentives to bring partners in are essential. The process should lead to a greater understanding of needs of partners before projects are in place, i.e. understanding of roles, expectations, etc. Increased engagement with the private sector is very much welcomed.

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *ExCo encouraged an inclusive participatory approach for GCARD that draws on farmers, NARS and other civil society organizations, including consultations at events such as the Science Forum in June 2009.*
- *The process should balance the need for inclusiveness with focus on achievement of clear outcomes in order to help link research investments with development outcomes. There needs to be a visible reinforcement of the interface between GCARD consultations and development of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and mega-programs.*
- *Private sector needs to be more prominent in the GCARD process and event.*
- *ExCo requested that GCARD be mindful of costs going forward.*

Strategic Results Framework and Mega-programs Update

The Alliance of CGIAR Centers established a strategy team that has been working on development of a conceptual framework for development of the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and a portfolio of mega-programs. Tom Lumpkin, CIMMYT DG, presented a progress report on the team's work.

He noted that the SRF will be for the whole System and based on the new CGIAR vision and three strategic objectives. It's an iterative process of analysis and consultation that employs an evidence-based results-oriented approach. The SRF should be owned by the Centers and their partners. It will be a tool for planning and continued management.

T. Lumpkin noted the changing context under which the CGIAR currently operates and the impact this will have on development of the SRF. The approach planned by the strategy team includes an analysis of models; consultations and peer review of science leaders, stakeholders and partners; and consultations with frontline researchers. The approach will feed into development of a portfolio of mega-programs. He presented a first look at a set of mega-programs, noting that the draft is to be further revised based on the analysis and criteria to be developed. He also highlighted the importance of achieving the vision of a gender-responsive agricultural system.

He noted that the mega-program "mock ups" were developed as part of the background work for the SRF in response to a request from CGIAR Members. Feedback on the mock-ups is welcome. On transition to mega-programs, he noted that existing CGIAR activities would be evaluated against the mega-programs and mapped as follows:

1. Research that is already reasonably established that could be mapped to mega-programs with a light touch,
2. Research that already exists but in a fragmented manner and would require a significant effort to remap,
3. Research that is only partially or hardly covered by existing activities and would require a new initiative, and
4. Research that does not fit the new SRF and would be phased out.

He presented a timeline for completing the draft SRF, including surveys and workshops in the coming months. The draft final report is expected in September 2009. He concluded by reiterating that Centers are supportive of the transition but need support and incentives from donors.

Discussion:

- ExCo expressed support to the development of the SRF.
- Concern was expressed about interaction and link with GCARD. There needs to be significant consultation with stakeholders and partners to learn and ensure development of an effective SRF and portfolio of mega-programs.
- The analysis needs to be more evidence-based in terms of what has worked in the past. Judgment will come into play as well.
- Concern was expressed about the list of mega-programs presented. There is significant overlap and room for streamlining and rationalization. Priority setting and hard choices need to play a key role going forward. Caution against trying to fit all existing research into mega-programs was expressed. The number of mega-programs should be limited. There was also a plea for development of mega-programs that are programmatically and managerially coherent.
- The issue of how to deal with research that doesn't fit the SRF was raised. Should it be considered "blue sky" innovative research or should it be dropped entirely from the research agenda?
- ExCo agreed with the focus on gender and the need for appropriate indicators. Development of an appropriate platform to handle the issue is essential to ensure real impact on the ground.
- The need for support from donors is understandable; however, donors need a convincing framework that can be presented to their agencies to garner support.
- The process should benefit from lessons from previous consultations and studies, and modeling done by other entities. Existing literature will provide important guidance.
- T. Lumpkin responded to the issues raised by acknowledging that further debate is required on what activities will and will not fit into the SRF. The process seeks to develop a set of mega-programs that will bring more coherence to the System and reduce overlap and duplications. He noted that a discussion among donors on what is needed is welcomed, but also requested donors to let the analysis proceed and be presented to donors when complete. The current list of mega-programs is very preliminary and will be further refined as the process unfolds.
- S. Hall also responded, noting that the feedback from ExCo is very useful, and it highlights the difficulty and complexity of the exercise in the overall transition process, e.g. sequencing of events. It is essential, however, to future analyses and decisions on structural and organizational changes. It is currently at a very broad level and will get more detailed as it proceeds.

