



AN ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK FOR THE CGIAR

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISSEMINATION OR CITATION

May 21, 2009

NOTE: The roles and processes described in the document are tentative and subject to change as the various reform design workstreams develop them over the coming months

This accountability framework is designed to enable the CGIAR to more effectively deliver high impact results through effective collaboration on agricultural research. To do this, the accountability framework clarifies the distinct roles and responsibilities between those funding the CGIAR – represented by the CGIAR Fund -- and those delivering the strategy – represented by the Consortium and The Centers. The accountability framework helps drive these key system elements to:

- Align the System around impactful strategies
- Build efficient and effective management systems to deliver the strategies
- Meet clear expectations for financial management

The accountability framework therefore empowers the Consortium and the Centers to pursue high impact results while ensuring donors and stakeholders that the system is meeting legal, fiduciary, reporting, and strategic performance requirements. The accountability framework possesses three pillars:

- 1) It establishes the accountabilities that key system elements – the Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers – require of one another.
- 2) It specifies the areas for which these key system elements must be accountable. These include: financial and resource mobilization accountability, strategic & programmatic accountability, managerial and governance accountability
- 3) It maps the accountabilities that the Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers possess. Accountability maps can be used to help assess whether and how well system elements meet their accountability.

I. Establish key system accountabilities

Accountability possesses many definitions. A useful definition considered at the CGIAR London Donors' meeting follows.

Accountability can be defined as the acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for policies, decisions, and actions (including governance, administration and implementation, as applicable with the scope of a given role). It encompasses the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences.

To be accountable means:

- being *responsive* to key stakeholder concerns. This requires processes to identify stakeholders, seek their input and either take action or explain openly why none was taken. It means enabling stakeholders them to review our performance.
- adhering to clear systems of *control*. This requires defining standards for performance acceptable to our authorities and responsive to stakeholder

- concerns. It means reporting, evaluating, and transparently disclosing our performance.
- ensuring we *correct* our performance. This means identifying non-compliance or sub-par performance, and defining and taking corrective action. Figure X discusses different levels of corrective action.

Figure X: Levels of corrective action

Levels of corrective action

When the Consortium, Centers, or the Fund do not meet an accountability, corrective action is required. In most instances, we expect that corrective action will require a “low level” of course correction. Typically this occurs if a system element has not met its requirement fully or is struggling in some regard to meet its requirement adequately.

When a system element is unable to meet a requirement, or meets it in an unsatisfactory way (as judged via the control mechanisms), then it will require “moderate levels” of course correction. This may involve more investment of creative energy, time, or reporting to improve performance related to our accountability.

When a system element fails to meet its accountability, and does so due to a lack of capacity or willful neglect, “high-level” action is required. These will often take the form of restructuring, staff changes, or funding interruption.

The CGIAR’s authorities are its donors. Donors comprise “the Fund.” “The Fund” includes Funders Forum, Fund Council, Fund Office. The decision making body is the Fund Council.

Major stakeholders that possess clear authority in System governance include the Consortium and the Centers. The Consortium includes a Consortium Board, and a CEO with dedicated staff to perform a variety of functions.

Stakeholders the CGIAR seeks to be responsive to include the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC), NARs, ARIs, Partner organizations, end-user beneficiaries, and host countries.

Complex, collaborative arrangements like the CGIAR face a paradox. The more complex the system of actors, the more one needs strong controls and compliance mechanisms. However, the more rigid the controls, the more likely it becomes that accountability constrains the creativity, innovation, flexibility, adaptability necessary to achieve high impact results.

The accountability framework seeks to establish balance between these worthy requirements, and where feasible, to find ways to align accountabilities so that the requirements of compliance reinforce the requirements of delivering high-impact results (and vice versa). The accountability framework aims to build a

framework that helps the system understand when strong controls are necessary, and when controls can and should reinforce efforts to empower the system.

In practice this will occur through the specific and mutual accountabilities among the Fund, the Consortium, and the Centers. Each has expectations that must be met (these are specified in the left column of the ensuing tables). Each must help meet the expectations of the others, the CGIAR's stakeholders, and the system as a whole (these are specified in the right column of the ensuing tables).

