

September 2, 2002

Submission of Agreed CDC allocations of WB funds to SW/EPs for 2002

Dear Francisco

I am pleased to attach for the World Bank's consideration the recommendations from CDC of the allocation of USD1.5million to existing, high priority strategic Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs. The recommended allocations have been made on the basis of a thorough examination of the 20 or so programs now in existence, criteria and principles developed in the Fitzhugh/Brader paper discussed at ExCo in April and others developed by CDC at its workshop in May and subsequently taken further out of session with the assistance of Hank, Lukas and myself. All of this work was also done with the evolving experience of Challenge Program development in mind.

I am pleased to report that the CDC has:

1. Endorsed the rationale and criteria for deciding allocations to systemwide programs involving two or more centers, including those referred to as ecoregional programs.
2. Endorse allocations from the \$1.5 million strategic fund provided from the World Bank grant to CGIAR for 2002.

We forward the following materials to support the recommendations: (1) Recommendations for funding, in a paper outlining the basis for them, (2) analytical framework for this and future allocations, and (3) annotated set of criteria.

We are very grateful for the opportunity that the Bank and ExCo have given us to work together in making these funding allocations. We hope that it may give other donors to the Centers the confidence in the CDC processes and therefore delegate to us the rights to recommend other allocations for the common good of the System in the future.

We look forward to hearing the Bank's response to our recommendations.

Meryl

Recommendations for Decisions by CDC on Allocation of Strategic Funds to Systemwide Programs in 2002

2 September 2002

Prepared by Hank Fitzhugh, Lukas Brader and Meryl Williams

Actions by CDC:

1. Endorse rationale and criteria for deciding allocations to systemwide programs involving two or more centers, including those referred to as ecoregional programs.
2. Endorse allocations from the \$1.5 million strategic fund provided from World Bank grant to CGIAR for 2002.

Rationale and criteria for supporting systemwide programs

(Additional background information provided in the Fitzhugh/Brader report, “Core Funding for Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs”)

1. The World Bank provides strategic support for the agricultural development oriented research agenda addressed by the CGIAR. In recognition of the value of systemwide programs as a means for improving efficiency and effectiveness of the System, \$1.5 million has been earmarked for their strategic support from the World Bank grant for 2002. These funds are intended to provide catalytic grants to ensure the successful development of new programs and the participatory management and governance of established programs. These catalytic grants reinforce, but do not substitute for the major funding for the systemwide program provided by donors and in-kind support from partners.
2. Because the SW/EPs transcend the responsibility of any single center, the CDC has been given the responsibility for allocating this strategic funding and for overseeing the use of these grants. Recipient programs will report on the use of funding to the CDC through the DG of each lead/convening center.
3. At its May 2002 Workshop and Meeting, the CDC identified nine criteria for evaluating systemwide programs (Attachment 1). These criteria incorporated the principles guiding recommendations on core program funding allocations (Fitzhugh/Brader, 2002) including:
 - a. High importance to CGIAR goals,
 - b. Problem addressed is beyond mandate of any single center,
 - c. High potential for efficiency gains through consortium of centers and other partners,
 - d. Nature of research and efficiency gains justify the additional management/governance superstructure and transaction costs required for systemwide programs
 - e. Donor interest and support sufficient for the program to be effective
4. The current set of 20 active programs had very different origins, and followed different development pathways. On the positive side, this diversity provides

useful comparisons for identifying what works well. On the negative side, it is difficult to establish criteria for deciding allocations which consistently fit across all programs. For example, there are major differences in the extent to which the objectives and activities of the program coincide and overlap with those of the lead center. We identified three categories of programs as they relate to the mandate and core programs of the lead center:

- **Complementary.** The objectives and activities of the systemwide program complement but do not coincide with the research, commodity or ecoregional mandate of the lead center. This center undertakes the convening responsibility primarily as a service for the System. The convening center, along with other partners, is expected to provide in-kind support to the program's operations. However, the convening center is not expected to divert core funds from its mandate to provide costs of starting, managing and governing programs in complementary category. In fact, donors supporting the mandate and core programs of the convening center may question use of their funding for purposes other than that for which they are provided. This category includes SIMA/IWMI, SWIHA/WARDA, SIUPA/CIP, GMP/CIP, SP-IPM/IITA, PRGA/CIAT, CONDESAN/CIP, AHI/ICRAF, Ecor(I)Asia/IRRI, and RWC/CIMMYT.
 - **Supplementary.** The designation of the "lead center" becomes self evident because the objectives and activities of programs in this category fit within the mandated responsibilities of the lead center for type of research, commodity, and/or ecoregion. A principal benefit from supplementary programs is that they mobilise and focus the efforts of other partners on activities for which the lead center has mandated responsibility. Core funds from the lead center may support the management/governance, as well as operational costs of the program based on the priority given the supplementary program among the core activities of the lead center. This category includes SGRP/IPGRI, ASB/ICRAF, SLP/ILRI, SWIM2/IWMI, CAPRI/IFPRI, SWNM/CIAT, IVC/WARDA, CAC/ICARDA, TLAP/CIAT and DMP/ICRISAT.
 - **Integral.** Principal activities for programs in this category coincide so closely with those of the lead center that it is difficult to distinguish between the priorities and responsibilities of the program and those of the lead center. We suggest that the benefits from collaboration can be gained more efficiently and cost effectively through the mode of intercenter projects that do not need the superstructure required for systemwide programs. Examples of programs in this category include ecoregional programs led by the center which has mandated responsibility for the target ecoregion.
5. Criteria for 2002 allocations. The purpose of the World Bank grant to CGIAR, and the \$1.5 million from this grant, is to provide strategic support for the CGIAR. These are catalytic grants to support specific needs for program management and governance that will vary with size and scope of the

program. This catalytic purpose, not the amount of the grant, makes it strategic. Rationale for determining the strategic purpose for grants includes:

- Systemwide programs are generally established as time-bound, problem oriented mechanisms to address complex problems beyond the mandate of any single center, building on core strengths of the established centers, but specifically avoiding investments in bricks/mortar to create new centers
- Operational funding for systemwide programs often comes from tightly restricted bilateral and regional funding which does not support core capacity in management/governance; nevertheless, without this core capacity, the program may not meet its objectives and the operational funds may be poorly utilised.
- Experience from first 5-10 years experience with systemwide programs indicates the essential need for strong capacity in management/governance to facilitate planning and collaboration, ensure resources are allocated fairly and most effectively, monitor and evaluate work of partners, mobilize resources and report to investors, and provide transparent process for oversight and governance.
- Another lesson from experience is that real conflicts of interest can arise between what is best for a program and what is best for a lead center, especially when there is competition for scarce resources. The systemwide program needs a management/governance mechanism which has sufficient autonomy from the lead center that decisions can be made which are best for the program and the partnership overall, even when they are at the expense of the lead center. In general, this core capacity for management and governance should be supported from the grants to the program; however, pre-investments will generally be required for new initiatives in future. And there is an immediate problem for those programs for which this core capacity is not now adequately funded.

6. The current set of systemwide programs --20-- is not attracting adequate donor support for various reasons. In some cases, the same intercenter work, harnessing the capacities of several centers, can be done at lower cost through the less cumbersome model of an intercenter project or an ICWG.

Reducing the number of programs can bring multiple benefits, including

- Reducing the complexities and transactions costs with which Centers must now cope,
- Signaling to donors that the System is dynamic, and
- Freeing resources in future to start new systemwide initiatives.

The CDC has an excellent opportunity to make responsible consensus decisions that are best for System, even at the expense of individual programs and centers. The CDC also has the opportunity to show that it can provide objective peer review and evaluation of programs and make strategic decisions to change, even end, programs in order to improve overall efficiency and effectiveness. Strategic decisions and actions by CDC are likely to encourage additional support from CGIAR members and to

increase the delegation of authority and responsibility for intercenter activities to the CDC in future.

7. Our recommendations to CDC:

All 20 SW/EPs have good points to recommend them; however, the requests for additional funding exceed the \$1.5 million for allocation in 2002. We have a triage situation in which programs fall into three classes:

- Programs that have sufficient support for operations, management and governance in 2002 to be effective and to continue successfully to 2003.
- Programs that have insufficient donor funding and/or in-kind support from partners and are not likely to be effective and to continue successfully to 2003.
- Programs that have good support for operations in 2002, but require additional support for management/governance to ensure stability and continuing effectiveness in 2003.

We identified six programs that we recommend ending or transforming to intercenter projects within the core program of the current lead center, following the example of IITA action with EPHTA. In addition, we suggest that the CDC review the status of two programs, which we believe are on the borderline between Supplementary and Integral to the mandate of the lead center.