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *The current work on SRF is in the right direction.*
- *SRF should be an evidence-based framework that will guide the System on how to best organize and bring programmatic and managerial coherence.*

- *It is important to build trust by bringing in partners to ensure a bottom-up participatory process. The new CGIAR needs to be a learning organization.*
- *The process should provide evidence to the System on where it is going and how it should be organized.*
- *The CGIAR reform is not about closing down Centers or programs, but about eliminating duplications and inefficiencies.*
- *While recognizing it was a first draft that was presented, mock up mega-programs do not meet the expectations of the donors.*
- *There was also a level of discomfort on the number of mega-programs in the draft paper.*
- *There is a risk of re-packaging existing projects into mega-programs. Mega-programs should be balanced among the three strategic objectives. There is also a need for capacity building.*
- *Handling cross cutting issues will be a challenge.*
- *Strong support was expressed for ensuring gender in programs. However, the details of the gender platform need to be carefully analyzed and developed.*

Consortium Update

S. Hall provided an update on development of the Consortium. He presented a synopsis of activities to date, including Consortium design, roles and responsibilities and activities planned for the remainder of 2009. The Consortium is expected to become fully operational in early 2010.

A proposed draft Consortium Constitution has been developed and unanimously agreed by the Alliance as a workable model. The Alliance has also expressed agreement around the “Performance Manager” model in the presentation as an operational modality. It places significant decision making authority in Consortium leadership, and ultimate responsibility for achieving results for the CGIAR as a whole, while leaving research expertise in Centers.

He highlighted the Consortium’s role in SRF, mega-programs, fund allocation, organizational design; composition and selection of the Consortium Board, Centers’ role in the Consortium; and the role of the Consortium CEO.

He concluded by noting that feedback from ExCo will be considered by the Alliance and needed adjustments made to the proposed draft Consortium Constitution. The next phase of the Consortium design will continue, and the Consortium Board nomination and selection process will be initiated.

Discussion:

- ExCo commended the Alliance for the amount of work toward design and development of the Consortium, and the big shift in mindset and enthusiasm toward the Consortium from the Centers.
- Concern was expressed that the proposed draft Consortium Constitution fell short of and did not capture the intent and spirit of the decisions reached at AGM08.

- Significant concern was raised that the Consortium would not have sufficient authority over the Centers, and therefore would be unable to exercise effective leadership. ExCo was concerned that the proposed “members group” of the Consortium would indeed exercise power over the Consortium CEO and Board resulting in circular accountability and a very weak Consortium—a similar situation to what currently exists. This is not what was expected.
- It is still not clear what power or authority Centers will relinquish to the Consortium. The “soft” power that was outlined in the presentation will not be enough for the Consortium to exercise effective leadership.
- In addition to the issues raised above, there are several inconsistencies between the draft Constitution and the decisions reached at AGM08, e.g. explicit language should be included that the Fund will be consulted on the SRF, the Fund Council will approve mega-program proposals presented to it, the role of the Fund in resource mobilization and allocation of funds to mega-programs.
- Inconsistencies in the text of the draft also need clarification, e.g. expectations and attendance of Consortium Board members at meetings, roles of the Consortium vis-à-vis the Fund. It was suggested that a code of conduct for the Consortium also be developed.
- Linkages with GCARD, the Fund, and other parts of the System should be made explicit.
- Establishment of the Consortium is a complex undertaking and there is a lot of opportunity for misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Organizing the Consortium and messaging should be kept as simple as possible. The Consortium should primarily play a leadership role that sets strategy and identifies needs, articulates priorities, and mobilizes resources. The organization should be as flat as possible to ensure accessibility of staff. The Alliance should consider whether a CEO and a board chair are both necessary. Perhaps the same person could play both roles.
- Language of the draft Constitution should be clear and concise and leave no room for misinterpretation. The text needs to be clarified and sharpened and make explicit the leadership of the Consortium that will provide the System with a strong single voice, and have the power to decide on organizational restructuring.
- ExCo discussed the possibility of recruiting an interim Consortium Board chair to serve during the transition period to undertake some of the activities envisioned for the CEO/Board chair. There was a sense that this was not necessary since a Consortium Board chair is scheduled to be identified and selected later in the year.
- S. Hall responded to comments by noting that the desire for strong Consortium leadership is entirely in line with the thinking of the Alliance. The intent of the Alliance is very much to have a strong Consortium consistent with the AGM08 decision, and not for the members group to watch over its shoulder. The rationale of the members group was more about having a check on the Consortium becoming an overly bureaucratic entity. The Alliance agrees that the Board chair and CEO would play a key role in the external environment. Consideration will be given to the idea of one person filling these roles. He also noted that each Center Board would have to make an absolute agreement on its obligation as a

member of the Consortium. Each Center would have to conduct due diligence to ensure their individual constitutions would not be a hindrance to joining the Consortium.