The Fund Council...	
Must see significant positive change in results and efficiency in order to grow their investments. It must see compliance with fiduciary and legal requirements. It must ensure The Consortium and Centers respond to key stakeholder concerns.	Must empower the Consortium to pursue aligned strategic agendas. It must seek guidance of the ISPC and Funders' Summit.

The Consortium...	
Must possess the authority to define strategy, manage programs, allocate resources, and lead the system's operations. It must ensure Centers respond to key stakeholder concerns.	Must satisfy the requirements of both the Fund and the Centers and serve the CGIAR's mission. It must respond to the concerns of Center and Fund stakeholders.

The Centers...	
Must see clear value in participating in the collaborative structure both from the value an individual center accrues, and the broader value their system delivers to the vision and objectives. They must ensure the Consortium responds to the concerns of key stakeholders.	Must empower the Consortium to lead. Centers must align their strategies with system-wide strategies, and must meet the requirements of the Fund. They must respond to and transmit the concerns of their key stakeholders.

II. The accountabilities of the Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers

The Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers hold each other accountable to criteria related to the following areas:

1. Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization Accountability
2. Strategic and Programmatic Accountability
3. Managerial and Governance Accountability

The Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers each have specific accountabilities in these three areas.

1. Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization

The intent is to define accountabilities in a way to:

- Deliver to funders a high standard of compliance
- Define fiduciary responsibilities at all levels in the system
- Define collective reporting standards that will meet the needs of all donors
- Create strong linkages between the performance targets specified in the strategies such as the Strategic Results Framework (SRF), Mega-program strategies (MPs), and Performance Contracts (PCs) with reporting requirements.
- Establish the Consortium and the Fund Council as key resource mobilization entities on behalf of the CGIAR
- Empower the Consortium to have allocation, monitoring, and evaluation authority over Center use of MP funding
- The Centers will exchange efforts to secure bilateral funding in return for more stable funding through the Fund Council, and less onerous fiduciary reporting.

Specific and detailed accountabilities are being defined in proposals describing the roles of The Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers. The final, accepted proposals serve as detailed reference documents that are part of the accountability framework. The following summarizes the emerging accountabilities for each.

The Fund will establish the terms of fiduciary accountability for the Consortium. In doing so, the Fund Council commits to establish a new 'compact' expressed most tangibly in the link between donor reporting requirements and the Performance Contracts between the Fund and the Consortium. The Fund Council will work with the Consortium to mobilize resources. It will set the terms of the new "donor code of conduct", align members to agree to comply with terms of the code, and provide funds to support the SRF and agreed MPs. This will establish an aligned, single, & consistent approach to grants management and reporting that meets the needs of donors. At the same time, this will ease the administrative burden on the Consortium and Centers. The Fund will design reporting elements to reinforce elements in the SRF and MP performance agreements. This will happen by applying the conditions and schedules in multiyear funding decisions including performance and results based reporting, milestones, and benchmarks. To help meet its accountabilities, the Fund will create control mechanisms that encourage public feedback on its own performance. A new proposal that has not yet been discussed is to

encourage the Consortium and Centers to provide 360 degree review to the Fund Council. The review will identify experience with the Fund Council and its members in keeping to the terms of the “compact.” In return, the Fund Council will expect to see strong returns on investment (defined by the SRF and Mega-program strategies). It will expect to see consistent compliance with fiduciary and legal controls. It will expect to work closely with a partner in the Consortium that will be able to provide effective leadership, direction, oversight, supervision, and corrective action for the whole system. It will expect to work closely with the Consortium in building robust approaches to evaluation. It will expect to see Centers performing at high levels of effectiveness and efficiency. It will expect to see the CGIAR deliver high-impact results.

The Consortium will establish a transparent process to manage and monitor Mega-program implementation, develop annual financial statements subject to independent audit, and provide oversight of Center financial performance & management. The Consortium will be empowered to lead fund-raising efforts. It will receive fund allocations related to the Mega-programs and will develop Performance Contracts with the Fund Council that will in part identify how the Mega-program funds will be used. Fund Council and Center review and due diligence will identify whether the Consortium is meeting its accountabilities.

