



Follow-up to

First Challenge Program External Review

of the

Challenge Program on Water and Food
(CPWF)

Overview Documents

1. CPWF Plan for Phase 2: An Update for the CGIAR Executive Council
2. SC Commentary on the Challenge Program on Water and Food (CPWF) Research Agenda and Implementation Plan for Phase 2
3. CGIAR Secretariat Comments on the Governance and Management Aspects of the CPWF Phase 2 Plan

CGIAR Challenge Program on Water and Food

CPWF Plan for Phase 2: An Update for the CGIAR Executive Council

"ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the CPWF CPER recommendations and the CP should proceed to Phase 2. The CPWF was requested to report back to SC and then to ExCo in May 2008 for a review of its Phase 2 plan towards a more focused program and reformed governance structure" (ExCo 13).

The CPWF has been working intensively on plans for Phase 2, taking account of External Review (ER) findings (April-August 2007); Science Council commentary (September 2007); ExCo recommendations (October 2007) and the AGM resolution (December 2007). In a recent meeting (February 2008), the Consortium Steering Committee (CSC) took major decisions about the shape of Phase 2 (research agenda, implementation and monitoring plan, governance arrangements) which were presented to the Science Council at its Ninth Meeting. These decisions are as follows

Mission statement

The CPWF mission statement is left unchanged: "To increase the productivity of water for food and livelihoods, in a manner that is environmentally sustainable and socially acceptable". In Phase 2, the terms "environmentally sustainable" and "socially acceptable" will be explored in the context of social and ecological resilience – a more specific and quantitative measure of a system's ability to cope with or adapt to rapid and severe changes.

Focusing the research agenda

Several decisions were taken to more closely focus the research agenda. These emerged from a desire to more effectively generate basin-level impacts through a more coordinated portfolio of projects targeted at a limited number of key sites within a smaller number of basins:

- Of the nine Phase 1 benchmark basins, only the six poorest will be included in Phase 2. All of these are multi-country. They are: Limpopo, Volta and Nile in Africa; Mekong and Ganges in Asia; and the Andean System in Latin America.ⁱ
- In each basin, research will focus on one or two major development challenges. Research will be spatially concentrated in geographical areas where these challenges are most pressing. Such areas will be large enough to work with issues of scale but compact enough to provide focus. At the same time, research will maintain a whole-basin perspective: the downstream consequences of upstream interventions will be taken into account, as well as global drivers and processes of change. Research will build on achievements from CPWF Phase 1.
- The generation of International Public Goods will be facilitated by cross-basin learning and synthesis focusing on four topics: "improving rainwater management", "multiple uses of water", "benefit sharing", and "drivers and processes of change". The evolution of these topics will be driven by research needs in basins.
- To qualify for inclusion in the Phase 2 agenda, research must address basin challenges or foster (topic-based) cross-basin learning; be interdisciplinary; feature cross-scale analysis; take into account resilience (social and ecological); and contribute to a better understanding of links among water, poverty, productivity and ecosystems in the context of global change.

Basin development challenges

Through a multiple-step, iterative processⁱⁱ, the following development challenges have been marked for priority attention in Phase 2:

- Andes: benefit sharing and "payment for environmental services"; effects of climate change on water availability for marginal rural areas, hydropower, cities and other uses

- Ganges: improving the management of sodic and saline soils; water savings and aerobic rice; better use of groundwater; impact of climate change on food systems (two of these to be selected).
- Limpopo: improving rainwater management; equitable sharing of water and its benefits among competing uses and users.
- Mekong: trade-offs between urban water use, hydropower, and rural water use for livelihoods and ecosystems; local water governance for multiple use systems.
- Nile: improving rainwater management; effects of climate change, pollution and water supply variability in the Nile delta.
- Volta: improving rainwater management; benefit sharing and the downstream consequences of upstream expansion of ensembles of small reservoirs.

Topics for cross-basin learning

The above basin challenges are strongly linked to the priority topics, “improving rainwater management”, “multiple uses of water”, “benefit sharing”, and “drivers and processes of change”. The effect of climate change on water productivity, food security and livelihoods is important in all basins. With similar challenges being addressed in multiple basins, topic-based cross-basin learning and synthesis will clearly be helpful in generating further IPGs beyond those generated within basins. Topics are developed to enrich and support the work done in the basins, so the precise content of each topic will evolve as basin agendas unfold.