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *The sentiment, intent and substance of the presentation at the ExCo 16 Meeting reflected more closely than the draft Constitution the AGM08 decisions for a strong Consortium Board with authority and tools to set the overall strategy, raise funds, effectively lead the Consortium and manage results.*
- *However, there was a sense of shortcoming in the proposed draft Consortium Constitution document which did not explicitly reflect the AGM08 sentiments and decisions. ExCo requested the document to be redrafted with clear and consistent language, which clearly states that the Consortium Board Chair and CEO will have authority of decision on overall strategy and organizational framework.*
- *The current document gives the impression that the envisioned Members Group of the Consortium would have inappropriate power over the Board.*
- *ExCo recognized that Center Boards would remain intact and be responsible for implementation of Consortium decisions.*
- *ExCo outlined several areas of ambiguity in the draft Constitution that need to be clarified with clear and consistent language.*
- *A small advisory group of ExCo members will be formed to provide feedback on the revised draft Constitution of the Consortium. (At the meeting, members from Australia (2), Canada and Norway agreed to serve on this group. Other CGIAR Members who are interested to serve are also welcome.)*
- *The preamble of the draft Constitution should contain language on linkages with GCARD, the CGIAR Fund, and other parts of the System.*
- *It is important that the Center Boards undertake due diligence on the legal implications of the Consortium as soon as practical.*

CGIAR Fund Update

R. Wang presented an update on development of the CGIAR Fund. Following identification of key issues and requirements of the trustee, working drafts of the Fund Framework were developed and shared with a small group of donors and stakeholders. An informal donor consultation was also held, at which advice was received for further refinement of the framework document. An advisory group has also been established to provide further feedback. Going forward, a sample trust fund agreement will be sent to donors, and draft guidelines for mega-program proposals and performance agreements will be developed. These will undergo a set of internal World Bank reviews and advisory group reviews, respectively.

The presentation highlighted a high-level roadmap for funder buy-in and alignment and an approach for mobilizing funder commitment. Remaining key questions center on composition of the Fund Council, the roles of the Funders Forum and Fund Office, ISPC, who pays for what in the new CGIAR, and whether there is a need for an overarching governance mechanism.

Discussion:

- Membership on the Fund Council should be as inclusive as possible. Stakeholders should participate as full members to ensure their voices are heard.
- Incentives to encourage high-level unrestricted funding should be put in place. This could be done through minimum requirements for donor participation on the Fund Council. Options should be explored and presented in the next iteration.
- Different minimum financial contribution thresholds should be set for developed and developing country representatives.
- The Funders Forum should not become another AGM-type event, but should be inclusive of stakeholders.
- Clarification and information on costs of contributing and holding funds in different currencies should be included in the analysis.
- Engagement of the private sector and foundations should be ensured. In order to avoid adding complexity, perhaps meetings with these groups should be set up now to explore how this can be done.
- On the ISPC, ExCo expressed the desire for it to be a standing panel that reports to the Fund Council. However, the question was raised on how the new ISPC will differ from the current SC, and there was particular interest regarding partnerships.
- R. Wang welcomed the feedback on composition of the Fund Council and suggestions on incentives for participation. He noted that a task group has been established to explore options on the new ISPC and suggested ExCo wait to receive recommendations from the group. The Fund Framework document will be revised and circulated to the advisory group and other interested CGIAR Members for further feedback.

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *ExCo expressed a desire for a balance of representation on the Fund Council from the South and North and from stakeholders using appropriate financial thresholds to ensure this. In the spirit of inclusiveness, engagement of private sector and foundations also needs to be explored.*
- *Composition of the Fund Council needs to be balanced, consistent with the AGM08 decision. Regarding the size of the Council, the Chair noted that, while inclusiveness is an objective, this should not be at the expense of losing efficiency by having a large Council.*
- *Stakeholders should also participate in decision making process on the Fund Council. Decision rules (consensus vs. voting) should be revisited and options for the latter explored.*
- *The first/inaugural meeting of the Fund Council should be open to all funders.*
- *ExCo expressed satisfaction with the role of the Fund Office as described in the Fund Framework document.*
- *Discussion on the role of the ISPC will be deferred until the task group that has been constituted has completed its work and made recommendations.*
- *A new draft will incorporate ExCo's feedback and circulated to the advisory group for the Fund and other interested CGIAR Members.*

Accountability Update

J. Wadsworth updated ExCo on development of an accountability framework that explained the approach to accountability, categorized the content of the framework, and sought feedback on a number of key issues.

