

# **Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research**

**Annual General Meeting  
Business Meeting  
December 5-6, 2007  
Beijing, China**

## **Summary Record of Proceedings**



*CGIAR Secretariat  
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)  
The World Bank  
Washington, DC  
January 30, 2008*

## Acronyms Used

AB	Alliance Board of CGIAR Centers
AE	Alliance Executive of CGIAR Centers
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ARI	Advance Research Institution
BecA	Bioscience eastern and central Africa
BOT	Board of Trustees
CAAS	Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COP	Conference of the Parties
CPER	Challenge Program External Review
CPWF	Challenge Program on Water and Food
CP	CGIAR Challenge Program
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CST	Change Steering Team
CWANA	Central and West Asia and North Africa
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DG	Director General
EC	European Commission
EIARD	European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ExCo	CGIAR Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
HR	Human Resources
ICT-KM	Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDTF	World Bank Multi Donor Trust Fund
MTP	Medium-Term Plan
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NERICA	New Rices for Africa
PM	CGIAR Performance Measurement System
PSC	Private Sector Committee
SAS-HR	Strategic Advisory Service on Human Resources
SC	Science Council
SKEP	Scientific and Knowledge Exchange Program
SO	CGIAR System Office

SP	System Priorities of the CGIAR
SPIA	SC Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SPMS	SC Standing Panel on Mobilizing Science
SPPS	SC Standing Panel on Priorities and Strategies
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWEP	Systemwide and Ecoregional Program
TICAD	Tokyo International Conference on African Development
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WG	Working Group

## **International Agricultural Research Centers Supported by the CGIAR**

The Africa Rice Center (WARDA)

Bioversity International

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)

Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)

International Water Management Institute (IWMI)

World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF)

WorldFish Center

## Contents

Agenda .....	v
AGM07 Conclusions and Decisions .....	viii
Change Management Forum.....	1
Business Meeting .....	6
1. Opening Session.....	6
2. CGIAR Change Management Process .....	7
3. CGIAR Status Report .....	12
4. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan .....	14
5. CGIAR External Review .....	17
6. Evaluation .....	19
6.a. IWMI EPMR.....	19
6.b. WARDA EPMR.....	20
6.c. ILRI EPMR.....	21
7. Report from Science Council .....	22
8. Perspectives from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers .....	23
9. CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Climate Change .....	24
10. SSA Challenge Program: Progress Report .....	26
11. Evaluation (cont'd) .....	27
11.a. IITA EPMR.....	27
11.b. CIAT EPMR .....	27
11.c. CIP EPMR.....	30
11.d. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPEs) .....	31
11.e. Options to Streamline the EPMR Process.....	32
12. Updates from CGIAR Committees .....	34
13. Other Business .....	35
14. Closing Session.....	36
Attachment	
Summary: CGIAR Member Feedback on AGM07 .....	37

All documents for AGM07 are available at: [http://www.cgiar.org/meetings/agm07/agm07\\_business.html](http://www.cgiar.org/meetings/agm07/agm07_business.html)

# Agenda

**Wednesday, December 6, 2006**

## **Change Management Forum**

### **Opening Session**

-- Chair's Opening Remarks

### **Scoping Team**

- Background
- Issues for change identified by consultations and survey
- Phase 2 of Change Process

### **Feedback from Stakeholder consultations :**

- Alliance
- Science Council
- Science Forum
- GFAR – perspectives from partners, NARS
- CSOs
- Private Sector

### **Final Report: ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities**

Questions and clarification

**Breakout Group Workshops** (3 groups, facilitated by Trium Group)

## **Business Meeting**

### **1. Business Meeting: Opening Session**

-- Adoption of Business Meeting Agenda

### **2. CGIAR Change Management Process**

-- Report back from Change Management Forum Breakout Groups  
-- Discussion and Decision Making

### **3. CGIAR Status Report**

-- Report from Director  
-- Discussion

**4. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan**

- Comment from Science Council
- Report from CGIAR Secretariat
- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- Discussion and Decision Making

**Thursday, December 6, 2007**

**5. CGIAR External Review**

- Inception Report of the Review Panel
- Discussion

**6. Evaluation**

**6.a. IWMI EPMR**

- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- Discussion and Decision Making

**6.b. WARDA EPMR**

- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- Discussion and Decision Making

**6.c. ILRI EPMR**

- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- Discussion and Decision Making

**7. Report from Science Council**

- Report from Science Council
- Discussion

**8. Perspectives from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers**

- Incoming and Outgoing DGs
- Discussion

**9. CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Climate Change**

- Presentation of the Initiative
- Discussion

**11. Evaluation (cont'd)**

**11.a. IITA EPMR**

- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
- Discussion and Decision Making

- 11.c. CIP EPMR
  - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
  - Discussion and Decision Making
  
- 11.b. CIAT EPMR
  - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
  - Discussion and Decision Making
  
- 10. SSA Challenge Program: Progress Report**
  - Discussion and Decision Making
  
- 11. Evaluation (cont'd)**
  
- 11.d. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPER)
  - HarvestPlus
  - Water and Food
  - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
  - Discussion and Decision Making
  
- 11.e. Options to Streamline EPMR Process
  - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
  - Discussion and Decision Making
  
- 12. Updates from CGIAR Committees**
  - Genetic Resources Policy Committee
  - Private Sector Committee
  - Discussion
  
- 13. Other Business**
  - Future Meetings
  
- 14. Closing Session**

## AGM07 Conclusions and Decisions

### 2. Change Management Process

#### *Conclusion and Decisions:*

#### Change Management Process:

- *The CGIAR expressed broad support and energy for the change management process and for moving forward with momentum, while at the same time recognizing some of the constraints.*
- *This sense of urgency is in the context of a number of global issues including climate change, poverty reduction implications of new agricultural developments, high attention to the World Bank World Development Report, and the threat of donors moving money elsewhere if change in the CGIAR doesn't take place.*
- *There is need for more focus on vision, which should be done early to help drive activities of the change management process.*
- *The process should identify quick wins that can help maintain momentum.*
- *Linkages with the Independent Review of the CGIAR System should be maintained, but should not slow the change management process, and the Review should be more sharply focused.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed the establishment of a Change Steering Team, with four working groups (on visioning and development challenges, partnerships, governance, and funding mechanisms) to help drive the change management process:*
  - 1) *WG 1 (visioning and development challenges) should include donors, and others partners, e.g. NARS. The WG should begin its work first and bring together many voices to ensure broad support early in the process.*
  - 2) *WG 2 (partnerships) should think broadly about partnerships, including new approaches with the private sector, advanced research institutes, etc. Individuals with experience with other organizations should be included in the WG to spur innovative thinking and ideas.*
  - 3) *WGs 3 and 4 on System- and Center-level governance should be merged and consider a systemwide approach to governance and think boldly.*
  - 4) *The TORs of the WGs should be clearly developed and articulated.*
  - 5) *The Chair requested Members to nominate individuals from within and from outside the System as candidates for the WGs, which should include a brief description of the person's experience and/or leadership abilities. She asked that Members entrust her with appointing WG members so as to not delay the process by waiting for approval from ExCo. She stated that she would draw on nominations received but also ensure the groups are diverse and balanced. She requested the Alliance and the Gender and Diversity Program to nominate young scientists that could be included to help start building the next generation of leaders in the System*
- *The World Bank has paid the cost of the change management process so far. The Chair asked that those who serve on WGs be able to donate their time, and she*

*noted that it would send a good signal for other Members to contribute funds to the process.*

*ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities:*

- *The CGIAR thanked the ExCo ad hoc Committee for its work and expressed support for its report.*
- *The CGIAR requested WG 5 (on funding mechanisms) to examine a more in depth implementation plan for the funding mechanism, drawing on the experience of other global programs. Building on the proposed funding mechanism, the WG should also examine the pros and cons of establishing an international fund on agricultural research.*
- *The CGIAR agreed to establish an ExCo ad hoc committee on finance, which may evolve into an ExCo standing panel depending on the outcome of the change management process. The first task of the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance would be to examine the CIAT case and the Center's plea for special donor support to its reinvigoration plan.*
- *The CGIAR requested WG 5 (on funding mechanisms) to develop TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance, in addition to examining the role such a committee would play in the future CGIAR System. (The decision on development of TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance was superseded in a later agenda item (11.b. CIAT EPMR), and the CGIAR Secretariat was requested to develop TORs immediately following AGM07. The WG on funding mechanisms will continue to examine the role such a committee would play in the future.)*

### **3. CGIAR Status Report**

***Conclusion:***

- *The CGIAR Chair thanked Ren Wang for his report and noted the progress made in many areas since he assumed his duties as CGIAR Director.*
- *It is important to share the experience of the World Bank and USAID negotiations to join the MDTF for other Members to learn and possibly replicate.*
- *The CGIAR should scale up and align its efforts on climate change with those of the UN System, and establish its own position.*