Implementation arrangements

In Phase 2, CPWF research in each basin will be organized into one or two Basin Projects, each of which will focus on a development challenge in a geographically-focused part of the basin. Research will be managed and guided by a Basin Leadership Team composed of a Basin Science Leader and a Basin Impact Leader, connected to analogous positions at the Program level. An important task of the Basin Leadership Team is to integrate science and impact in that basin. Basin Science Leaders and Basin Impact Leaders will typically be employees of institutions contracted to provide the Basin Leadership Team, not employees of the CPWF.

The Program will be led by a Program Director supported by a Challenge Program Management Team that includes a Program Manager, a Science Director, an Impact Director and one or two part-time external members. The Science Directorⁱⁱⁱ and Impact Director^{iv} will be responsible for strengthening Basin Teams, fostering cross-basin learning, and integrating science and impact at the Program level. The Program Director is responsible for the overall quality of the Program, including partnerships for science and for relations with donors and other institutions. A detailed plan for Phase 2 monitoring and evaluation has been prepared.^v

Changes in CPWF governance

The External Review pointed out the need for a smaller, more independent governing body that meets more frequently, commands new areas of expertise, and maintains representation of different categories of CPWF partners while avoiding conflicts of interest. Other CPs already use this model (Harvest Plus) or will soon do so (Generation, decision taken in December 2007). The changes proposed in this chapter respond in general to ER recommendations, but are implemented in a different sequence. They are more transparent regarding selection of members and can be implemented more rapidly and smoothly. They are being implemented after an amendment to the CPWF Consortium Joint Venture Agreement. The amendment has been approved by the Consortium Steering Committee (CSC) and also by the IWMI Board, given its legal responsibility for the CPWF.

CPWF Consortium Steering Committee

The present Steering Committee of 18 members will maintain its name and legal status through the Joint Venture Agreement, but its functions will be restricted to selection of the Board (see below) and providing it with strategic advice; responsibility for content and approval of changes in the CPWF Joint Venture Agreement; and high-level stakeholder consultation (on which a sub-committee is presently preparing a proposal for cost-effective CSC input). For legal reasons, once the Board is selected it is not formally accountable to the CSC but rather to donors and other stakeholders.

CPWF Board

The newly created Board will be responsible for programmatic and budgetary decisions, including those requiring independent judgment and/or regular interaction with program staff^{vi}. The Board should meet at least four times a year, at least twice in person. A Board Chair will be selected by a Selection Committee (see below) from among those independent candidates who in their nomination demonstrated interest and expertise in fulfilling that role. The Chair should be a person capable of leading and moderating the Board of this diverse program, taking different points of view into account. Decisions will be reached by consensus when possible or by simple majority vote when consensus is not achieved. A quorum of five is required for regular meetings. If the Chair is not one of the five, the quorum will nominate an 'acting chair' for that meeting.

Board membership

There will be nine Board members as follows:

- one representative of the Alliance of the fifteen CGIAR Centers
- one representative of IWMI, as the lead centre that carries legal responsibility for the CPWF
- one representative of the non-CGIAR members of the Consortium
- five independent members, not representing any Consortium member
- the CPWF Program Director (ex-officio)

All members will be required to have expertise in science for development, finance, and/or corporate governance. One member, selected for professional expertise in audit and finance, will be named Chair of the CPWF Audit Committee.^{vii} Experience in finance of at least one other Board member is highly desirable. At least one member should be selected primarily for experience in corporate governance of international development organizations, including those connected to research. At least four members should have complementary expertise in science for development, including policy and institutions, hydrology and water management, agricultural science including livestock and aquaculture, economics, social sciences and collective action, natural resource management and the environment, and development. The need for the "Scientific Advisory Panel" recommended by the ER is obviated by the strong science presence and frequent meetings of the new Board, thus reducing transaction costs and complexity.

Independent members of the Board will serve for a period of three years, renewable once, as a consecutive appointment. The representative of the CGIAR Alliance will be selected by the Alliance and will also serve for a period of three years, renewable once. The IWMI representative to the Board is appointed at IWMI's discretion, but IWMI is requested to inform the Selection Committee with two months notice about any changes proposed. The representative of non-CGIAR Consortium members will be selected by those members, from among nominations they themselves make. For continuity and staggered rotation of the 'founding Board', two independent members will be up for replacement or reselection (for a full three year term) after two years, one after three years and two after four years. It is not necessary that replacement members have precisely the same technical expertise as the departing member, as long as the overall balance of expertise in the Board is retained.