The Centers will move resource mobilization responsibilities to the Consortium. In return the Centers will expect to receive stable and consistent funding tied to the SRF and Mega-program strategies. Centers will still seek bilateral funding. However the expectation is that these programs will align with the CGIAR’s strategic objectives, and over time establish systems to respond to Fund Council and Consortium requirements. The Centers will meet the reporting and performance expectations that the Consortium defines.

2. Strategic and Programmatic Performance

The CGIAR sets strategy and defines programs through the following mechanisms.

- Vision and Strategic Objectives.
- Six Year Strategy & Results Framework (SRF)
- Mega-program Strategies (MPs)
- Individual Center Strategies

Strategies and programs – focusing on the SRF and MPs -- must define high impact results and the processes to deliver them. The process used to design strategies and programs must:

- Follow a rigorous approach that includes the voice of The Fund, The

Centers, Partners, ISPC, Funders' Summit, and local stakeholders including the NARs, ARIs, and end-user beneficiaries among others. The approach should include clear analytics that show how recommendations are made. The resulting strategy should allow for comment and feedback.

- Set clear criteria for what constitutes high impact results. This includes metrics for individual well-being (potentially targeting certain socio-and-demographic groups), scale, scope, economic impact, health impacts and others. The metrics should help indicate when research solutions are more cost-effective than existing solutions.
- Define strategies to influence “impact pathways.” To impact development, research must be adopted and diffused. Typically the CGIAR is not directly involved in adoption and diffusion “pathways.” To achieve high-impact results requires the CGIAR to be more active, creative, and influential to ensure that our research is widely and effectively applied.
- Set clear goals, objectives, and key performance indicators. These should benefit evaluation processes (discussed later)
- Establish timelines for delivery of key outputs and resource requirements
- Establish acceptable rates for research that does not yield results. The strategy must accept that research does not always succeed and then embrace the learning that comes from it. Yet, the strategy must define acceptable levels and reasons for non-success.
- Identify crucial ethical concerns and ways to address them (e.g., related to equity, genetic resources, integrity, and social impacts).

Specific and detailed accountabilities are being defined in proposals describing the roles of The Fund Council, the Consortium, and the Centers. The final, accepted proposals will serve as detailed reference documents that are part of the accountability framework. The following summarizes the emerging accountabilities for the Consortium, the Fund Council, and the Centers.

The Consortium takes the lead role in strategy design. It enters into performance contracts with the Fund Council on each agreed Mega-program. Depending on how a Mega-program is to be managed the Consortium may enter into performance contracts (or agreements) with the Centers. The Consortium uses stakeholder guidance in strategy design. The Centers and The Fund participate in the planning process. If strategies do not meet expectations the Consortium should modify plans, or review and potentially redo key process elements (with the expectation of approval based on satisfactory modifications). The Consortium will report on overall MPs, focusing less on individual projects rather than overall programs.

The Fund Council and the Centers empower the Consortium to formulate the strategy and results framework (SRF). The Fund Council works to align the views of Fund donors to achieve consensus agreement and approve the Mega-program strategies. As a result, the Fund Council commits to mobilize resources that will be allocated in an unrestricted manner to the Consortium to pursue the Mega-program strategies. Fund Council's decisions on fund allocation would be made by consensus. Fund donors have the option to exit from being a Fund donor any time.

The Fund Council should be actively engaged in providing inputs to the design of the SRF and Mega-programs. The Fund Council will seek peer review of the Mega-program proposals. The Fund Forum approves the SRF. The Fund Council approves mega-program proposals. The Fund Council and the Consortium agree to assess strategic performance through evaluation.

The Centers empower the Consortium to set CGIAR strategy. Centers provide input into the strategies. They perform a vital role to engage the voice of key stakeholders through processes each Center determines in consultation with the Consortium. The Centers collaborate with the Consortium and at times with each other to develop specific proposals related to projects that link to the Mega-program strategies. The Centers design affiliated strategies related to MPs and to their research overall that align with the SRF and MPs. Center strategies emphasize impact pathways. Center strategies identify the partnerships they will need to form. Centers form agreements with the Consortium. The Consortium provides centers with funds it has secured from the Fund Council through agreements. The Consortium in discussion with the Centers will determine how Center performance will be evaluated. As a result, the Centers will expect to receive clarity on strategy, and related consistency in the approach and direction they take. They will expect to be able to focus – supported by sufficient resources – on programs and projects that are consistent with the Strategic Results Framework and that will achieve high impact results. They will expect to see the burdens of fund raising efforts and administration decrease.