### **4. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan**

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *CGIAR approved the 2008 financing plan.*
- *CGIAR appreciated the positive indications of increased financial and multi-year commitments of several Members.*
- *CGIAR requested the CGIAR Secretariat to explore ways to:*
  - 1) *Provide Members with more information on Centers' financial health;*
  - 2) *Drill down the analysis of the financing plan;*
  - 3) *Examine prospects for change in the MDTF to enable other Members to use it for channeling their contributions to Centers.*

- *The CGIAR agreed that further analysis of the SC proposal to de-link the MTP output planning from the PM System is required. CGIAR endorsed ExCo's recommendation that the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat submit a proposal to ExCo 14 that does not devalue but optimizes the utility of the PM System, maintains incentives, and ensures high output goals.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed ExCo's recommendation for analysis of Center MTPs by the SC every third year, or as required by SC assessment, instead of automatically yearly. It also expressed support to the online tool linking the MTPs, the finance and the PM databases.*

## **5. CGIAR External Review**

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR asked that the Inception Report be revised to reflect the following amendments:*
  - *The Review should have a stronger emphasis on the analysis of partnerships;*
  - *A stronger balance on seeking views of Members and NARS from the South; and*
  - *The Review Panel optimizes its time management by focusing more on elements such as partnerships issues, and not to expand its scope.*
- *The CGIAR stood firm on the timeline for the deliverables, e.g. interim and final reports, and asked the Review Panel to ensure the Review is not prolonged and therefore does not delay the change management process. There may be areas that can be cut back (e.g., the technical papers). It is essential to receive the interim report by March 2008 and the final report by July 2008.*

### **6.a. IWMI EPMR**

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR Chair thanked the EPMR Panel for its work and a well balanced review.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 3<sup>rd</sup> IWMI EPMR.*
- *The CGIAR is concerned about financial management at the Center and sent a signal to the entire System about the importance placed on this area, and expressed appreciation to the new DG on the steps he is taking to examine the issue more closely.*

### **6.b. WARDA EPMR**

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 5<sup>th</sup> WARDA EPMR and commended the Center for a positive review and its ability to maintain standards and results during a time of turmoil.*
- *The CGIAR cautioned against too rapid expansion of the Center by taking a deliberate approach that builds on core competencies.*
- *The likely support of Egypt to WARDA was welcomed by the CGIAR.*

- *The CGIAR requested WARDA to keep the CGIAR Secretariat informed on negotiations with IFPRI on transfer of the HIV-AIDS initiative to ensure a systemic view on such issues.*

### **6.c. ILRI EPMR**

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 2<sup>nd</sup> ILRI EPMR.*
- *Concerning the global expansion of ILRI, the CGIAR cautioned that it should be an evolutionary process and should be within the framework of a well-structured and financed strategic plan. It welcomed the pro-active response of the Center management on partnerships. It also noted the importance for ILRI to share lessons from its positive EPMR with other Centers.*

### **7. Report from Science Council**

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The Chair thanked R. Rabbinge and J. Ryan for their reports.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendation on the proposed SC structure changes to mainstream priorities and strategies, and mobilizing science into the work of the entire SC.*
- *SC should determine what metrics to use to measure results of mainstreaming mobilization of science, and report back to ExCo on the results.*
- *The SC was encouraged to keep CGIAR science in the context of development effectiveness and welcomed the development of ways to measure the social and environmental impacts of CGIAR work. The need to balance the development aspect with the research should also be reflected in selection of new SC members who should bring in the social science perspective.*
- *The Chair also emphasized that the CGIAR should stay ahead of the curve on new emerging issues, e.g. climate change and agriculture, health and nutrition, to help reposition the CGIAR.*
- *The CGIAR should consider undertaking an evaluation of the Science Council, which has been in place for four years. The ongoing Independent Review of the CGIAR System will include a light review on the role of the SC this year; a full review should come after it is concluded in order to not overload the System with too many evaluations.*

### **8. Perspectives from Alliance of CGIAR Centers**

#### ***Conclusion:***

- *The Chair thanked the Alliance for the report and its efforts.*

## **9. CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Climate Change**

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the concept of a CGIAR strategic initiative on climate change.*
- *The Chair thanked Members for their support of the initiative and noted Membership's request for it to be strategic, and based on the CGIAR's distinctive competences within the context of the extensive pre-existing external activities. The Chair also acknowledged the Group's desire for a new more flexible, networked and collaborative approach to rapidly building a climate change initiative given the urgency of the issue and significance of the debate.*
- *There was agreement that the CGIAR should call for a doubling of funding for climate change related research at the 13<sup>th</sup> UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference in Bali, Indonesia.*

## **10. SSA Challenge Program: Progress Report**

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *CGIAR thanked FARA for the progress report on the SSA CP.*
- *CGIAR expressed strong support for the SSA CP. It is one of the important mechanisms to meeting the needs of Africa.*
- *FARA should continue to work with SC to determine the correct research protocol and on evaluation of proof of concept for the program.*

## **11.a. IITA EPMR**

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 6<sup>th</sup> IITA EPMR.*

## **11.b. CIAT EPMR**

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 6<sup>th</sup> CIAT EPMR.*
- *To demonstrate its commitment to taking fiduciary and accountability standards seriously, the CGIAR requested CIAT to develop a more specific reinvigoration plan that includes options and takes into account Members' concerns. Members were requested to send written comments on the existing reinvigoration plan to the Center, copied to the finance team at the CGIAR Secretariat within one week.*
- *A special meeting on CIAT will be held at the end of January 2008 to examine details of the reinvigoration plan and make decisions on next steps, including consideration of the option of realignment, if necessary.*
- *The ExCo ad hoc committee on finance should be established immediately and tasked with examining the CIAT reinvigoration plan, including on governance issues in addition to finance. Its analysis will be an input into the special January 2008 meeting on CIAT .*

- *The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to develop TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance and suggested membership, to be approved virtually so the ad hoc committee may start its work as soon as possible. (This decision supersedes the decision in an earlier agenda item (2. CGIAR Change Management Process) for the Change Management Working Group on funding mechanisms to develop TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance.)*
- *ExCo 14 (May 2008) will take stock of progress on CIAT.*
- *There is also the need for a serious analysis of how to avoid similar situations in the future. The System must use the CIAT case and the outcome of the January 2008 meeting to improve donor behavior and financial management of Centers.*
- *A paper on lessons learned on what could have been done to avoid the current situation will be commissioned. It should be available for discussion at the May 2008 ExCo meeting, and also serve as an input into the governance part of the change management process.*
- *The CGIAR commended the scientific community at the Center for their resilience in the face of severe problems, and for the scientific excellence of their research.*
- *The CGIAR also expressed thanks and support to the Board Chair and Interim DG and their efforts to improve the situation.*

#### **11.c. CIP EPMR**

##### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 6<sup>th</sup> CIP EPMR.*
- *The SC review on SWEPs was welcomed as a basis for a more in depth discussion on partnerships.*

#### **11.d. Challenge Program External Reviews**

##### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 1<sup>st</sup> CPWF and HarvestPlus CP External Reviews.*
- *The CGIAR must take a closer look at an appropriate balance between funding by traditional and non-traditional donors.*
- *The CGIAR must consider a minimum set of standards and principles on governance for Challenge Programs. Experience to date, lessons learned, and the first set of external reviews can serve as input. The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to present to ExCo 14 some thoughts on a minimum set of guidelines/principles for governance of the CPs, also incorporating inputs from the workshop on institutional issues of research partnerships, scheduled to be held in France in February 2008.*

#### **11.e. Options to Streamline EPMR Process**

##### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *It is important to use the EPMR process to maintain fiduciary and accountability standards, and as a feedback mechanism for learning.*

- *The CGIAR endorsed Option 2 to maintain fiduciary and accountability standards:*
  - *CGIAR delegated to ExCo decision making responsibility on Center and Challenge Program external reviews;*
  - *Those EPMRs (and/or CPERs) that require, in ExCo's judgment, full discussion by the CGIAR should be brought to AGM;*
  - *All EPMR reports should be sent to CGIAR Membership including those not requiring full discussion at AGM as determined by ExCo;*
  - *ExCo should recommend discussion of a particular EPMR at AGM, if ExCo feels the EPMR contains either positive or negative lessons for the System;*
  - *Centers should also be given the option to request an EPMR report be discussed at AGM;*
  - *ExCo's decisions should be transmitted to the CGIAR following discussion at ExCo meetings;*
  - *EPMRs should be scheduled so that submission of the report would coincide with SC meetings to prevent undue time delays in handling EPMRs.*
- *For feedback and learning from EPMRs:*
  - *CGIAR requested the CGIAR Director to give a presentation at AGM business meeting on the common themes and issues that arise from EPMRs.*
  - *Issues that emerge from EPMRs that contain lessons for the System should be shared at the AGM stakeholders meeting. This must be done in a responsible and useful manner.*
  - *ExCo should also examine quality of the reviews as part of the feedback mechanism.*
- *CGIAR encouraged individual Members to harmonize review requirements to avoid multiple reviews, within the framework of the Paris Declaration.*