Selection of independent members

The primary selection criterion for independent members will be their professional expertise, being mindful of the need for a suitable balance of skills across all nine Board members. Another criterion is the extent to which a new member will help maintain a suitable balance in categories of partner institutions; experience in developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America; national origin; and gender. Independent members should not have been an employee nor received compensation from any consortium member for a period of at least two years before the appointment.^{viii}

Independent members of the Board will be selected from among qualified candidates by a Selection Committee after an international call for nominations. The Selection Committee will be composed of representatives chosen by members from each CSC category. There will be one representative for CGIAR members, one for NARES and RBO members, one for ARI members, and one for NGO members. The Chair of the Selection Committee will be elected by all CSC members. Members of the Selection Committee shall serve for three years.

The first Selection Committee was elected by the 20-21 February 2008 CSC meeting. It called for nominations from the CSC, the CPWF Management Team, the CGIAR Science Council, the CGIAR ExCo, CGIAR members and GFAR and approached suitable nominees. It will make its final selection of the five independent Board members after any ExCo commentary on these governance arrangements, with the intention of calling the first meeting of the Board by the end of July 2008 and ensuring a smooth transition to Phase 2.

ⁱ Scientists from Phase 1 CPWF basins in Brazil, China and Iran will be invited to continue contributing to the CPWF by helping strengthen research in the six named benchmark basins. It is hoped that they will continue to work in their own basins in association with the CPWF providing they do so with their own financial resources (for example from national funds, or bilateral or multilateral loans) and thereby to contribute to research on global drivers and processes of change.

ⁱⁱ The process of defining basin challenges and strategies to address them has several sources: basin priorities developed at stakeholder meetings at the beginning of Phase 1; results available from Phase 1 competitive grant projects; the results of the Comprehensive Assessment on Water Management in Agriculture (CA); a November 2007 workshop among basin coordinators where key issues were identified and debated with theme leaders and CPWF management; the results of basin focal projects (BFPs); and further review of challenges and strategies in interaction with a basin advisory committee of major stakeholders including researchers, development specialists, policymakers and farmer representatives (to be formed).

ⁱⁱⁱ The Science Director will: encourage research integration across topics, basins and scales; ensure that CPWF research adheres to agreed priorities, maintains a high level of quality and produces international public goods; supervise within-basin and cross-basin synthesis of scientific research findings; identify desirable adjustments in research directions and priorities; lead the group of Basin Science Leaders in developing basin-level work plans; oversee cross-basin Topic Working Groups, and (in concert with the Impact Director) provide leadership in the suitable integration of gender, institutional and participation issues and approaches, and capacity-building into CPWF project planning and implementation.

^{iv} The Impact Director will: provide leadership in developing and updating impact pathways for the CPWF and individual basins; supervise "impact research" (on how research outputs move along impact pathways in different contexts, and the types of partnership required to transform research outputs to development outcomes); oversee Program and basin-level work on monitoring and evaluation and impact assessment; oversee the development and implementation of basin strategies as they are related to generating impacts; lead the group of Basin Impact Leaders in completing and adjusting basin-level work plans; lead the Impact Working Group; and participate in Topic Working Groups.

^v Planning and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the CPWF is based on program theory evaluation used extensively in the US and Europe, and recommended as good practice by the Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE) and EIARD. Fundamental to good planning and evaluation is developing cause-and-effect models that link project activities to outcomes to eventual impact. For the CPWF it is equally important to show the partnerships required for the type of research the program undertakes and to promote the development mandate of the program. The CPWF calls these models 'impact pathways' (IPs). Impact pathways models include a logical framework and network maps (showing partnerships).

^{vi} "Staff" means all personnel directly employed by the CPWF or through other institutions and with functions in the CPWF, whether full- or part-time.

^{vii} The Chair of the IWMI Board Audit Sub Committee shall also be a member of the CPWF Audit Committee. The CPWF Program Director, Program Manager and the IWMI Finance Director shall be resource persons.

^{viii} Receipt of compensation from the CPWF for short term consultancy (less than 20 days total in the two previous years) is permitted, since this is not considered to create a conflict of interest in favor of any particular Consortium member.