Our recommendations to change program status and reduce the number of programs in the systemwide category include:

- SWIHA and Ecor(I)Asia have not attracted sufficient donor interest and support to be effective as planned. We recommend re-evaluation of objectives, research plans and financing strategies leading to decisions to reorganise or discontinue these programs.
- SWNM has not attracted sufficient donor interest and support; moreover, its activities substantially overlap activities in the core programs of CIAT-TSBF, IWMI(IBSRAM), and other centers with significant INRM research. We recommend that SWNM be discontinued with elements subsumed into activities of CIAT, IWMI, and INRM activities of other centers and the ICWG-INRM.
- As TLAP and IVC have evolved over the years, they now appear to be integral to the core programs of the lead centers. We recommend that they become intercenter projects within the core programs of CIAT and WARDA, respectively.
- GMP is an umbrella program encompassing CONDESAN and AHI-- both have attracted significant donor interest and support-- and the Asian mountain region primarily served by ICIMOD. A case can be made to develop a Mountains Challenge Program involving ICIMOD and other institutions outside the CGIAR; however, we do not believe that GMP is needed as a systemwide program providing another level of coordination over CONDESAN and AHI. Project funding for GMP(which appears to be primarily targeted to the Andes) should support CONDESAN. An ICWG-Mountains could bring together CGIAR scientists with similar interests at lower cost than a systemwide program.

- DMP and CAC have successfully attracted substantial donor interest and funding in 2002. Both programs appear to be integral to the core mandates of their lead centers, ICRISAT and ICARDA, respectively. We suggest consideration be given to changing DMP and CAC to intercenter projects led by ICRISAT and ICARDA, respectively, and thereby reducing the costs of maintaining the management and governance superstructure necessary for systemwide programs.

We agreed that the twelve remaining programs, plus CAC and DMP pending consideration of their change in status, were performing well and/or showed good potential and that the \$1.5 million should be strategically allocated to ensure their management and governance requirements for continuing stability and effectiveness in 2003 and future years.

Because funds available for 2002 are limited, we agreed to target support to those programs that had attracted significant donor support for operational costs, however, additional funding for their management and governance requirements is needed to ensure their effective operation in 2002 and their successful continuation to 2003.

First priority is given to ensuring requirements for the management and governance of those programs that are complementary to the convening center's mandate. Next priority is given to those programs which are supplementary to the lead center's mandate, but which require additional funding to provide management and governance capacities essential for their effectiveness in 2002 and their successful continuation in 2003.

Five programs have attracted significant donor support for operations and also appear to have adequate funding for management and governance requirements in 2002 and to ensure their stability and continuing success in 2003. These programs in the first triage class include:

- Programs in complementary category- PRGA, AHI,
- Programs in the supplementary category- SGRP, SWIM2, DMP

We recommend that the \$ 1.5 million be strategically allocated among the remaining nine programs which fall in the third triage class. Based on the information provided and our judgment of the scope and needs of the program, we recommend two allocation amounts--\$150,000 and \$200,000.

\$150,000 grants

- Programs in complementary category--CONDESAN, RWC, SP-IPM, SIUPA
- Programs in supplementary category – CAC, CAPRi

\$200,000 grants

- Programs in complementary category--SIMA
- Programs in supplementary category--ASB, SLP

Comments on programs supported in 2002:

CONDESAN. Broad based consortium of national and international institutions; problems addressed complementary to , but not specific to CIP mandate; however,

CIP has had to support from core funds. If GMP funding for the high Andes are assigned to CONDESAN, management and governance requirements will increase.

RWC. Funding and activities are increasing with additional national and international institutions joining consortium bringing added demands on management to oversee activities and use of funds. This project is complementary to CIMMYT mandate. We suggest that consideration be given to ICRISAT taking responsibility as convening center for what appears to be an ecoregional program that is supplementary to ICRISAT mandate for this region.

SP-IPM. Program addresses research for which a systemwide approach is needed; program has been reorganised and new plans and donor support show good promise for future; however, there will be significant additional facilitation and coordination costs in 2002 and into 2003. As the convening center for a complementary program, IITA is not in position to provide for these costs.

SIUPA. Relatively new program addressing urban and periurban systems to which many Centers can make a contribution; however, significant efforts to facilitate planning, development and fund raising are needed in 2002 and into 2003. Program is complementary to CIP mandate

CAC. Central Asia has become a focal point of interest for the CGIAR and has been added to the mandate region served by ICARDA. The CAC steering committee has requested support for the Program Facilitation Unit in 2002.