3. Managerial and Governance Accountability

Processes must empower the CGIAR to deliver strategies and achieve high-impact results without compromising essential controls. They must:

- Ensure system-wide ownership and delivery of the high-impact results
- Empower Centers and their staff to focus on research and strategy delivery
- Tangibly improve efficiency and effectiveness. This means first defining common criteria for efficiency and effectiveness, and next assessing whether processes deliver these results.

- Meet the standards of good governance and management required by the Fund Council in its reporting requirements
- Provide mechanisms for continuous improvement, learning, and corrective action

The Consortium, the Centers, and the Fund Council possess three main accountabilities. The first is to set and implement **Mega-program Performance Contracts**.

The Consortium enters into Mega-program performance contracts with the Fund Council for each agreed Mega-program. The Consortium then sets Centers Performance Contracts (or similar agreements) related to Mega-program implementation by the Centers. Each MP strategy may identify a lead Center to drive implementation. However PCs with Centers will be designed to optimize collaboration and participation of a variety of Centers and Partners. This will need to be clarified in the Mega-program proposals prepared by the Consortium for Fund Council approval. The Consortium reviews the institutional and programmatic performance of Centers and reports this to the Fund. Fund Council will monitor Mega-program implementation through agreed results indicators reported by the Consortium. Fund Council will also arrange third party evaluation of each Mega-program. The Consortium will develop its own monitoring and evaluation arrangement to check on Center performance based on performance contracts with Centers.

The Centers will enter into performance contracts with the Consortium on Mega-program implementation. Centers will implement strategies and programs as defined in agreements with the Consortium. In return the Centers should expect supervision and oversight to come only from the Consortium. In addition, supervision and oversight should be limited only to that defined in agreements. I.e., there should be no experience of “micro-management”. The Consortium will review Center performance. In addition, lead Centers may set up their own 360 degree review to secure input from other participating Centers and partners regarding PC performance. This will complement the third party evaluations. If program performance is inadequate, Centers will instill improvement plans. At a high level corrective action by the Consortium may involve transfer of lead Center roles to alternative Centers or to the Consortium itself.

The Fund Council will review Mega-program proposals from the Consortium, enter into program performance contracts with the Consortium on each Mega-program and provide partial funding for each agreed Mega-program. The Fund will respond to the reporting and feedback from the Consortium, the donors, partners and stakeholders and the independent evaluations.

The second area of managerial accountability is for the Consortium to set – for the benefit of the Centers – an approach to **providing common services**. A vital shared service to underscore is a common approach to **human resources**. A research institution succeeds based on the strengths and achievements of its people. To deliver high-impact results means enabling the CGIAR's people to achieve breakthroughs in research and to enact strategies with as few distractions as possible.

This means being accountable for creating plans, systems, and a culture that allows the CGIAR's scientists to:

- Deliver their best contributions to the CGIAR's vision and goals
- Focus the vast majority of their time on innovative and scientific activities or strategy delivery
- Focus a minimum of their time on administration of bureaucratic tasks deemed not related to production of results
- Build a secure relationship with the CGIAR that allows them to pursue a fulfilling career
- Ensure opportunities for women and diverse minorities to advance their careers

The key mechanism for meeting these accountabilities will be the human resource policies and function of the Consortium and Centers.

The Consortium will be primarily accountable for providing common services that reduce administrative burden. The Consortium will work with the Centers to design an appropriate way to mobilize resources to support shared services. Common services include strategy design, strategic communications, financial reporting, non-financial reporting, results management, internal audit, information technology, Human Resources, stakeholder engagement templates. Each year the Consortium and Centers will set specific targets for how common administrative services, program administration, and coordination will reduce administrative burdens (financial and otherwise) for Centers. The principal accountability relationship will reside between the Consortium and The Centers. If the Consortium is not delivering target results, the Centers will review and potentially alter the approach to shared service delivery.