SCIENCE COUNCIL OF THE CGIAR

Commentary on the Challenge Program on Water and Food (CPWF) Research Agenda and Implementation Plan for Phase 2

SC Secretariat, 20 April 2008

The CPWF document “*Research Agenda & Implementation Plan for Phase 2*” submitted to the SC in mid March 2008 was discussed by the Council at its 9th Meeting. Jonathan Woolley, CPWF program coordinator presented a brief summary of the document. He emphasized this was a plan not a proposal, and that the Phase 2 plan responds to the concerns raised in the External Review (2007) and the SC Commentary on it. Phase 2 will focus its efforts in six basins (vs. nine previously), where two development challenges have been identified in each basin as well as four cross-cutting topics. Woolley emphasized that the CPWF is a ‘platform’, both from a logistics and a scientific point of view. The plan also puts forward an implementation, monitoring & evaluation and exit strategy, and proposes a new governance and management structure.

The SC would first like to emphasize that the decision of ExCo 13 – approved at AGM ’07 – was for the CPWF to proceed to Phase 2, but to also present a more focused strategy and research plan to the SC. Therefore, this commentary of the SC is only meant to help improve the CP as it moves into Phase 2. The SC expects to see such improvements subsequently reflected in the new three-year rolling MTP for 2009-2011 yet to be developed by the CPWF.

The SC is pleased to see that the CPWF research plan attempts to address a number of the key External Review recommendations related to strategy and greater focus. The CPWF has reacted positively to the recommendations to develop a new vision, strategy and objectives, and to develop a more cogent and focused research agenda by drawing on results from Phase 1 and the Comprehensive Assessment on Water and Food completed last year. In particular, the SC commends the CP for focusing on a reduced set of research questions (from 90 in Phase 1 to 13 in Phase 2) and reducing the number of research topics by 20%.

Due to the unexpected complexity of water and food problems, CPWF calls for a ‘new way of doing science’, through integrated research to solve water and food problems. The CPWF thus logically visualizes that it provides “*an institutional innovation that helps deal in an integrated fashion with multi-scale water problems and how they affect agricultural systems. It helps break down boundaries set up by institutional structures and mobilizes the efforts of a diverse group of stakeholders. It helps build a water dimension into on-going research on food, poverty, the environment and livelihoods*”. No change was made in the mission statement which reads: “*To increase the productivity of water for food and livelihoods, in a manner that is environmentally sustainable and socially acceptable*”. The SC endorses that decision.

The Phase 2 plan has three modified objectives:

1. *Contribute more effectively to the delivery of development outcomes (through partnerships with development institutions such as policymakers and NGOs)*
2. *Produce more relevant and targeted scientific outputs for development*
3. *Foster a more effective and integrated process of collaboration in research (among CG Centers and between Centers and other research partners)*

The SC notes that while this is a step in the right direction, the modified objectives are still very general and may not help focus the program. The objectives as written leave open what is specifically being targeted from research in this CP. It is difficult to interpret the true nature of the water and food challenge in these objectives – water is not even mentioned. The SC Commentary on the CPWF External Review highlighted the need to articulate a set of achievable objectives in Phase 2. It is not yet clear that has been accomplished, nor is it clear how success would be measured against the generic objectives as currently stated.

The ‘strategy’—as presented in Chapter 2 as the Research Agenda—could still be improved and elaborated upon, as it leaves open some questions regarding the main focus of the CP, and would benefit from more clarity about the objectives and the targeting of measurable, significant outcomes. The SC struggled to see in the new plan “a clear focus on those parts of the complex issues of the challenge that it intends to address in Phase 2 and elaborate how it will do so” (SC Commentary on CPWF-ER). The Plan does reflect some initial steps to narrow the focus geographically (by reducing the number of basins and focusing on specific geographical parts of each basin) and by topic (by focusing on 2-3 development challenges related to each basin), but it can and should go further. The SC would hope that a revised Phase 2 plan could address these issues with more specificity—as described below—and within the context of sharply defined research objectives. In defining a set of clear and measurable outputs and outcomes, and to effectively track them, the SC recommends that the CPWF management and governance take note of two recent documents: (i) the recent EPMP of CIAT which provided guidance on planning and monitoring of “outcome lines”; and (ii) the External Review of the Generation CP, both of which gave clear recommendations on focusing on do-able “output products” in the second phase of the CP in order to demonstrate proof of concept. There is a similar need here to focus on achievable outputs and outcomes and to monitor progress toward achievement in this phase of the CPWF.¹