CAPRi. The competitive small grants mechanism used by CAPRi (and PRGA) are an effective means for increasing results from research already underway in participating centers. CAPRi has been reasonably well supported in previous years, but a major grant providing fungible funding is ending in 2002. Our recommendation to support CAPRi in 2002 anticipates that donors will provide funding for management and governance costs in 2003 and that the competitive grants model will continue.

SIMA. New program that addresses an important problem for which no Center has mandated responsibility, but to which several can contribute meaningfully to the research. Significant donor support has been obtained, giving promise to success in future, but there is immediate need for support to ensure essential management and governance in early stages of program implementation.

ASB. Well-established program noted for innovative research; significant amount of funds are passed through to national and international members of regional consortia; coordination/management and governance costs are increased by the multilocation-global nature of research. Additional support is required if program is to continue as now managed and governed; however, in future, program should collect these costs from donors providing pass through grants to be managed through the ASB

SLP. Well-established program involving ten Centers, including ILRI. Has attracted substantial new funding for 2002-4, but these funds do not provide for

management and governance costs. Additional support is required in 2002 if program is to continue as now managed and governed; however, in future, program should collect these costs from those donors providing restricted project grants that are managed through the SLP

8. Future decisions. Funding recommendations for 2002, which focus on requirements for stability and effectiveness during 2002 and into 2003, will not necessarily be the same as those appropriate for allocation in future years. Every effort must be made to convince donors providing operational funds to also support the management and governance mechanisms essential for the best use of these operational funds. Systemwide programs do not have reserves to draw on to meet shortfalls in funding for these essential costs. The immediate concern is for 2003. Allocations should be decided by CDC as soon as funding available for next year is known, preferably before the end of 2002 so that program coordinators can plan for 2003 with more certainty. Based on our experience with allocations this year, we suggest an analytical framework to guide the allocation process in future.

Acronyms/Names and Lead Centers for Systemwide and Ecoregional programs:

African Highlands Initiative	AHI/ICRAF
Alternatives to Slash and Burn Systemwide Program	ASB/ICRAF
Collaborative Research Program for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Central Asia and the Caucasus	CAC/ICARDA
Systemwide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights	CAPRI/IFPRI
Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion	CONDESAN/CIP
Desert Margins Program	DMP/ICRISAT
Ecoregional Initiative for the Humid and Sub-Humid Tropics of Asia	Ecor(I)Asia/IRRI
Global Mountain Program	GMP/CIP
Consortium for the Sustainable Use of Inland Valley Agroecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa	IVC/WARDA
Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation	PRGA/CIAT
Rice-Wheat Consortium for the Indo-Gangetic Plains	RWC/CIMMYT
Systemwide Genetic Resources Research Programme	SGRP/IPGRI
Systemwide Initiative on Malaria and Agriculture	SIMA/IWMI
Systemwide Initiative on Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture	SIUPA/CIP
Systemwide Livestock Program	SLP/ILRI
Systemwide Program – Integrated Pest Management	SP-IPM/IITA
Systemwide Initiative on HIV/AIDS and Agriculture	SWIHA/WARDA
Systemwide Initiative on Water Management	SWIM2/IWMI
Soil Water and Nutrient Management program	SWNM/CIAT
Tropical Land and Agriculture Program	TLAP/CIAT

Draft Analytical Framework for Decisions on SW/EP Funding

The CDC has been given responsibility for allocating funding from the World Bank grant to CGIAR which has been earmarked for support to systemwide programs. This grant is intended to increase the effectiveness of these multi-center programs, including those focusing on specific ecoregions, as strategic mechanisms for accomplishing the CGIAR goals of poverty reduction, food security and environmental protection.

None of the programs have been fully funded relative to original plans and funding requirements. Most have downscaled or delayed activities because of funding limitations.

Some programs have obtained donor support for operations, but not for the management, governance and transactions costs, including proposal development and reporting to donors. There is risk that the available donor funding could be used without needed monitoring and evaluation and that poor performance and inadequate reporting to donors will affect future support for this and other CGIAR activities.

In some cases, the lead center has used its core funding to support the management and governance (and even operational costs). The appropriateness of using donor funding to Center to support the systemwide program depends on the relevance of the systemwide program's objectives to the Center's mandate.