The Centers will empower the Consortium to deliver shared services. However Centers will work with the Consortium to define clearly the services each will provide. They will establish efficiency and effectiveness targets to assess the quality of Consortium services. The Centers will seek staff input and transmit feedback to the Consortium to enhance service design.

The Consortium and the Centers will need to work closely on HR policy and system design. The Centers will empower the Consortium to set system wide human resource policies. The Consortium will design shared service

programs to relieve administrative burdens from key Center staff. The Centers will maintain responsibility for hiring and firing of their own staff. The Consortium will set policies and resources to incentivize staff development. The Consortium and Centers will agree on staff diversity targets, programs, and policies. Together they will ensure equity in hiring, training, compensation, and other rewards. They will collaborate to define a system wide policy, strategy, and results framework. The Centers executives will be help to account for implementation and progress.

The Centers and Consortium will agree on a review mechanism if system-wide policies conflict with existing Center-level human resource policies. They will establish performance measures throughout the system to connect HR policies and programs to: attracting top scientists, increase retention, staff satisfaction, diversity and gender targets. They will update Center-based and system wide employee dispute and grievance process, and update the system-wide code of conduct with oversight. They will seek employee feedback and measure satisfaction, retention, and recruitment rates.

The Fund Council will not possess a special role in this regard other than to review efficiency gains in the system and help in resource mobilization.

The third area of managerial accountability is to implement and respond to the results of **evaluations**. As much as possible, evaluations should help the system to learn and support continuous improvement. This means evaluations should help the CGIAR specify criteria that differentiates the need for “low,” “moderate,” and “high” level corrective actions. Evaluation mechanisms must be

- Structured to comply with the standards set by the World Bank
- Structured to avoid conflict of interest
- Conducted where possible by independent, credible, and capable “third-parties”
- Based on indicators that reinforce high impact results defined in the SRF, MPs, and PCs
- Designed to support learning, innovation, and reporting on progress towards achieving results
- Designed to reflect stakeholder concerns and priorities

The CGIAR is in process of defining the structure and terms of an independent evaluation arrangement. The accountability framework will be updated when this is defined.

III. Accountability Maps

The Consortium, the Fund Council, and the Centers must each understand and meet its accountabilities. Each must identify the key stakeholders they must be responsive to, the controls that will ensure they meet their accountabilities, and

the corrective actions that will go into effect if they do not. The following maps summarize these accountabilities. ***These maps are preliminary. They are to provide guidance and inspire discussion. CGIAR Workstreams will finalize them.***

Accountability maps for the Consortium

The Consortium – Financial Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Control Mechanisms	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take the lead on resource mobilization for MPs • Establish a transparent process to allocate MP funding • Set policies for cost recovery • Set policy for enhanced reserve requirements • Provide detail on all donor financial contributions • Develop annual financial statements subject to independent audit • Establish system-wide transparent reporting and related data collection process • Provide necessary training and resources to ensure full compliance • Set target for level of admin burden the Consortium will take vs. Centers • Provide oversight of Center financial performance & management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund Council <p>Feedback on assistance and capacity needs provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centers and Partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund Council due diligence mechanisms • Feedback from Centers and Partners on quality of Consortium management • Level of administrative burden taken by the Consortium vs. Centers • Independent review of the Consortium commissioned by the Fund Council 	<p>Low level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities to improve efficiency <p>Moderate level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modifications to roles, responsibilities, training, and burden sharing • Penalties imposed for modest non-compliance <p>High level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop funding • Severe penalties • Staffing changes • Legal action

The Consortium – Strategic and Programmatic Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Controls	Corrective Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead planning process that Centers & Fund agree with • Set Vision & Goals 	<p>Plan design & implementation must reflect the feedback of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund Council • Centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funders' Forum Approval of SRF • Fund Council approves MP proposals 	<p>Low-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify plans <p>Mid-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign SRF, MP, or PCs <p>High-level</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set the SRF and MPs • Define PCs in collaboration with Centers • Implement MPs and SRF • Oversee specific strategies designed by Centers • Monitor Center implementation • Produce progress reports • Designs plans for MP implementation • Chooses how to allocate MP funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISPC • Funders' Summit • Partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium publicly reports the strategy • Independent evaluation assesses progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suspension of funding streams • New process • Staffing changes at executive level
--	---	--	---