## **12. Updates from CGIAR Committees**

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The Chair thanked the PSC and GRPC Chairs and committee members for their work.*
- *CGIAR requested GRPC to ensure there is no confusion about new guidelines in terms of communication.*
- *These issues should be included in the ExCo 14 agenda, in addition to the thinkpiece already requested by ExCo on deriving income from intellectual property.*
- *The output of GRPC work goes beyond the CGIAR and is a symbol of the value of global public goods produced by the CGIAR.*

### **13. Other Business**

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR agreed to hold AGM08 in Mozambique (December 1-4, 2008) and AGM09 in Montpellier, France (November 30-December 3, 2000).*

## **Change Management Forum**

### *Chair's Opening Remarks*

CGIAR Chair Kathy Sierra opened the meeting and welcomed Members. She thanked the Government of China and the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS) for hosting the meeting and all of their support. She extended a special welcome to CGIAR Director Ren Wang, noting that it was his first Annual General Meeting (AGM) as CGIAR Director.

She introduced the format of the first day of the Business Meeting which will begin with a "Change Management Forum," designed to maximize broader informal consultation and in depth discussions on the change management process. The formal Business Meeting would start later in the day.

### *Change Management Process*

The Chair gave a brief background of the change management process, noting that at ExCo 12, ExCo recommended (and the CGIAR later approved) a facilitated change management initiative in order to revitalize the CGIAR in its ability to meet emerging challenges, opportunities, and threats, and to further streamline itself and increase its effectiveness and efficiency. As a first step, a small Scoping Team was established and requested to submit a proposal to ExCo for discussion on next steps in the alignment process. The key elements of the Scoping Team's terms of reference (TOR) were to identify achievable high impact changes needed in the CGIAR, and to design a highly consultative process for this change. The Scoping Team was supported by a consultant company, Trium Group.

The Scoping Team presented its proposal at ExCo 13 (October 2007). ExCo endorsed the Scoping Team's proposal and recommended the CGIAR move forward with the change management process.

The Scoping Team conducted a questionnaire survey and a series of special consultations, consisting of focused discussion with various stakeholder groups during AGM07, e.g., the Alliance of CGIAR Centers, Science Council, civil society organizations (CSOs), national agricultural research systems (NARS), developing country Members, and the private sector. The Chair thanked Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) Chair Adel El-Beltagy for organizing a special meeting and facilitating discussion with NARS and CSOs prior to AGM07.

Following the Change Management Forum, formal decision making on the Scoping Team proposal and the change management process would take place later in the day during the Business Meeting.

Discussion on the final report of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities was also incorporated as an integral part of the Change Management Forum since funding mechanisms have been clearly identified by the Scoping Team as an issue for the change process.

The Chair reminded Members that there was a Member Coordination Forum at AGM06 on funding issues. This year's Change Management Forum is part of the Member Coordination Forum, which is expected to be an ongoing feature at AGMs.

The Chair concluded her remarks by noting that although a significant portion of the change process is wrapped up in formal processes and procedures, two elements that will be important to the success of the entire change process are to: (1) strengthen the System mindset by not just thinking and acting as individual Centers and donors, but working together as a *system* to find solutions and get results, and (2) strengthen elements of trust and empathy. Decisions and actions are often difficult to reach because of a lack of these elements and they will be essential moving forward.

R. Wang explained the format of the Change Management Forum. The Group would hear first from the Scoping Team, followed by input from stakeholder consultations on the change management process, and a presentation on the final report of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities. The plenary would then break into three groups for more in-depth discussions. The breakout groups would be facilitated by the consultant company, the Trium Group. The breakout groups would report back to the formal business meeting later in the day. All Members and observers were invited to participate.

### *Scoping Team Report*

Peter Core, Chair of the Scoping Team presented the Scoping Team report and the proposal for moving the change management process forward. He noted emphasized that the scoping process was highly consultative and included interviews, a survey, and many informal conversations. In the days prior to AGM07, the Scoping Team conducted focus group discussions with various stakeholders including the Alliance, GFAR, CSOs, NARS, Science Council, and the private sector. The Scoping Team also regularly consulted with the panel of the Independent Review of the CGIAR System and the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities.

The Scoping Team identified the following key challenges that the CGIAR should focus its effort to revitalize the System:

- Visioning and development challenges (previously referred to as research priorities and programs)
- Partnerships
- Funding mechanisms
- Governance at the System level
- Governance at the Center level

He noted that there have been many change proposals in the past that often times resulted in very little change. The Scoping Team found that trust and empathy were missing in past efforts and believes they are essential to the current process. There is also a very clear need for the CGIAR to strengthen the “System” mindset so as to effect real change and achieve what it sets out to do. The proposed process, centered around the five key challenge focus areas, will require time and effort from all parts of the System. The CGIAR has a unique opportunity to move forward.

The proposed design goes through calendar year 2008, and suggests that the process be led by a Change Steering Team (CST). Five working groups (WGs) would develop deeper and greater understanding of the identified challenges and develop creative suggestions for formal plans to address the issues:

- Working Group 1: Visioning and development challenges
- Working Group 2: Partnerships
- Working Group 3: Governance at System level
- Working Group 4: Governance at Center level
- Working Group 5: Funding mechanisms

Following P. Core’s presentation, R. Wang explained linkages between the change management process and the Independent Review Panel:

- The change process will concentrate in the first half of 2008 on “strengthening the System mindset” and on “strengthening trust and empathy” while further identifying issues to be addressed;
- In the meantime, the Independent Review Panel will provide technical papers in early 2008 (as they become available) to the Change Steering Team as an input to the change process;
- Detailed formal change plans will incorporate the Independent Review Panel’s recommendations from its July 2008 report;
- The Chairperson of the Independent Review will join the Change Steering Team as one of two “external advisors”;
- There will be open and full communication between the Chairs of the five Working Groups in the Change Process team and the Panel members on issues of common interest.

#### *Feedback from Stakeholder Consultations*

**Alliance of CGIAR Centers:** Alliance Executive (AE) Chair Emile Frison reiterated the Alliance’s commitment to the change process and is ready to contribute to the leadership of the process, and act with a sense of urgency and in a coordinated way. He noted that the timing is right to undertake the process, expressed support for the inclusiveness with which it is being undertaken, and that the process is about repositioning the CGIAR to be more effective, relevant and worthy of investment. He drew attention to the following issues and possible solutions:

- Sequencing: begin WG1 immediately to focus on higher level issues, with other WGs taking on its output as a framework.

- **Accountability:** include metrics and milestones in the TORs as first deliverables of the Change Steering Team.
- **Timing and flexibility:** include enough flexibility in the process to allow for changes if necessary, to ensure quality is not compromised.

**Science Council:** Science Council Chair Rudy Rabbinge noted that the SC believes it is important to use the opportunity of the change process to strengthen partnerships outside the System. The CGIAR has fulfilled its role well over the past two decades but its market share is decreasing. In addition to traditional sources of funding, there is more willingness to invest in agricultural research from new sources. The demands of the developing world are also changing. The CGIAR must respond effectively to these changes. It is also important for the change process to have linkages with the Independent Review Panel, but it must be done in a way that does not unnecessarily expand the activities of the Review Panel. All parts of the System need to take advantage of this opportunity.

**Science Forum:** R. Rabbinge also reported that the change process was discussed during the Science Forum. Some of the issues raised in discussions included the clear need to engage in partnerships with those currently outside the CGIAR network, including universities from the South and North, NARS, advanced research institutes (ARIs), private sector, etc. There are enormous opportunities in new fields and ways of operation that require a more interactive approach, and for the CGIAR to see itself as one actor in a web of actors that needs to engage with others. The question is whether the CGIAR will simply respond to the changing environment or play a lead role as an interactive knowledge center.

**GFAR:** GFAR Chair Adel El-Beltagy noted that while the views of stakeholders present during the meeting with the Scoping Team differ, it is clear that change in the System must take place to address concerns regarding exclusivity, value-addition, duplication, recognition, representation and partnerships at all levels. The CGIAR must dialogue and bridge global, regional and national realities, and base its relationship with partners on the principle of subsidiarity. GFAR is ready to play a role and be a conduit for interaction and enhanced stakeholder ownership. GFAR believes the change process should proceed in a timely fashion so as to not adversely affect staff morale and scientific quality.