When the concept of systemwide programs was first developed, two general categories were identified. Those that were complementary to convening center's mandate (eg, AHI, PRGA, SIMA, SIUPA), and those that were supplementary to the mandate (eg, SGRP, SLP, ASB, CAPRI).

As individual systemwide programs have evolved and, especially as the lead center has had to subsidize costs from its core funding, some programs are now difficult to distinguish from intercenter projects integral to the core program of the lead center. Systemwide programs which are essentially integral to the core activities can reduce costs by transforming to intercenter projects which the more costly superstructure and transaction costs of systemwide programs. This transformation has already been made for EPHTA in 2002.

Recognising that effective management and governance is necessary for the future success of each systemwide program, \$1.5 million from the World Bank grant has been earmarked for catalytic grants to improve effectiveness of program management and governance, including capacity for raising funds required for meeting objectives. A similar grant is anticipated in 2003, other members may decide to add this pool of funding depending on the outcomes from allocations in 2002.

The amount available for 2002, \$1.5 million, is substantially less than the amounts requested by current programs or as seed money to start new systemwide initiatives.

The CDC has the difficult task of reaching consensus on which programs receive grants and the amounts per grant. It is likely that some DGs must join consensus in favor of programs other than the ones for which their center is responsible.

A consensus decision process recognised as fair, transparent and in the best interest of the System could well attract additional funding for CDC allocation decision in future years. Therefore, even though the task facing CDC is difficult, the benefits from good decisions potentially are much greater than just those realised by the programs which receive additional funding in 2002.

Based on experience with the process this first year, an “analytical framework” is suggested to assist the CDC in reaching agreements on key questions from which consensus decisions can then be reached. This framework incorporates the nine criteria agreed by the CDC for evaluating the systemwide programs.

1. What is the potential for impact of the program in the foreseeable future (5-10 years) in terms of the CGIAR goals—poverty reduction, food security, environmental protection—High, Moderate, Low?

Estimating potential for impacts will not be precise but should be reasonably accurate using the following indicators:

a. Scope of recommendation domain for results from research as indicated by numbers of poor, ecologies, countries, regions, continents to which results from research will be applicable

b. Probability that program will be successful in producing results and contributing to interventions indicated by

- feasibility of research plan,
- capabilities of the implementing consortium for conducting research and delivering results according to plan and
- adequacy of resources provided from donors or in-kind support

2. In which category does the program best fit in terms of its relation to the mandate of the lead/convening center?

a. **Complementary.** The objectives and activities of the SW/EP complement but do not coincide with the research, commodity or ecoregion mandate of the lead center, which undertakes the convening responsibility primarily as a service for the System. The convening center as well as other partners are expected to provide in-kind operations support to the SW/EP. However, it is no more appropriate that the convening center divert core funds from its mandate to support the management/governance of SW/EPs in this category than for other partners to divert core funds from their mandated priorities

b. **Supplementary.** The designation of the “lead center” is self evident because the objectives and activities of the SW/EP fit within the mandated responsibilities of the lead center for the type of research, commodity, and/or ecoregion. A principal value of these SW/EPs is that they mobilise and focus the efforts of other centers and partners on activities for which the lead center has mandated responsibility. It is appropriate that core funds from the lead

center support the management/governance, as well as operational costs of the program as long as these are priorities for the lead center.

- c. **Integral.** The activities of these SW/EPs are so integral to those of the lead center that it is difficult to distinguish between the responsibilities of the SW/EP and those of the lead center. We suggest that the benefits from involving other partners can be gained more efficiently and cost effectively through intercenter projects without the superstructure required for SW/EPs. Examples include EPs led by the center which has mandated responsibility for the target ecoregion. Other examples are specific activities by SW/EPs which coincide with activities also carried out by lead center. In general, it will be more efficient and cost effective and reduce confusion if these activities are directly implemented by lead center with partners as needed, rather than through a SW/EP.

3. Recognising the uncertainty of CGIAR funding, does the program have funding required for plan of work in 2002 and either assured or good prospects for required funding in 2003 and 2004?

- a. Has the program attracted sufficient donor support for its research objectives and operational plan to indicate that additional funding is likely if additional fund raising efforts are made?