The thematic research areas for Phase 2 were selected through an elaborate stakeholder consultation process using three criteria: (i) *it must fit within the current research agenda for topics or basins*; (ii) *it must be interdisciplinary, include cross-scale analysis, and take into account resilience (social and ecological)*; and (iii) *it must contribute to an improved understanding of the interrelationships among water, poverty, productivity and ecosystems in the context of global change*. Four thematic areas (topics/priority areas) were identified: improving rainwater management, multiple uses of water, benefit sharing and drivers and processes of change. Each of these topics cut across each of the basins. Policy and to a lesser extent institutions, however, seem to be at the heart of almost all research questions described.

These criteria are clearly relevant but are not sufficient as a basis for selecting research topics of the highest relevance at the basin level particularly after 4 years of work in Phase 1. The question remains how the criteria were applied, how the CPWF’s comparative advantage in addressing the key topics was established and how priority areas were selected based on the most likely to succeed within the time frame of the CP. The plan could be more explicit about who the most relevant partners are and how CPWF is positioning itself to deliver the selected outcome lines within the CPWF timeframe.

¹ Although the original proposal for the CPWF states that “*The CP is envisaged as a major program of research, extension and capacity building over a period of ten to fifteen years*”, it was the research agenda and the business plan described in the proposal for the first 5-year phase that was approved by the Group at AGM 2002. The SC is recommending that, similar to the timeframes for the other CPs, this CP be considered in the context of a ten-year time horizon, consistent with the document on Lessons Learnt on CPs (Sept 2007).

With respect to the four key topics identified, the Plan should go further in describing what critical aspects of these complex topics will be specifically investigated that are additional to ongoing work in the agriculture or water sectors. The tangible research outputs from each during the Phase 2 period should also be identified. Further elaboration would be required to judge whether the major constraints in water and food related productivity/sustainability are likely to be successfully addressed. For example, under the broad topic “improving rainwater management”, vast amounts of earlier research both within and outside the CGIAR have already been done, for example, on water catchment and strategic use for cropping and fisheries (e.g., by ICARDA, ICRISAT and World Fish Center). This should be reflected when describing the added value and distinguishing features of this CPWF effort in rainfed systems. What are the new and novel components? To what extent will upstream/ downstream effects on a landscape/catchment scale be a focus of attention? If the outcome lines and output products for the rainfed system topic could be described, it would strengthen the case for selecting that topic.

The SC notes in the Plan that the “research questions are expected to evolve as research proceeds over the years” (p. 12). To an extent, this is natural, but it is also surprising that after four years into the CP, the research questions are still ‘evolving’. The SC would urge the Basin Focal Projects and CPWF management to ‘hone in’ on some clearly defined problems and target measurable outputs for Phase 2. Leaving the refinement of the “presently formulated research questions into basin development challenges” to the discussions planned for the 2nd CPWF International Forum in November 2008 is too late. The SC believes that the 2nd phase of the CPWF must begin with a very clear and tightly focused set of objectives and nested set of outcomes and outputs in order to have the desired impact and to show proof of concept by 2013.

The relevant questions and potentially important research outputs that have been alluded to in the discussions under the research questions for each basin should be embedded into an overarching conceptual framework and a set of objectives and research hypotheses. This would strengthen the document. In addition, the Plan should identify and clearly described development outcomes, details on the pathway for these outcomes and means by which they could be tracked.

There is an acknowledgement that the “CPWF is only one player amongst many, and cannot on its own ensure the delivery of development outcomes.” The SC agrees with the statement in the Plan that it “can, however engage more closely with those people and institutions – policymakers, NGOs, and others – with prime responsibility for fostering development [and] ... encourage and participate in social processes of innovation and it can help with capacity-building”. To ensure this will in fact happen, the document could describe how the CPWF plans to bring the non -agricultural research communities – who have a deciding role to play in delivering some of the CPWF outcomes – within the CP realm. Programs such as the UNESCO sponsored IHP and HELP and the ICSU-ESSP sponsored Global Water System Program could and should play a key role here.