**CSOs:** The CGIAR Chair also invited Tom Remington from Catholic Relief Services to address the meeting to provide a CSO perspective. He noted that a single individual or organization could not represent CSOs since it is such a broad and diverse group. He cautioned the CGIAR against looking for such an individual or organization to represent CSOs, but rather to solicit individuals to give perspectives on various issues being discussed. There is a need for continuous consultation grounded in implementation in order to be effective. He noted that Catholic Relief Services works more on the development end of the research-development continuum but is a “customer” of technologies from the CGIAR, which is positioned more on the research end of the continuum. Ongoing consultations will be essential to any successful change process.

**Private Sector:** Private Sector Committee Chair Bill Niebur noted that it is also difficult to speak for the private sector as a whole because it is also a broad and diverse group. He stated that the time is right to undertake a change process and that there is general strong support for the Scoping Team findings. There is a need for the CGIAR to become more innovative, flexible, and proactive. The challenge will be to drive the change process in such a way that future challenges are envisioned and appropriate solutions developed. There are no easy answers and many of the elements are as yet unknown. He encouraged diverse individuals to serve on WGs and noted that it is critical to encourage dissent in thought and opinion so that innovative ideas may emerge. He noted that, as currently structured, interactions with the CGIAR involve a lot of transaction costs because every interaction is an independent event. The CGIAR must ensure that all components realize that the whole is larger than the sum of its parts. He also suggested that Center Boards must be brought in for active participation. The private sector is interested in partnering with the CGIAR more effectively in the future and looks forward to being involved in the change process.

#### *ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities*

Jonathan Wadsworth, Chair of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities, presented the final report of the ad hoc committee to Members.

In the context of the Change Management Forum, the ExCo ad hoc committee believes that now is a good time for traction in the CGIAR for the following reasons: the CGIAR has been infused with new leadership (CGIAR Chair and Director), the Alliance has proposed a “way forward”, and the System is undergoing an external review and change process. He described the work of the ExCo ad hoc committee, and reviewed the principles of CGIAR funding and the messages from the AGM06 Member Coordination Forum, including funding the System Priorities (SPs) as a means to an end, the need for outcome orientation, and general support for a programmatic approach.

He reviewed the current three Center-based entry points for funding, and described the System Priority-based entry points envisaged, with varying levels of restriction. The proposed funding allocation mechanism would involve four steps:

- 1) Develop an Annual Demand Matrix from Center and Challenge Program (CP) Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) to determine proposed investments based on System Priorities.
- 2) Donors declare what they will be funding in coming year (and as many subsequent years as possible), which would represent an Annual Funding (Supply) Matrix.
- 3) Subtract the Annual Demand Matrix from the Annual Supply Matrix to determine over-, under-, and adequately-funded cells.
- 4) Donors willing to support this process to agree among themselves to reallocate some of their funding from over-funded cells to under-funded cells.

The ExCo ad hoc committee believes the proposal delivers on all of its intended objectives and noted that ExCo endorsed its recommendations. To that end the ad hoc committee's recommendations to the CGIAR were as follows:

- 1) The CGIAR endorse the step-wise process suggested, including joint preparation by SC, Alliance and the CGIAR Secretariat of the information needed to enable considered discussion by those donors willing to discuss harmonization of all or part of their funding to the CGIAR.
- 2) ExCo to establish a standing panel on funding to oversee implementation of the mechanism and provide advice on funding. This would provide a means of continuing to provide a space to discuss System level, medium to long term strategic funding issues of the CGIAR.
- 3) Among the first tasks of the panel would be to draw up a donor code of conduct with respect to funding issues for eventual incorporation in the CGIAR Charter.

The Chair opened the floor for questions and clarification. The issues raised included the need for full cost recovery, increasing long term unrestricted funding, funding entry points possible in the CGIAR due to lack of a legal entity, and allocation mechanisms. There were also questions on validity of the demand matrix. Following questions and clarification, Members broke into three groups to discuss the presentations and deliberate on the proposals.

## **Business Meeting**

### **1. Opening Session**

The Chair formally opened the AGM07 Business Meeting following breakout sessions of the Change Management Forum. She noted that the agenda was very full and request Members to keep comments as brief as possible to help adhere to the timed agenda.

#### *Adoption of the Agenda*

The agenda was adopted without changes. One Member suggested that the discussion on the CIAT EPMP be held in closed session. The Chair suggested that a decision on the need for a closed session be made at the time of the agenda item. The order of some items in the agenda was changed during the course of the meeting. Items appear in this summary in the original order of the agenda.

Marina Puccioni (Italy) announced that EIARD (European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development) had elected Jonathan Wadsworth (UK) as its new chair at its November 2007 meeting. The Chair thanked M. Puccioni for her contribution as EIARD Chair and welcomed J. Wadsworth as the new EIARD Chair.

## 2. CGIAR Change Management Process

The Chair invited rapporteurs from the three breakout groups to report back to the Group on their discussions:

### *Group A*

Ayman Abou Hadid (Egypt) reported that on the change process Group A concluded that there should be a clear set of objectives that would serve to unite the CGIAR behind the process. It also suggested merging WGs 3 and 4 on System and Center level governance to avoid duplication and address governance from a holistic perspective. The membership of all WGs should be inclusive of stakeholders, not just WG 2 on partnerships, in order to gather all views and perspectives in the System. One of the objectives Group A would like to see is for the CGIAR to become a \$1 billion System that is integrated and focused on addressing major issues in agricultural research and to liaise and collaborate with national systems. Success of the change process should be measured through the level of funding received and impact on the ground.

On the proposal for funding System Priorities, any funding system should be linked to the development challenges. Clear incentives should be established for donors to participate and they should take into account the diversity of donors. There should also be a system to review overhead costs of the System. There was also a concern that allocation of funds across the System Priorities could result in an increase in transaction costs. For the proposal to work, it would be necessary to have a commitment from Members to be more open and committed to doing what they say they will do. Likewise, Centers need to be objective in communicating their own comparative advantages and create realistic and robust business plans.

### *Group B*

Alexander Müller (FAO) reported for Group B. On the change process he noted that a clear commitment in terms of time and resources is needed. The System should also identify and implement quick wins immediately, e.g. reductions in bureaucracy. The group also identified suggestions for improving the process, including:

- Need for a focused and shared vision for the entire System,
- Need for a bottom-up approach but at the same time clear leadership,
- Demonstrate that the CGIAR is opening up to the outside world,
- Avoid losing momentum (linkage of the change process with the independent review should be clear but not slow down the process),
- Ensure broad participation in the process,
- Adjust membership of WGs and clarify TORs,
- On funding System Priorities issues, ensure performance-linked allocation with no free riders,
- There should be increased coordination among Centers, leading to more programmatic alignment and then possible mergers.

Some signs of success following implementation would be for the System to be more focused based on a shared strategic vision, better collaboration within the System, better

networking and collaboration with partners, incentives for Centers to work in partnership, and recognition that the CGIAR is a major player in the field of research for development and preferred by development agencies.

Group B suggested the CGIAR to act more businesslike, organized as a single System with a focused strategic vision and coherent funding strategy. There is need for one consolidated secretariat and for restructured governance, as well as to open up the System to new and traditional partners, e.g. regional stakeholders. It is also essential to bring in a new generation of players in the CGIAR. It also suggested merging the two WGs on governance.

On funding the System Priorities, the group raised the following questions and issues:

- Should governance be more businesslike?
- Should performance and allocation be linked?
- Opening up for developing countries, and taking into account regional planning systems.
- Do the System Priorities sufficiently reflect global development challenges?
- Reinstall a finance committee and look at whether the next step should lead to a global fund.
- How to reduce complexity of the System?

The benefits of such a funding mechanism include increased and unrestricted core funding and opening up for new funders and operational partners, increased coherence of the agenda, decreased transaction costs, and the System would be driven by development challenges.

Members would need to behave differently by supporting the SPs instead of pet projects, demonstrated by commitment to more disciplined reliable long term funding, and full cost recovery. This would require more collaboration on major funding issues.

Centers would also need to undergo behavior changes; namely, through increased levels of cooperation and reduced duplication, efficiency gains through divisions of labor, coordination, programmatic alignment and perhaps merging of Centers. They would have to demonstrate impact, accept cross cutting strategic management, and provide incentives for creation of bottom-up partnerships.