He noted that the accountability framework empowers the Consortium and Centers to pursue high impact results, and guarantees donors and stakeholders that the System is meeting legal, fiduciary, reporting and performance requirements. Draft accountability maps have been established for the Fund Council, Consortium and Centers to assess whether and how well they meet their accountability targets. The framework looks at governance and accountability from a System perspective.

The challenge is to develop a framework that has sufficient controls so that compliance reinforces the purpose of high-impact results, but does not stifle creativity, innovation and flexibility.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is an essential part of an accountability framework. Two types of evaluation will be needed in the new CGIAR: evaluation of CGIAR components (e.g. Centers, Consortium, Fund Council, etc.), and evaluation of programs. Evaluations would be done by independent external panels, and be based on performance indicators and contracted results delivery.

The Accountability Framework will be revised based on ExCo guidance and stakeholder feedback and completed by mid-July 2009. An editorial advisory panel will be established for the framework. Starting in July, the framework will be applied to the other transition workstreams to ensure synergy and coherence to the overall transition.

Discussion:

- ExCo acknowledged the progress on development of an accountability framework.
- The locus of responsibility for accountability in the new CGIAR should be with the Fund Council. The Consortium should report to the Fund Council, which in turn would report to the Funders Forum. In order for donors to move toward more unrestricted funding, it is important to understand where the balance of authority lies.
- *Ex post* evaluation should be linked to *ex ante* planning.
- The draft accountability maps are very complex, but provide a significant amount of information. Simpler, easier to understand maps should also be developed as a marketing tool.
- A component on accountability to beneficiaries should also be added to the framework.
- The current framework doesn't differentiate between donors to the Fund and bilateral donors to Centers. An element on bilateral funding should be included.
- A table that compares existing and envisioned M&E mechanisms should be developed.

- SC has prepared a paper on M&E that provides ideas; it will be shared with ExCo.
- J. Wadsworth thanked ExCo for comments, and clarified some of the questions raised. The comments will be useful in the next iteration of the framework. He agreed that inclusion of beneficiaries and simplified accountability maps are essential to a marketing piece on accountability.

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *ExCo acknowledged that significant progress has been made in developing an accountability framework. The challenge going forward is to combine it with the managerial simplicity envisioned in the AGM08-approved reform proposal, i.e. a well-managed organization, consisting of a series of Centers, with appropriate and effective accountability tools in place.*
- *An addendum to the current paper should be included to state that new or additional tools should not be added to the accountability mix.*
- *The document should include the table of contents expected in the Consortium annual report. This will help the Alliance to see what reports will be necessary and how to best manage themselves.*
- *The document should also include a performance contract template. This will provide Members with an idea of what is expected, and help the Consortium determine the minimum set of tools needed to fulfill the contracts.*
- *A section on external beneficiaries should be included to demonstrate links to GCARD, and accountability to beneficiaries through surveys, transparency of documentation, and other tools. This can also be used as a marketing tool for donors.*
- *Further work is needed on M&E in terms of what independent evaluation will be needed in addition to what the Consortium will do. Clarity on who does what is also needed.*
- *A table on existing and on expected M&E mechanisms should be developed to ensure something is not being added.*
- *ExCo agreed on the suggestion that the Fund Council will be the locus of System oversight responsibility for the Consortium to report to, and the Fund Council in turn will report to the Funders Forum.*
- *ExCo requested a dispute resolution or other mechanism be developed and built into the framework in the event of a severe disruption (or worst-case situation) to the System.*
- *ExCo agreed with the suggestion to set up an editorial advisory panel for the accountability framework document. It will also help synthesize the document with other transition documents to ensure coherence. Australia, Canada and Ireland agreed to serve on the panel; other CGIAR Members are welcome to join. ExCo requested a beneficiary point of view to also be included on the panel.*

Transition and Next Steps

R. Wang presented a high-level sequencing of the events surrounding the transition workstreams, and the proposed meeting schedule. Given the complexity of the remaining steps of the process, another ExCo meeting was proposed for the first week of November

2009, following the Alliance meeting in late October. The CGIAR Business Meeting will need to be moved one week later, and availability of documentation for both meetings may be delayed due to the meeting schedule.