- b. Is a catalytic grant in 2002 from available \$1.5 million likely to increase effectiveness of program in 2003 and future years by ensuring stability of program management and governance, which in turn will facilitate the effectiveness of the implementing consortium and increase donor awareness and support for the program.

These questions should be asked for each program. Yes or no answers will eliminate some programs from consideration for grants. These include programs which have low potential for impact; those which have failed to attract significant donor interest and support; those which have adequate support for management and governance, *inter alia*.

Finally, decisions are made as to which of the remaining programs should receive and the amounts for grants to meet the strategic objectives of providing stability and improving future effectiveness of systemwide programs.

ATTACHMENT 1

CDC CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SYSTEMWIDE PROGRAMS

The CDC proposed nine criteria to be used in decisions on allocation of the \$1.5 million. Comments on how the working group of Hank Fitzhugh, Lukas Brader and Meryl Williams interpreted and used the criteria include:

(i). Minimum level of funding for 2002 is \$300000.

- We agree to importance of sufficient donor support to ensure the program will operate effectively; however, the minimum amount of funding deemed essential varies among programs depending on objectives, operating modalities (eg, competitive grants), numbers of locations and partners, etc.
- Some programs indicated they had received substantial funding, but in many budgets, most funds were earmarked by donors for specific activities and/or locations; often the funding to support management and governance essential to continuing effectiveness of program appears inadequate.
- Total funding is not adequate indicator for predicting effectiveness; the amount of fungible funding and, especially, the adequacy of funding available to support management/governance are important elements to consider
- The ASB budget presentation is an excellent model, providing details needed for analysis. For example, ASB budget indicates large amount of pass-through funding, necessitating major efforts to monitor and evaluate performance and use of funds and to report to donors providing funds. Unless these coordination and oversight responsibilities are done well, efficiency and effectiveness may decline, donor funding will be poorly used, and the reputation of the program, centers and system will suffer.

(ii). Evaluations.

Not all SW/EPs have been externally evaluated; some are still in early stages of development.

Those that have been externally reviewed have generally been given good marks, with recommendations for program to continue with additional funding.

We recommend periodic external reviews for each systemwide program, including in-depth "sunset" reviews to facilitate freeing resources for new initiatives.

(iii). Extent of Partnerships.

- All programs have extensive partnerships depending on nature of research and research sites,
- Type of partners depends on program requirements; differences in partners appropriate to different programs, including Challenge Programs, were noted in the report, "Core Funding for Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs."

(iv). Strategic objectives

- Essential that the program objectives serve CGIAR goals
- Our evaluation considered program's potential for impacting on poverty reduction, food security and environmental protection

(v) Challenge Programs

- At this time, no Challenge Program has been established
- Aspirations to become a CP is not reason to deny funding. However, these funds are intended to provide catalytic support to enable Programs to effectively meet their objectives as a systemwide program, not to maintain programs until decisions are made on CPs.

(vi). Mandate beyond single center.

- Participation of two or more Centers is a necessary condition; however, there are also other modalities for intercenter collaboration when activities transcend the mandate of a single center, including intercenter projects, ICWGs and CPs (in future).
- Key point is that the programmatic benefits systemwide program must justify the additional transaction and other costs; i.e., there may be more cost-effective ways to achieve benefits from intercenter collaboration.

(vii). Governance structure

- The minimum requirement is a management/governance mechanism that ensures transparent decision process on priorities, assignments and resource allocations as well as program oversight and evaluation; there is need for a formal entity, such as a steering committee, in addition to management/governance structure of the lead center.
- Governance of systemwide programs does not require a legal entity, analogous to a Center Board, with the additional costs inherent in such a structure; there are already concerns expressed among donors about the costs of maintaining 16 Boards. The Board of the lead center generally assumes legal and oversight responsibility for the program on behalf of the other partners.

(viii). Effective coordination mechanism

- Experience with systemwide programs over the years underscores the importance of the coordinator to the success of the program; the coordinator plays a key role in convening, planning, monitoring, evaluating, analyzing, reporting and fund raising. Generally they have a dual reporting responsibility to the lead center and to the program's steering committee and must be able to negotiate the conflicts of interest which can arise between what is best for program and what may be best for the lead center or other partners.

(ix) iSC approval

- TAC has formally or tacitly approved the 20 systemwide programs under consideration. The future role of the SC in approving establishment of systemwide programs has yet to be decided; however, in an increasingly restricted funding environment, donor interest and support are essential conditions to be met in starting a new systemwide program.