The Consortium – Managerial and Governance Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Controls	Corrective Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set PCs with Fund Council • Set agreements with Centers on MP implementation • Provide supervision and oversight for MP implementation • Set inter-program and inter-center collaboration via standardized arrangements • Set common services to be provided subject to review on an annual basis by the Consortium Board. • Meet efficiency targets • Reduce transaction costs through consolidation of donor relations and/or reporting • Improve cost efficiency at Center level through shared functions & research platforms • Streamline system 	Plan design & implementation must reflect the feedback of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centers • Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for efficiency targets (criteria might include): • Increase in cost-effectiveness of program delivery • Reduce the overall complexity of the System • Reduce and where possible eliminate the negative effects of overlapping mandates • Take fully into account legal issues and the transaction costs of change host country-Center relationships • Review of actual administrative burden vs. target • Review of actual efficiencies vs. target • Review of quality of performance 	Low level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process improvement Moderate level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process modification High level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop funding • Staff changes • Alternative approaches such as devolution of services to Centers

<p>office and reduce central overhead costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define processes for each service area including policies, roles, responsibilities, performance targets, budgets, and training • Determine the administrative requirements Centers must deliver • Assess the need for Center capital improvements • Assess needs for staffing and core operational needs and advocate for support. • Report on results 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third party evaluation will assess Center institutional performance and the quality of service provision 	
--	--	--	--

Accountability maps for the Fund Council

The Fund Council – Financial Accountability			
Accountability	Responsive to	Control Mechanisms	Corrective Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set the terms of the new donors “code of conduct” • Align members to agree to comply with the terms of the Code • provide funds to support the SRF and MPs • Establish an aligned, single, & consistent approach to grants management and reporting • Establish a “Fast-track” style decision-making model to approve plans and budgets • conduct due diligence (oversight, auditing, reporting, and compliance) • Ensure the Consortium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors’ • World Bank needs <p>Feedback provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium • Centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRF, MP performance contracts • Funding mechanism • The Fund will set target for administrative burden of fiduciary management and reporting The Fund will report on variations where systems members may exceed burdens. The Fund will establish a corrective action plan. • 360 review of Fund performance by the Centers and Consortium (and included in public reports) 	<p>Low level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public report of the results of the 360 review and administrative burden reporting <p>Moderate level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund Council establishes improvement plan <p>High level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donor exit

<p>creates mechanisms to receive reporting data from Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply the conditions and schedules in multiyear funding decisions including performance and results based reporting, milestones, and benchmarks 			
--	--	--	--

The Fund – Strategic and Programmatic Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Controls	Corrective Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align Fund donor views & input into strategy • Ensure the process of designing SRF and MPs is high quality and responsive to stakeholder input • Approve MP proposals and enter into PCs with Consortium • Ensure the follow through of harmonized funding commitments 	<p>Plan design & implementation must reflect the feedback of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund • Centers • ISPC • Funders' Forum • Partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funders' Forum Approval of SRF • Fund Council approval of Mega-program proposals • Publicly report • Independent evaluation assesses progress 	<p>Low-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify plans <p>Mid-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISPC and key Funders' Summit participants are asked to input into member disputes and make public recommendations for consensus action. <p>High-level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member exit

The Fund Council – Managerial and Governance Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Controls	Corrective Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and approve Mega-program proposals • Enter into performance contracts with the Consortium on each approved Mega-program and provide partial unrestricted funding for each agreed Mega-program • Strive to mobilize additional funding for the System 	<p>Key feedback systems including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advice from ISPC - Funders Forum and GCARD discussions - Third party evaluations - Dialogue with the Consortium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to Consortium for MPs based on agreed performance contracts • Funders Forum will review availability of funds for SRF implementation 	<p>Low level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process improvement <p>Moderate level</p> <p>High level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design alternative approaches with Consortium and/or Centers • Member exit