### ***Group C***

Ruth Haug (Norway) reported that the breakout session helped create a sense of ownership and commitment to the change process and welcomed the opportunity to discuss the issues. Group C expressed broad support for the Scoping Team proposal. The group felt that the WGs should start their work, but should rely on findings of the visioning work of WG 1 to guide their efforts. However, this should not slow down the process. The group also stressed the need for WGs to interact and function across groups, be inclusive, and encourage participation from partners, Members from the South, and other parts of the System. One suggestion was for the GFAR Chair to chair WG 2 on partnerships. The group also suggested merging the two WGs on governance

since they are highly related. Membership of the WGs should also be examined more closely, e.g. CGIAR Members would like to be included in WG 1. There was support for a high level meeting in 2009 as suggested in the Scoping Team proposal. The group noted that the outcome of the work of the WGs will only be the beginning and implementation will be more difficult. To that end, the Group C called for radical and creative decisions, but perhaps a stepwise implementation.

On funding for System Priorities, one suggestion was for the WG 5 (on funding mechanisms) to take the ExCo ad hoc committee report as a starting point and go more in depth. However, another view expressed was that the System Priorities might not be the appropriate or effective basis of a funding mechanism. It was agreed that a simple system for funding is needed. The group discussed the framework plans in the context of how to improve them to make them more useful. It was agreed that full cost recovery should be an objective for the whole System. There was a plea for all six entry points for funding as mentioned in the ExCo ad hoc committee proposal to be maintained, as long as full cost recovery is in place. Although participants were not sure how it could be achieved, the need for more long term and unrestricted funding was stressed. Some were in favor of an international fund for agricultural research as a possible way to solve the funding problem.

***Discussion:***

- Members expressed general support for the Scoping Team proposal and recommendations of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities, with suggestions for modifications.
- There was a strong sentiment among Members that the CGIAR must make use of the present opportunity and move forward with the change process in a timely fashion.
- Members welcomed the linkages with the Independent Review of the CGIAR System, but cautioned that they shouldn't slow the change management process.
- EIARD supported and endorsed the change process and believes the guiding principles should be improvement of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and accountability of the System. However, EIARD would like to see more inclusiveness in the WGs. It supported the recommendation from the breakout group for GFAR to chair WG 2. The WG should also include ARIs. WG 2 should look particularly at CPs, since they were conceived as a way of increasing inclusiveness and opening up the System. EIARD also agreed that WGs 3 and 4 should be merged to ensure a coherent examination on governance. It cautioned against deviating from the current SPs which were only approved in 2005. Any initiatives should build upon the SPs.
- Members emphasized that the proposal on funding System Priorities must be placed in the context of the change management process, as the outcome is not yet known.
- There was general consensus on merging the two WGs on governance.
- Members also expressed desire for WGs to be inclusive and participatory to ensure the voices of stakeholders are heard.

- Feedback from the breakout groups should be incorporated in formulating the composition and TORs of the WGs.
- The WGs should be small teams, but at the same time intellectually diverse in order to bring new ideas. The TORs of the WGs should be clearly developed and articulated.
- The change process should also take into account other “big issues” of the day, e.g., climate change, focus on agriculture in the World Development Report, etc.
- Changes should strive to avoid complexity and transaction costs, and focus on enhancing the impact of the CGIAR on the ground.
- The proposal on funding SPs is sensible, but the System should look at new ways of funding, perhaps through an international fund for agricultural research. Exploring such an option should be specifically incorporated into the TOR of the WG on funding mechanisms (WG 5). Allocation mechanisms should also be explored. Fresh outside perspectives should be sought when thinking about these areas, and are necessary if the CGIAR is to raise its game on partnerships and attract the most appropriate partners. An effort should also be made to involve and engage young scientists and other young people in the CGIAR who could be groomed for future leadership roles.
- Many Members expressed support for establishment of a finance committee as it could be a quick win and start its work very soon by looking at financial and funding issues across the System.
- One Member noted the importance of using electronic communications to keep all Members informed during the process and to engage a broader group of Members.
- One Member stated that funding that is labeled “restricted” may be somewhat negative connotation. As long as funding doesn’t detract from a Center’s mandate and all costs are fully covered, it shouldn’t be labeled as such. Perhaps instead, “targeted” would be a more appropriate term.

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

#### ***Change Management Process:***

- *The CGIAR expressed broad support and energy for the change management process and for moving forward with momentum, while at the same time recognizing some of the constraints.*
- *This sense of urgency is in the context of a number of global issues including climate change, poverty reduction implications of new agricultural developments, high attention to the World Bank World Development Report, and the threat of donors moving money elsewhere if change in the CGIAR doesn't take place.*
- *There is need for more focus on vision, which should be done early to help drive activities of the change management process.*
- *The process should identify quick wins that can help maintain momentum.*
- *Linkages with the Independent Review of the CGIAR System should be maintained, but should not slow the change management process, and the Review should be more sharply focused.*

- *The CGIAR endorsed the establishment of a Change Steering Team, with four working groups (on visioning and development challenges, partnerships, governance, and funding mechanisms) to help drive the change management process:*
  - 1) *WG 1 (visioning and development challenges) should include donors, and others partners, e.g. NARS. The WG should begin its work first and bring together many voices to ensure broad support early in the process.*
  - 2) *WG 2 (partnerships) should think broadly about partnerships, including new approaches with the private sector, advanced research institutes, etc. Individuals with experience with other organizations should be included in the WG to spur innovative thinking and ideas.*
  - 3) *WGs 3 and 4 on System- and Center-level governance should be merged and consider a systemwide approach to governance and think boldly.*
  - 4) *The TORs of the WGs should be clearly developed and articulated.*
  - 5) *The Chair requested Members to nominate individuals from within and from outside the System as candidates for the WGs, which should include a brief description of the person's experience and/or leadership abilities. She asked that Members entrust her with appointing WG members so as to not delay the process by waiting for approval from ExCo. She stated that she would draw on nominations received but also ensure the groups are diverse and balanced. She requested the Alliance and the Gender and Diversity Program to nominate young scientists that could be included to help start building the next generation of leaders in the System*
- *The World Bank has paid the cost of the change management process so far. The Chair asked that those who serve on WGs be able to donate their time, and she noted that it would send a good signal for other Members to contribute funds to the process.*

*ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities:*

- *The CGIAR thanked the ExCo ad hoc Committee for its work and expressed support for its report.*
- *The CGIAR requested WG 5 (on funding mechanisms) to examine a more in depth implementation plan for the funding mechanism, drawing on the experience of other global programs. Building on the proposed funding mechanism, the WG should also examine the pros and cons of establishing an international fund on agricultural research.*
- *The CGIAR agreed to establish an ExCo ad hoc committee on finance, which may evolve into an ExCo standing panel depending on the outcome of the change management process. The first task of the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance would be to examine the CIAT case and the Center's plea for special donor support to its reinvigoration plan.*
- *The CGIAR requested WG 5 (on funding mechanisms) to develop TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance, in addition to examining the role such a committee would play in the future CGIAR System. (The decision on development of TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance was superseded in a later agenda item (11.b. CIAT EPMR), and the CGIAR Secretariat was requested to*

*develop TORs immediately following AGM07. The WG on funding mechanisms will continue to examine the role such a committee would play in the future.)*

### **3. CGIAR Status Report**

CGIAR Director Ren Wang updated Members on new and ongoing activities in the CGIAR since AGM06, not covered in other agenda items.

*Finance:* After a five percent reduction in 2006, funding growth in 2007 resumed due largely to the one-time doubling of the European Commission (EC) contribution. Uganda has also reengaged with a \$1.8 million contribution. China increased its funding by 50 percent. The Global Crop Diversity Trust is a new donor to the CGIAR with \$3 million contribution in perpetuity starting 2007-08 plus \$2 million for special projects. The CGIAR is preparing its request for \$50 million from the World Bank Development Grant Facility for FY09. He noted the CGIAR's appreciation for all of these donors. He noted that the World Bank and USAID have come to an agreement that led to USAID's accession to the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). The EC and IFAD also reached agreement for IFAD to administer the EC contribution and ensure funds are disbursed to all Centers. Following its EPMR, CIAT has developed a reinvigoration plan for the Center and presented it to Members at AGM07. The CGIAR Secretariat is facilitating CIAT's dialogue with Members contributing to the Center. He informed Members that in 2008 the Science Council budget will be \$3.6 million and will receive extraordinary support of \$1.5 million from investment income in the old CGIAR Trust Fund at the World Bank, resulting in a lower levy on Center budgets to fund the SC. He highlighted CGIAR's increasing support to SSA. He also noted that the quality of CGIAR funding has decreased, with the level of core funding below 40 percent.