He also presented a slide that highlights the linkages between development of the CGIAR SRF and mega-programs and the GCARD.

Discussion:

- ExCo members expressed support to hold a final ExCo meeting in November.
- Establishment of the Fund may be delayed due to required World Bank Board approval. This may delay the first Fund Council meeting following the Business Meeting in December.
- A decision on when to hold the first Funders Forum should be delayed until the Business Meeting; however, options should be explored.

Conclusion and ExCo Decisions:

- *A final ExCo meeting (ExCo 17) will be held on November 2-3, 2009, in Rome.*
- *The final CGIAR Business Meeting will be held December 7-8, 2009, in Washington, DC. (December 8th will be either an inaugural Fund Council meeting or an informal meeting of donors.)*
- *There are two alternatives for the first Funders Forum: 1) to be held either immediately following the first GCARD (on April 1, 2010), or 2) in conjunction with another international event later in the year. Timing of this event will depend on progress of the transition and a decision taken at the Business Meeting.*
- *Documents for the final ExCo and Business Meetings should be made available for posting to the web within the statutory time deadlines.*
- *ExCo reinforced the importance of the regional consultations to development of the Strategy and Results Framework. ExCo requested the TMT and the Alliance to consider the possibility of consultations with donors outside the ExCo environment to ensure a level of comfort prior to the final ExCo/Business meetings.*
- *TMT will discuss the financing plan for the transition and filling funding gaps of the Change Initiative Facility.*

3. Evaluation

3.a. ICRISAT EPMR

Rudy Rabbinge (SC Chair) presented both the SC and CGIAR Secretariat commentaries on the EPMR report. He joined the review panel in congratulating the Board and management of ICRISAT for the major turnaround in various aspects of the Center's operation since the last review in 2003. The substantial growth in research funding was highlighted as one of ICRISAT's key achievements. Two of the most important issues

raised were the need to strengthen strategic planning and research prioritization in the Center and to further improve the balance of research investments in Asia and Africa.

Although ICRISAT has accepted all the panel's recommendations, it was suggested that a more detailed action plan for their implementation would be useful.

Discussion:

- ICRISAT has a unique opportunity to promote private sector investment and partnership.
- NARS representatives in ExCo from both Asia and SSA expressed appreciation of ICRISAT's close collaboration with them and thanked the Center for its contribution, particularly to germplasm enhancement of crops important to both regions and to strengthening of research capacity at the country level.
- The need for ICRISAT to strongly re-invest in strategic planning was reiterated. The Center should retain those activities that are consistent and supportive of its plan and drop those that are not.
- Although the panel found the quality of ICRISAT's research to be at par with other CGIAR Centers, there appears to be a need to improve the monitoring of research quality. The SC Chair questioned the value added of the recent Center Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs) that the panel found to be weak in assessing both research quality and productivity.
- The Center's involvement in developing seed systems in some countries was recognized in the context of supporting the dissemination and adoption of improved varieties that it has developed. It is one of the key areas in the Center's work that private sector investment and collaboration should be encouraged.
- In response to some of the comments, Stein Bie, ICRISAT Board Chair, pointed out that the re-appointment of the current DG for a third term was made to ensure stability at the Center level while major changes in the System are being made. He also reaffirmed the Board's role in monitoring research quality and productivity in the Center.
- William Dar, ICRISAT DG, pointed out that the balance of investments between Asia and Africa will be a key focus of the Center's strategic planning exercise. He also informed ExCo that an implementation plan for EPMR recommendations is already being prepared.

ExCo Conclusion and Decision:

- *ExCo congratulated ICRISAT for a positive review and thanked the panel for its report and the Center for its response.*
- *ExCo endorsed the EPMR panel's recommendations and Center response, and agreed that ICRISAT should develop and share a detailed plan to implement the recommendations.*

3.b. IRRI EPMR

R. Rabbinge presented the SC and CGIAR Secretariat commentaries on the IRRI EPMR report. He congratulated IRRI for the panel's positive assessment of the Center's performance during the period in review.