Accountability maps for the Centers

The Centers – Financial Accountability

Accountabilities	Responsive to	Control Mechanisms	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish systems to respond to Bilateral donor and Consortium requirements • Work with Partners to ensure understanding of requirements • Participate in a 360 Review feedback of the Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilateral donors • Consortium <p>Feedback from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donor & Consortium due diligence mechanisms 	<p>Low level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities to improve efficiency <p>Moderate level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modifications to roles, responsibilities, training, and burden sharing • Penalties imposed for modest non-compliance <p>High level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop funding • Severe penalties • Staffing changes • Legal action

The Centers – Strategic and Programmatic Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Controls	Corrective Actions
<p>Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empower the Consortium to set strategy • Provide input into SRF, PC, & MP design • Transmit input from key local stakeholders (especially end-users) into the SRF & MP design process • Build specific strategies and implementation plans to implement SRF • Define in the plans impact pathways that include: long-term strategy to connect to delivery systems; requirements to support delivery systems including financing, capacity building, institution building; plan to form partnerships 	<p>Plan design and implementation must reflect the feedback of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-users • Institutions vital for key impact pathways • NARS • ARIs • Partners • Consortium & other Centers • Fund • Funders' Summit • ISPC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium review • Progress report shaped by stakeholder panel with the Consortium & publicly shared • Consortium monitoring of Center performance based on performance contracts 	<p>Low-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify plans • Modify partnerships <p>Mid-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign Center MP and other strategies • Redesign partnerships <p>High-level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suspension of funding streams • Staffing changes at the Centers' executive level • Change Partnerships

with key partners to support delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the programs and projects they implement are part of or consistent with the CGIAR SRF 			
---	--	--	--

The Centers – Managerial Accountability			
Accountabilities	Responsive to	Controls	Corrective Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set proposals to deliver related to MPs. Reach agreements with the Consortium. • Maintain responsibility for core functions such as hiring/firing, financial management, and others. • Establish clear plans and processes to meet Performance Contracts with the Consortium • Set services to be provided by Consortium (subject to review on an annual basis by the Consortium Board). • Define processes for each service area including policies, roles, responsibilities, performance targets, budgets, and training • Report on results 	Plan design & implementation must reflect the feedback of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center staff input on Consortium role in shared services and criteria for efficiency • The Fund and the Consortium's oversight of PC performance • 360 degree feedback from partners and Centers on PC performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund and Consortium review of Mega-program performance • 360 feedback from other Centers and Partners on program performance • Third party evaluation will assess the quality of service provision 	Low level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process improvement Moderate level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process modification High level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop funding • Staff changes • Alternative approaches such as centralization of PC elements to Consortium or to other Centers

IV. Next Steps

This accountability framework will receive comment during the ExCo meeting in Cali, Colombia. Further revisions will involve:

- Linking the accountability framework to the finalized design of the Fund, The Consortium, and The Centers.
- The new CGIAR Charter
- Emerging SRF and Mega-program strategies

The reform design process includes the creation of specific workstreams responsible for detailing the roles, responsibilities, polices, and measures of a variety of key strategy and service areas for the CGIAR. Workstreams will have the responsibility to use the accountability framework to define the specific accountabilities their workstream functions possess.

Annex I: Glossary

The following glossary comes from the Fund Framework Draft of May 22, 2009.

Glossary

Accountability Framework: An integrated description of the roles, relationships and mutual expectations of the components of the CGIAR and the principles and processes agreed to reinforce accountabilities in the System.

Active Observer: An individual invited to participate in the meeting of a committee in observer status (not as a member of the committee), expected to participate in the discussions but not in decision-making.

Administration Agreement: A legal agreement between the Trustee (World Bank) and Donor(s) which governs the trust funds. The AA defines the nature of the Bank's relationship with the donor and spells out the arrangements governing the use of funds, the donor's funding commitment, progress and financial reporting, auditing, cost recovery, disclosure of information, etc.

Bilateral donors: A donor that provides part or all of its funding [cf. Fund Donor below] to a CGIAR Center directly, through a bilateral arrangement that provides support for mega-programs under the Strategic Results Framework and the Centers and their partner institutions implementing the programs.

Centers: International agricultural research centers of the Consortium that implement the CGIAR's program portfolio. Centers receive funding both from the CGIAR Fund (through the Consortium) and may also receive funding from bilateral donors that provide support for mega-programs under the Strategic Results Framework and the Centers and their partner institutions implementing the programs. Centers operate under oversight of their own Board and the Consortium.