*Governance and Accountability:* R. Wang updated Members on CGIAR nominees on Center boards, noting that all Centers will have at least one CGIAR nominee on their boards by the end of the current cycle. Following CGIAR approval of the recommendations of the Stripe Review on Corporate Governance of CGIAR Centers, the CGIAR Secretariat developed a template for Centers to report to ExCo on implementation of the recommendations. The Alliance reported to ExCo 13 on implementation and ExCo will continue to monitor implementation of the recommendations. He noted that a Board Orientation Program is being held after AGM07 for incoming Center Board members, and the Third CGIAR Senior Leadership Program held in July 2007 in Switzerland. He thanked Switzerland for its support. A search for two new Science Council members is being conducted by the Search and Nominations Committee for SC and will be appointed by the end of February 2008. The Independent Review of the CGIAR System is underway and the final report is scheduled to be completed in July 2008. The inception report of the review will be discussed later in the meeting. He also noted that most Centers have provided information on compensation which has been posted to the CGIAR Members Only website.

*System Office:* A System Office (SO) workshop on governance was held in October 2007. Based on the recommendations of the workshop, the SO Steering Committee has recommended that the Gender & Diversity Unit become a Systemwide program, the SAS-HR function be performed by the CGIAR Secretariat, Science Council Secretariat no longer be part of the SO, and the Media Unit to be folded into the Communications Team at the CGIAR Secretariat, to provide strengthened support to the Marketing Group. An oversight board of the SO will also be established, to be chaired by the Alliance Board (AB) Chair. Each unit will have its own technical advisory panel, and report to the CGIAR Director and Director General (DG) of the host Center.

*Challenge Programs (CPs):* A lessons learned document was jointly developed by SC and the CGIAR Secretariat and discussed at ExCo 13. Two Challenge Programs (Challenge Program on Water and Food and HarvestPlus) underwent external reviews and will be discussed later. ExCo 13 discussed CP Cycle 2 and agreed to ask for full proposals on Climate Change, "Oasis", and High Value Crops.

*Partnerships:* R. Wang highlighted the strengthening of the CSO-CGIAR partnership and various steps being taken to achieve this, e.g. consultations on the change process at AGM07, competitive grants program, CGIAR-GFAR blog, etc. He thanked GFAR for its help in facilitating inputs from CSO partners and Members from the South. Private Sector Committee (PSC) continues to strengthen its involvement in the CGIAR. PSC Chair will update the CGIAR later during the meeting. In collaboration with France, the CGIAR is organizing a workshop on sharing mechanisms for forging effective research partnerships, scheduled to be held in February 2008.

*Communications and Outreach:* R. Wang reported on a series of successful communications and outreach activities, and highlighted a very successful Parliamentarians visit to Cambodia as part of the effort to bring focus to agricultural research on the part of policy makers. The CGIAR also had a presence at a significant number of international events in 2007.

*Media Coverage:* Media coverage activities have increased in the past year. Through story development workshops held with Centers, examples of CGIAR work with a potential interest to a wide audience are identified. The communications campaign on climate change will continue in 2008.

He also noted that most of the items on the CGIAR business follow-up checklist have been completed or are on track.

He concluded by highlighting the continuing global need for international agricultural research, the importance of positioning the CGIAR strategically, and the opportunity to enhance and demonstrate improvements in accountability, transparency, efficiency and impact.

***Discussion:***

- Members welcomed the disclosure of information on Center compensation.

- EIARD highlighted its commitment to CPs and welcomed Cycle 2, stressing the need for the new CPs to incorporate lessons learned from ongoing CPs and the external reviews of CPs.
- One Member suggested going further in the communications and outreach strategy, particularly in the activities related to climate change.
- Members were interested in understanding the details of the negotiations between the World Bank and USAID on its accession to the MDTF, as they may be useful to help other Members to join.
- The CGIAR must act proactively on climate change, particularly to be aligned with the UN System.

***Conclusion:***

- *The CGIAR Chair thanked Ren Wang for his report and noted the progress made in many areas since he assumed his duties as CGIAR Director.*
- *It is important to share the experience of the World Bank and USAID negotiations to join the MDTF for other Members to learn and possibly replicate.*
- *The CGIAR should scale up and align its efforts on climate change with those of the UN System, and establish its own position.*

#### **4. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan**

Science Council Chair Rudy Rabbinge presented the SC commentary on Center and Challenge Program Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) for 2008-2010. Shey Tata (CGIAR Secretariat) followed with presentation of the 2008 Financing Plan.

R. Rabbinge reported that, overall, discipline and effort have gone into preparing the current MTP documents that, in general follow a standardized format and show improvement in quality over last year's submissions. The improvement was especially noted in the descriptions of the background and rationale for the proposed research and capacity building efforts, the results to be delivered, and the plausible outcomes expected in the near and long term. As a result of the improvement in the quality of MTPs, SC identified six MTPs that will not require in-depth review in 2009: CIMMYT, IFPRI, ILRI, IRRI, HarvestPlus and Generation CPs.

This was the second year in which Centers and CPs used the MTPs to demonstrate the contribution of their research agenda to the approved System Priorities. Centers, by and large, allocated their research to the SPs much more appropriately this year than last year. It was evident from the MTPs that Centers and CPs were engaged in SPs with clear development outcomes. However, the SC noted that development of frameworks plans for implementation of the SPs was moving more slowly than anticipated, and thus allocations to SPs still do not present a coherent agenda for priority research in the System. In cases where a framework plan had been drafted, the plan should have been used as the organizing principle for formulating Centers' research. The SC looks forward to seeing a more integrated (across Centers) approach to addressing SPs in subsequent MTPs with clear roles and responsibilities elaborated.

He noted that there seems to be oversubscription to the SPs, as only 5.7 percent of allocations are to non-SP activities, due to downstream research and development activities. He praised the efforts of IRRI and IFPRI for their inclusion of new and innovative research in the MTP, including those outside the SPs. The SC noted that Centers cited the weaknesses of the NARS as justification for conducting certain activities themselves that are not appropriate for an international agricultural research center. The SC expects that during framework planning these non-SP activities will be either dropped or devolved or, if Centers consider them essential for securing impact, that they are presented in the non-SP agenda.

The SC and the CGIAR Secretariat are analyzing the output indicator in the PM system and will report back to ExCo.

Finally, the SC will continue to work with Centers and CPs to streamline the development of the rolling MTPs. The Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management (ICT-KM) unit of the System Office, in collaboration with a number of Centers is developing a very promising MTP reporting tool that will be comprised of a Center/CP module for compilation and submission, and a System database. With this system and the generally more satisfactory level of reporting now observed in the Center MTPs, the SC believes it may not be necessary to assess MTPs every year in similar detail. The SC therefore expects to gradually move from reviewing MTPs to reviewing the strategic plans of Centers and CPs.

S. Tata presented a summary of the investment proposals and financing plan of the 2008 CGIAR agenda, prepared this year in collaboration with ICRISAT.

Implementing the CGIAR System Priorities for 2008 requires an investment of US\$529 million, representing an increase of \$71 million (16 percent in nominal terms or 13 percent in real terms) over the actual 2006 level. Eighty seven percent of the investment will be implemented through Centers, 11 percent through Challenge Programs and partners, and two percent will go to underwriting the cost of CGIAR facilitation units and business processes. In order to add clarity to the financing of the proposed investment, the structure of CGIAR financing was also presented to explain how these elements were combined in the 2008 financing plan. S. Tata emphasized that “reserves and grants under negotiation” was an adjusting line item that could lead to adjustments to other elements in the financing as well as the investment side of the plan, depending on the outcome of negotiating the grants.

The financing of the proposed research agenda is expected to be provided from \$478 million in investor grants, \$17 million from Center income, and \$34 million from grants under negotiation (grants still under negotiation that cannot yet be attributed to specific investors), and/or Center reserves. The projected level of investor grants would represent an increase of \$52 million (12 percent in nominal terms or 10 percent in real terms) over the actual 2006 level. Of the total projected investor grants, \$175 million (37 percent) will be unrestricted, \$38 million (8 percent) will be loosely restricted (attributed) while

\$265 million (55 percent) will be project restricted, compared with 42 percent, 1 percent and 58 percent, respectively in 2006. These levels of restriction correspond to Type IV, V and VI funding types used by the ExCo Ad Hoc Committee to describe the existing entry points for funding the CGIAR System Priorities.

Four risk factors were identified that could affect the outcome of the financing plan:

- 1) timing of information on funding affecting the impact of exchange rate movements and inflation,
- 2) quality of information affecting funding levels and allocations,
- 3) policies affecting levels and conditionality of support, and
- 4) the rate of implementation of restricted projects.