Discussion:

- IRRI's positive impact is evident in many Asian countries which are benefitting from the Center's effective technologies and training activities. The impact in other regions such as CWANA (notably in Egypt) was also recognized. However, it may need to reconsider its reduced investments in LAC and the level of its backstopping to CIAT, in the context of its global mandate. The Center's well-documented response to the food crisis was also noted.
- IRRI's renewed collaboration with WARDA puts the two Centers in a better position to exploit complementarities, primarily in East and Southern Africa (including Madagascar). IRRI/WARDA joint programs incorporating strong capacity building components are expected to deliver significant impact and strengthen NARS in the region.
- In addition to maintaining strong partnerships with NARS, IRRI's strategy should continue to include selected collaborations with private companies to ensure the Center's participation in upstream research, including biotechnology in its broader context.
- The substantial growth of restricted funding in IRRI's budget over the last few years could jeopardize the Center's overall strategy and flexibility.
- It was suggested that the CCER on Integrated Pest Management recommended by the EPMR should include a study of rodents' impact on rice cultivation and post-harvest.
- On the issue of board size, the validity of IRRI's argument for solid regional representation was recognized. However, it was also acknowledged that other mechanisms (e.g. advisory committees) can be used to benefit from such representation. Higher priority should be given to ensuring board efficiency and effectiveness.
- Concern was also expressed regarding recruitment and retention of staff.
- In his response, Robert Zeigler, IRRI DG, pointed out that the integration of IRRI's, WARDA's and CIAT's work through a global program on rice would bring about a critical mass of scientists building on the comparative advantage of the three Centers addressing poverty alleviation and food security issues. Robust HR policies are essential moving forward due to competition from private sector. He also emphasized the importance of maintaining and upgrading the research infrastructure for rice. IRRI's own capacity to invest in updating its laboratories and equipment will not suffice. He made an appeal to donors to consider specific investment in rice research infrastructure.

ExCo Conclusion and Decision:

- *ExCo was pleased with the results of the review and congratulated IRRI for the positive assessment of its performance. It also expressed appreciation to the panel for its report and the Center for its comprehensive response.*
- *ExCo endorsed the EPMR panel's recommendations and Center response.*

3.c. Performance Measurement System: 2008 Results

A presentation on Performance Measurement (PM) System 2008 results was included in documentation for information. The full report will be posted to the CGIAR website when finalized (likely at the end of June 2009).

R. Rabbinge pointed out that SC has prepared a guideline for using the performance information along with the previously mentioned document on M&E to help maintain continuity as the PM System is handed over to the Consortium during the transition process.

SC and the CGIAR Secretariat are also preparing a paper that documents experience from the PM System to date, and draws lessons learned on implementation. It will be a useful guide for design of M&E and performance monitoring in the new CGIAR. The paper is tentatively scheduled to be completed by the end of June 2009.

Discussion:

- ExCo looks forward to the paper on lessons learned as it will be a useful guide for the transition process.

Conclusion:

- *ExCo thanked the SC and CGIAR Secretariat for their work on the PM System and looks forward to the 2008 final report.*

4. Financial Matters

2008 Financial Report

The 2008 Draft CGIAR Financial Report was jointly produced by IRRI and the CGIAR Secretariat. The draft report was available for information in the documentation. Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) was available to answer questions from ExCo.

Discussion:

- Concern was raised on the SSA Challenge Program (CP) in regard to health of its finances and connection to FARA. Clarity was requested on this issue. Deficits at other CPs were also an issue.
- S. Tata clarified that the deficit financial results for two CPs (Water and Food, and Generation) had carryover funds from prior years to cover the 2008 deficits.

- An update on where Centers are for 2009 was also requested. S. Tata noted that the 2009 financing plan approved at AGM08 was updated earlier this year; however, numbers will change throughout the year depending on results of individual Centers.

Conclusion and ExCo Decision:

- *ExCo thanked IRRI and the CGIAR Secretariat for the report.*
- *ExCo requested the CGIAR Secretariat to prepare a short report for discussion at ExCo 17 on the financial status of the SSA CP and its connection with FARA.*
- *Centers were requested to provide an update on expenditures and forecasts for funding for the year so far that show donor breakdowns, so that the forecast for 2009 may be updated.*
- *It is important for the new Consortium to build a real-time financial reporting system so donors and others in the System can get a clear picture of finances at any given time.*

5. Other Business

R. Rabbinge updated ExCo on the Science Forum, scheduled to be held on June 16-17, 2009, in Wageningen, the Netherlands. It is being organized by SC, CGIAR Secretariat, the Alliance, GFAR and University of Wageningen. Six themes will be presented and discussion at the event will examine new opportunities for science to contribute to agricultural research for development, the means to organize new science partnerships, and opportunities for young scientists. It will be an important input to the GCARD process, and he encouraged attendance by all interested parties.