There are numerous references in the document to the climate change agenda as a focus of research in several basins, yet without a clear indication that the research agendas of the CPWF and CP on climate change (CCCP) have been reconciled. The SC does not deny the importance of such work; but it believes the CPWF might better focus on understanding the underlying water – productivity mechanisms, leaving the overlay of how climate change modulates such mechanisms to those with expertise in this area. It is understood from SC 9 discussions that for

the global Drivers and Processes of Change topic the CP will be seeking input from experts in climate change, biofuels, trade research, etc., on the implications of those changes on water productivity research in the basins. It should be clarified in the present plan how the CPWF will interact with the proposed new CCCP.

Although the research within the CPWF is expected to generate regional public goods from the platform-based research projects, the document is silent on how it proposes to generate IPGs through cross basin analysis and synthesis. The global setting is framed by two questions: (i) *Which key drivers of change, including climate change, biofuels and trade policies, are of most importance, and what complementary sets of policies and investments would be most effective to mitigate adverse and enhance positive impacts?* and (ii) *How does research achieve developmental outcomes and impacts (for different types of research output in different contexts) and what partners are necessary at different levels to achieve impact?* The CPWF basins may be well set up to contribute to answering some aspects of the first question but it is not clear which datasets and what type of analyses the CPWF will itself be generating and engaged in? Some of these issues may need to be addressed on a CGIAR level and not on a CP level that deals with water only. It would be useful to describe roles played or expected to be played by others, e.g., the CCCP partners. The brief narrative explanation for the second question says very little. Indeed, the question itself suggests considerable uncertainty with respect to the potential value of further research in solving development problems and raises questions about whether impact pathways are yet sufficiently defined.

The Monitoring and Evaluation processes described in Section 4 are very thorough and are grappling with three elements outlined in the beginning, i.e., knowledge, development outcomes and effective partners. The SC recognizes that the issues are complex. The previously noted CIAT EPMR also dealt with this dilemma -- how to maintain focus on achievable outcomes in complex systems. The SC urges the CPWF, in addition to the pathway analysis as described, to define more clearly the critical outputs and key entry points along the impact pathway and where the major constraints to impact are likely to be. Simple clear metrics are required to be monitored by the CPWF on an annual basis.

The exit strategy defined on p.26 needs more attention. It offers a somewhat confusing statement up front, i.e., "the exit strategy of the CPWF depends on the strong focus on basin research needs and questions". The SC suggests that a more proactive exit strategy could be outlined consistent with a set of more clearly defined research themes with well defined and measurable outputs and outcomes. The SC is aware that the CPWF Management considers Phase 2 only a mid-term phase. There may be value in extending this CP beyond two phases, but that should not be anticipated at this stage. The SC believes that over the next 5 ½ years, the CP should be able and have sufficient incentive to develop a much tighter research agenda and target clearly achievable outputs and outcomes by the end of Phase 2.

The SC suggests that in developing the 2009-2011 MTP, these comments on the Phase 2 Plan are taken into account by the CPWF management and new Governing Board. The SC would be pleased to review and comment on a revised Phase 2 Plan should that be useful to the CP.

CGIAR Secretariat Comments on the Governance and Management Aspects of the CPWF Phase 2 Plan

March 31, 2008

The comments below specifically refer to the governance and management arrangement described in Chapters 3 and 5 of the document.

- We are pleased that the Consortium Steering Committee has decided to implement the external review (ER) recommendation for a thorough reform of CPWF governance. Although the governance body (CPWF Governing Board) to be created is not the same as the one recommended by the ER panel, CSC is taking into consideration the principle of independence recommended by the panel in developing a new governance structure and operational arrangements.
- It is worth noting that the proposed changes will be reflected as amendments to the current CPWF Consortium Joint Venture Agreement.
- It is not clear if the Phase 2 research agenda and implementation plan was vetted by the now defunct Expert Panel on Scientific Quality before it was considered by the CSC. Shouldn't the founding CPWF Board be given the opportunity to review it, perhaps in its inaugural meeting?
- The change in title of the head of the CPMT from Program Coordinator to Program Director is appropriate. The creation of two new teams at the program, Science Team and Impact Team, each headed by a director, seems justified in the light of the roles and responsibilities assigned to them as described in Chapter 3.
- Table 3 is helpful in understanding the division of functions/responsibilities among CSC, CPWF Board, IWMI, and MT. However, further clarification is needed on who can fire or remove the Program Director. While the hiring and firing of the program director is indicated as a function of the CPWF Board, the CSC appears to have also the power to remove the program director from the Board (p.35).