The exchange rate risk was used to illustrate the fluidity of the plan. The analysis showed that, under certain assumptions, exchange gains could add as much as US\$40 million to the projected investor grants and increase the ratio of unrestricted funding to 42 percent in 2008. On the other hand, this gain would be partially offset by an increase of \$16 million due to the appreciation of the basket of local currency expenditures against the U.S. dollar. Foreign exchange and other risk factors demonstrate that the financing plan is subject to variability (on both income and expenditure) to which Centers need to respond to maintain equilibrium. Nevertheless, plans represent a vision and opportunity for monitoring and evaluation against benchmarks.

***Discussion:***

- R. Rabbinge was commended for the clear and comprehensive SC commentaries on the MTPs. The continued improvement of the Center and CP MTPs, which would allow the SC to move in the future to review of strategic plans was welcomed.
- It was recognized that alignment of the research agenda into the SPs was still in progress, and requires more time before it will be fully aligned. There was appreciation about the proposed online database to link the MTP with the finance and PM data.
- One Member enquired about the absence of regional MTPs from the SC commentary.
- There were strong concerns about the continued trend of declining unrestricted funding and also the low recovery of indirect costs, which pose considerable challenges to Center financial health, and should be reversed. Another Member also highlighted the need for Centers to have business plans which combined the programmatic and the financial aspects of operations.
- The Alliance expressed concern that the positive net impact of foreign exchange movements on the financing plan might cast it in an unrealistically optimistic light. S. Tata explained that the analysis took into account a basket of both contribution currencies and local expenditure currencies to ensure realism in the assumptions. Furthermore, he noted that Centers report their finances in U.S. dollars and its depreciation of recent years was a fact that could not be ignored in the financing plan. It was recognized that although the net impact of foreign

- exchange on the plan was positive, this did not represent an actual increase in contributions which mostly remained flat in terms of the contribution currencies.
- Members wished to have more information on financial health of Centers. S. Tata explained that the CGIAR Performance Measurement System, which has been in place for about four years, has a set of indicators on Centers' self-assessed performance, including on finance. He indicated that Center financial health is normally presented at the May ExCo meeting, and that this could also be presented at AGM as well.
  - Several Members wished to have an update of the status of the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). S. Tata indicated that the MDTF was still available to Members who wished to use it to route their contribution to the Centers, and that USAID was the latest Member to join the MDTF.
  - Several Members (notably the EC, Belgium and UK) announced commitments to increasing their CGIAR contribution as well as make multi-year commitments of financial support.

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *CGIAR approved the 2008 financing plan.*
- *CGIAR appreciated the positive indications of increased financial and multi-year commitments of several Members.*
- *CGIAR requested the CGIAR Secretariat to explore ways to:*
  - 1) *Provide Members with more information on Centers' financial health;*
  - 2) *Drill down the analysis of the financing plan;*
  - 3) *Examine prospects for change in the MDTF to enable other Members to use it for channeling their contributions to Centers.*
- *The CGIAR agreed that further analysis of the SC proposal to de-link the MTP output planning from the PM System is required. CGIAR endorsed ExCo's recommendation that the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat submit a proposal to ExCo 14 that does not devalue but optimizes the utility of the PM System, maintains incentives, and ensures high output goals.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed ExCo's recommendation for analysis of Center MTPs by the SC every third year, or as required by SC assessment, instead of automatically yearly. It also expressed support to the online tool linking the MTPs, the finance and the PM databases.*

## **5. CGIAR External Review**

Elizabeth McAllister, Chair of the Independent Review Panel, presented the Inception Report of the review.

She noted that the review panel is fully independent and its client is the whole of the CGIAR System, not a single part alone. She stated that the Review Panel has no preconceptions, and is taking a listening and learning stance.

The Review seeks to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the CGIAR partnership and governance, and effectiveness of research. It will recommend changes in view of emerging challenges such as food security, agriculture and natural resource management for the poor.

She noted that the review will follow the guidelines for reviews of global programs that have evolved in the last five years. She said that in the new evaluation context, evaluators are also evaluated against high standards for their report. The focus of the review will be the CGIAR context, governance, impacts and partnerships. The impact element will be a meta-review. The Panel will elaborate several work packages for each area and will commission eight technical papers. The ExCo ad hoc group on the Review continues to serve as a sounding board to the Review Panel. Additional members to represent other perspectives are being considered. She also highlighted the linkages with the change management process presented earlier in the meeting.

The Review Panel has committed to deliver an interim report on progress to World Bank in March 2008, and the final report by July 2008. The final report will be presented to ExCo in October 2008 and at AGM08 in December 2008.

*Discussion:*

- Some Members expressed concern that the timeline for the Review is very tight and ambitious. Since the Review will be an important input to the change process, requests for interactions with the Review Panel should be met with a cooperative and rapid response to get the most value out of the Review.
- Some Members questioned the need for a large number of technical papers and expressed concern that commissioning of these papers may slow progress, and seems unnecessary.
- A question was raised on the content of the March 2008 interim report. The Review Panel Chair responded that the interim report would be a progress report rather than a draft report.
- EIARD welcomed the review but expressed concern that more consultation with partners should be a stronger component. There also seems to be a lack of involvement of stakeholders from the South and Members in exit workshops. EIARD also mentioned that it is critical that the inception report includes the identification of the inefficiencies and constraints of the change process and take a more Systemwide approach to the review rather than reviewing parts of the System. Given the linkage with the change process, it's important that decisions on change management take into account findings of the Review.
- Another Member expressed concern on the need for a large number of technical papers. The TORs of the Review state that it should mainly be a meta-evaluation. Given the large amount of literature and reviews that already exist, is it necessary to commission technical papers that will likely delay the process?
- Another Member pointed out that the Review Panel should focus more on partnerships and governance, because on impacts there is already a large amount of literature. Other Members welcomed the accountability of evaluators.

- The Review Panel Chair responded to some of the issues raised, commenting that the technical papers will support the review for topics not included. She agreed that input from Members and partners from the South are essential and the Panel looks forward to their input. The Review will also look at reforms over the past five years to see how well the System has done as a whole. She noted that the Panel will visit Centers in the next months and that the Panel appreciates cooperation and rapid response to their queries.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR asked that the Inception Report be revised to reflect the following amendments:*
  - *The Review should have a stronger emphasis on the analysis of partnerships;*
  - *A stronger balance on seeking views of Members and NARS from the South; and*
  - *The Review Panel optimizes its time management by focusing more on elements such as partnerships issues, and not to expand its scope.*
- *The CGIAR stood firm on the timeline for the deliverables, e.g. interim and final reports, and asked the Review Panel to ensure the Review is not prolonged and therefore does not delay the change management process. There may be areas that can be cut back (e.g., the technical papers). It is essential to receive the interim report by March 2008 and the final report by July 2008.*

## **6. Evaluation**

K. Sierra introduced the item noting that, as at AGM06, handling of EPMRs would not include formal presentations. She reminded the Group that EPMRs have been discussed at both the SC and ExCo meetings during the year. At AGM07, the discussion was preceded only by brief opening remarks from a review panel representative (panel chair or member).

### **6.a. IWMI EPMR**

IWMI EPMR Panel member Jeff Bennett participated in the discussion through video conference on behalf of Panel Chair William Easter. He briefly summarized the key findings and recommendations of the Panel focusing on the need for IWMI to do more analytical and less descriptive science, the Center's drift towards more development activities in the research-development continuum, the Center's below average number of publications, and the need to redouble efforts on impact assessment.

R. Wang presented the ExCo12 recommendations.

***Discussion:***

- Concern was expressed over financial management in the Center.

- Regarding critical views of the EPMR on the scientific performance and orientation of IWMI, a number of Members supported the Center response that its mandate is research for impact on development. They also supported the response regarding the use of descriptive and analytical approaches to its research agenda.
- Members also recognized the value of IWMI's work on water management related to urban agriculture. It was agreed that a holistic approach addressing water, health, and environment issues should be adopted.
- Members reiterated ExCo comments and observations on HR management, i.e. the need for strategy, leadership and staffing.
- There was a renewed call for IWMI's leadership in addressing water management issues in collaboration with other CGIAR Centers (e.g. ICARDA).
- Colin Chartres, the new Director General of IWMI, briefly outlined what the Center has planned or started to do in response to the EPMR recommendations and other issues raised by Members. R. Rabbinge and a number of Members were pleased to hear the Director General's views and plans for the Center.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR Chair thanked the EPMR Panel for its work and a well balanced review.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 3<sup>rd</sup> IWMI EPMR.*
- *The CGIAR is concerned about financial management at the Center and sent a signal to the entire System about the importance placed on this area, and expressed appreciation to the new DG on the steps he is taking to examine the issue more closely.*

**6.b. WARDA EPMR**

K. Sierra invited WARDA EPMR Panel Chair Eric Tollens (who was at the meeting) to make brief remarks on the EPMR.

R. Wang presented the ExCo 13 recommendations.

***Discussion:***

- Members expressed general support for the EPMR recommendations.
- Members acknowledged WARDA's efforts on maintaining quality research standards despite the turmoil it has faced.
- WARDA is a good example of an effective partnership, not only as a CGIAR Center but as an African institution with positive impact in several countries.
- One Member considered that the alignment with CIAT and IRRI is another good example of partnerships and is perhaps a modality to be replicated elsewhere.
- Some Members commented that the distribution and production of NERICA varies. The research should be enhanced and the distribution better targeted. More research is needed to develop new varieties and to understand its acceptance at the farm level.
- WARDA should exercise caution and care in programmatic expansion in order to build on its core competencies, but not to the detriment of quality research.
- Egypt noted its likely entry into WARDA's membership.