K. Sierra also briefed ExCo on negotiations toward a climate change agreement at the upcoming Copenhagen COP15. The negotiations look positive but there are difficulties that lie ahead. The negotiations are important to the work of the CGIAR and it is essential for CGIAR to have a voice at the table and be agile enough to take a stand. The Alliance pointed out that the chair of the Climate Change Challenge Program is orchestrating a CGIAR presence at the negotiations.

6. Closing Session

Prior to closing the meeting, R. Echeverria thanked ExCo for holding the meeting at CIAT, and invited participants to return to the Center in the future.

K. Sierra thanked CIAT for hosting the meeting and the excellent support provided. She also thanked CGIAR Secretariat staff for their work in organizing the meeting and commended their continued support to ExCo and her role as CGIAR Chair during a difficult period of transition. She acknowledged the support and advice of the SC Chair and Secretariat as well.

She noted the significant progress made at ExCo 16 on the transition during the meeting, while recognizing the amount of work yet to be done. She closed the meeting by thanking ExCo for their participation and attentiveness.

List of Participants
Sixteenth Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chair:</i>	Kathy Sierra	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Isabel Alvarez	FAO
	Jurgen Voegelé	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>Alliance of CGIAR</i>		
<i>Centers:</i>	Steve Hall	AE Chair
<i>SC:</i>	Rudy Rabbinge	SC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Adel El-Beltagy	GFAR Chair
 <u>OECD/DAC:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Hélène Corneau	Canada
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Hung-Goo Hwang	Korea
<i>Europe</i>	Marc Debois	European Commission
	Ruth Haug	Norway
	Jonathan Wadsworth	United Kingdom
 <u>Developing Countries:</u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Elisio Contini	Brazil
<i>SSA</i>	B.Y. Abubakar	Nigeria
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	S.P. Tiwari	India
<i>CWANA</i>	Jafar Khalghani	Iran (could not attend)
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Mario Allegri	FORAGRO
 <u>Foundations:</u>	Marco Ferroni	Syngenta Foundation
 <u>Partners:</u>		
<i>Private Sector</i>	Bill Niebur	PSC Chair

Observers:

Pamela Anderson	CIP
Robert Bertram	U.S.A.
Stein Bie	ICRISAT
Philip Chiverton	Sweden
Catherine Coleman	Canada
William Dar	ICRISAT
Ruben Echeverria	CIAT
Pierre Fabre	France
Peter Gardiner	SC Secretariat
Simon Hearn	Australia
Mark Holderness	GFAR
Anne-Marie Izac	Alliance Office
Jos Kalders	Belgium
Wolfgang Kasten	Germany
Ian Kershaw	Australia
Kang-su Kwak	Korea
Emma Leonard	Ireland
Tom Lumpkin	CIMMYT
Gordon MacNeil	CIAT
Paolo Sarfatti	Italy
Keiichi Sugita	Japan
Ryotaro Suzuki	Japan
Monika Szamko	Considea Consulting
Howard Ting	Considea Consulting
Arturo Vega	Colombia
Robert Zeigler	IRRI

Executive Secretary, ExCo: Ren Wang
CGIAR Secretariat Support: Lystra Antoine
Laura Ivers
Iftikhar Mostafa
Nathan Russell
Shey Tata
Feroza Vatcha
Jason Yauney

Agenda

1. Opening Session

- Welcome by Host Country
- Election of Meeting Co-Chair
- Adoption of the Agenda

2. CGIAR Transition

Transition Management Team Progress Report

Report on Progress: Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD)

Strategic Results Framework and Mega-programs Update

Consortium Update

CGIAR Fund Update

Accountability Update

Transition and Next Steps

Discussion and ExCo Decision

3. Evaluation

- Presentation of Final Report
- Discussion and ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

3.a. ICRISAT EPMR

- SC Commentary
- CGIAR Secretariat Commentary
- Discussion and ExCo Decision

3.b. IRRI EPMR

- SC Commentary
- CGIAR Secretariat Commentary
- Discussion and ExCo Decision

3.c. Performance Measurement System: 2008 Results

4. Financial Matters
-- 2008 Financial Report

5. Other Business
-- 2009 Science Forum

6. Closing Session