CGIAR (or CGIAR System): The global network of donors, international agricultural research Centers, and the governing and advisory bodies created by them.

CGIAR Fund or Fund: A central multi-donor fund that serves as a strategic financing facility for the CGIAR System to provide multi-year support for mega-programs under the Strategic Results Framework.

Consortium of CGIAR Centers (or Consortium): A legal entity established by the Centers that is the recipient of funding from the CGIAR Fund for implementation of the Strategic Results Framework through the Centers and their partners, and the signatory of the performance agreements with the Fund.

Donor (or CGIAR Donor): A country or organization (including foundations, multinational agencies and non-governmental organizations) that provides funding to support activities carried out by the CGIAR.

Fund Council: The decision-making body for the CGIAR Fund acting on behalf of the Fund Donors.

Fund Donor: A donor that provides funding to the CGIAR Fund.

Fund Office: The support unit of the Funders Forum and the Fund Council hosted, administratively, by the World Bank.

Fund Transfer Agreement: An agreement between the Trustee (World Bank) and the Consortium confirming the amount, Mega-program, account information and other identifying information necessary to affect the transfer of funds to the latter.

Funders Forum A forum of all donors to the CGIAR over a threshold amount, including bilateral donors and Fund donors, countries hosting the headquarters of CGIAR Centers and stakeholder representatives invited by the Chair of the Funders Forum in consultation with donor members.

Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD): Biennial conference organized by the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) to create a development-outcome-based framework for improving the targeting of international agricultural research and to provide inputs to CGIAR on strategy and priorities.

Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC): [The science-advisory organ of the CGIAR, whose primary responsibility is to enhance and promote the quality, relevance and impact of science and science partnerships in the CGIAR.]

Limited Fiduciary Arrangement (LFA): A type of trust service provided by the World Bank where funds received from the donors are transferred through the World Bank to an agreed third party or entity. In an LFA the Bank, as trustee, is not responsible for monitoring the use of funds or for supervising the execution of activities by said entity.

Mega-program: The programmatic and operational expression of the CGIAR's Strategic Results Framework to be implemented by the Consortium through the Centers and their partner institutions, and the subject of the performance agreement between the Consortium and the Fund. Mega Programs are the key delivery mechanism for the outputs of the Strategic Results Framework.

Mega-program portfolio: The suite of Mega Programs that constitutes the entire Strategic Results Framework of the CGIAR.

CGIAR Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF): A trust fund operated by the World Bank since 2005 which transfers funds to Centers and other legal entities representing CGIAR programs and undertakings based on specific instructions from the contributing donor.

NARS: National agricultural research systems, including academia, public and private sector institutions, and civil society organizations.

Partners: Groups and entities that work in partnership with CGIAR, including NARS, regional fora, Global Forum on Agricultural Research, advanced research institutions in the North and the South, private sector organizations, non-governmental organizations, and donors.

Performance Agreement (for mega-programs): A binding agreement between the Fund and the Consortium on each Mega-program, clarifying mutual obligations and expectations, as well as the remedies for non-compliance.

Results Framework: The *program logic* that describes the objectives of an action and the presumed causal relationships and underlying assumptions about how that action leads to the intended outcomes and impacts. CGIAR's mega programs are an integral part of the Results Framework and are tied to its strategic objectives through a cause and effect logic.

Shareholders (or Investors): Countries and organizations that contribute financially to the CGIAR System. Terms used interchangeably with "Donors."

Stakeholder: An individual or organization who is affected by the actions of the CGIAR, including especially those involved or interested in agricultural research for development, such as the institutions that partner with CGIAR Centers in the production or delivery of research results.

Strategy and Results Framework (or Strategic Results Framework): A systematic description of the CGIAR's strategy and the results framework that shows the specific outputs and outcomes that are expected to result from the implementation of the strategy.

Trustee: The World Bank, in agreement with Fund Donors, maintaining the CGIAR Fund and disbursing funds to the Consortium.

Unrestricted funding (or "unrestricted system funding"): A type of funding that is provided to the Fund as a whole, available for allocation by the Fund Council based on its judgment, following review of funding requests from the Consortium.