- With regard to dissemination of NERICAs, WARDA DG Papa Seck detailed that, with FAO's support, productivity of NERICA had increased due to dissemination of seeds. He mentioned specific advances in Uganda and Nigeria. The DG also noted the strategy to transfer the HIV-AIDS initiative to IFPRI.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 5<sup>th</sup> WARDA EPMR and commended the Center for a positive review and its ability to maintain standards and results during a time of turmoil.*
- *The CGIAR cautioned against too rapid expansion of the Center by taking a deliberate approach that builds on core competencies.*
- *The likely support of Egypt to WARDA was welcomed by the CGIAR.*
- *The CGIAR requested WARDA to keep the CGIAR Secretariat informed on negotiations with IFPRI on transfer of the HIV-AIDS initiative to ensure a systemic view on such issues.*

**6.c. ILRI EPMR**

K. Sierra invited ILRI EPMR Panel Chair Lindsay Falvey (who participated through video conference) to make brief remarks. The Panel Chair reaffirmed the Panel's positive view of ILRI research and of how the Center is governed and managed. He highlighted some of the key aspects of the Center's programs which are doing well and those that would need strengthening.

R. Wang presented the ExCo12 recommendations.

***Discussion:***

- Members congratulated ILRI for a positive external review report.
- Several developing country Members endorsed the strengthening of ILRI's global coverage/presence. It was pointed out that a key role that ILRI could play is in the promotion of North-South and South-South cooperation in livestock research, particularly in capacity building and strengthening.
- Greater collaboration with ICARDA was recommended.
- Some Members also stated the need for ILRI to maintain strong understanding of cross-boundary diseases.
- The BecA (bioscience eastern and central Africa) network which IRRI established was considered a useful model that could be employed in other lines of CGIAR research.
- Some Members advised caution concerning expansion of ILRI's geographic coverage and collaboration. They pointed out the need to ensure that resources are available for such expansion.
- ILRI Board Chair Uwe Werblow and Director General Carlos Sere responded to the comments raised and gave an update on what has been achieved in both programmatic and governance/management aspects since the report was discussed at ExCo12. They fully recognized the huge demand on ILRI, which in their view could only be addressed through partnerships subject, of course, to availability of resources.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 2<sup>nd</sup> ILRI EPMR.*
- *Concerning the global expansion of ILRI, the CGIAR cautioned that it should be an evolutionary process and should be within the framework of a well-structured and financed strategic plan. It welcomed the pro-active response of the Center management on partnerships. It also noted the importance for ILRI to share lessons from its positive EPMR with other Centers.*

## **7. Report from Science Council**

R. Rabbinge briefed the CGIAR on the main SC activities it has undertaken in 2007.

On monitoring and evaluation, he noted that in 2007 there have been six EPMRs, two Challenge Program external reviews and the meta-review of EPMRs. Currently, SC is finalizing the meta-review of Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (SWEPs). He also discussed the several proposals made by SC to streamline the review process of MTPs.

On System Priorities, he noted the importance of cross cutting themes such as climate change, nutrition and health. In addition, the development of framework plans is progressing towards completion by mid-2008. He thanked the Alliance for their work on this task. He also welcomed the work of the ExCo ad hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities.

The SC has prioritized a key set of strategic activities and proposed a reduced budget for 2008-09. The plan and budget was presented to and endorsed by ExCo 13. Some of the highlights of the 2008-09 budget are a review of social science in the CGIAR, studies of intellectual property stewardship and liability, renewing the emphasis on the mobilization of science and impact studies.

The SC looks forward to 2008 with the proposed structural changes as endorsed by ExCo and the identification of the two new SC members. The proposed changes would mainstream the function of the Standing Panel on Priorities and Strategies (SPPS) and Standing Panel on Mobilizing Science (SPMS) into the entire SC.

Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) Chair Jim Ryan presented a report on SPIA activities. A SPIA strategy has been developed that envisions making the CGIAR a leader in design and conduct of *ex post* impact assessment of agricultural research, building investors confidence in their investments in the CGIAR and institutionalizing impact assessment as an essential part of research management and planning. He also noted some of the ongoing and future activities of SPIA.

***Discussion:***

- EIARD congratulated SC and SPIA for their work and achievements to date. The SC was urged to play a greater role in identifying crucial emerging issues at an

early stage. The SC has been in business for four years, and EIARD recommended an evaluation of SC be organized to take stock of its achievements and to help design its future course.

- One Member cautioned the SC to maintain the balance between the science component of its work with the development work. Signs of impact are essential.
- Members were happy to note that the work plan includes review of the CGIAR social science; there was also a request for an indicator on social impact to be developed in the future, and a renewed emphasis on gender.
- Emphasis was also placed on mobilizing NARS to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as part of the effort to mobilize science.
- J. Ryan reassured the Membership that an indicator for social impact is in the agenda of the SPIA.

#### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The Chair thanked R. Rabbinge and J. Ryan for their reports.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendation on the proposed SC structure changes to mainstream priorities and strategies, and mobilizing science into the work of the entire SC.*
- *SC should determine what metrics to use to measure results of mainstreaming mobilization of science, and report back to ExCo on the results.*
- *The SC was encouraged to keep CGIAR science in the context of development effectiveness and welcomed the development of ways to measure the social and environmental impacts of CGIAR work. The need to balance the development aspect with the research should also be reflected in selection of new SC members who should bring in the social science perspective.*
- *The Chair also emphasized that the CGIAR should stay ahead of the curve on new emerging issues, e.g. climate change and agriculture, health and nutrition, to help reposition the CGIAR.*
- *The CGIAR should consider undertaking an evaluation of the Science Council, which has been in place for four years. The ongoing Independent Review of the CGIAR System will include a light review on the role of the SC this year; a full review should come after it is concluded in order to not overload the System with too many evaluations.*

## **8. Perspectives from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers**

Two outgoing and one incoming Directors General were invited so say a few words. Masa Iwanaga (CIMMYT) noted his long association with the CGIAR and expressed thanks for the support he received as CIMMYT DG. He noted the Center's emergence from a recent crisis and his belief of future success of the Centers. Joachim Voss (CIAT) said he is leaving the CGIAR with mixed emotions but believes it is the right decision for CIAT. He commended the scientists at the Center and thanked Members for their support. Colin Chartres (IWMI) noted his appreciation for being invited to serve as IWMI DG and looks forward to the challenges ahead.

E. Frison presented the report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers. The report covered some of the main activities of the Alliance, including the status of the development of framework plans, contribution to the lessons learned paper on CPs, contributions to the Scoping Team and the organization of the external review of the System, and pursuit of more collaboration with FAO and the private sector.

He noted that the Alliance would like to be engaged in improving the performance of the System and has developed an internal mechanism at the Center level to monitor and improve financial health as noted at ExCo, through sharing of information and knowledge.

Lastly, in keeping with the commitment to make available the data of remuneration, he noted that 14 out of 15 Centers have provided information, which is available on the Members only page of the CGIAR website.

***Discussion:***

- A Member commended the Alliance and its contribution to discussion on System issues by bringing a single voice from the Centers to meetings.
- One Member expressed concern about the transaction costs of developing framework plans especially if these are to be renewed on an annual basis.
- E. Frison acknowledged that the framework plans should be a living document and the development of these do have transaction costs, but emphasized that they will help guide implementation of the System Priorities

***Conclusion:***

- *The Chair thanked the Alliance for the report and its efforts.*

## **9. CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Climate Change**

K. Sierra restated her comments made at ExCo 13 in which she indicated the importance of positioning the CGIAR as a center of excellence in adaptation and mitigation research for poor farmers. She indicated that ExCo had agreed the CGIAR should develop a strategic initiative on climate change and that the Alliance, Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat should undertake a stock take of the existing work; that a conference which would bring together scientists from the CGIAR and from partners in NARS and ARIs should be held in 2008; and that the CGIAR should scale up its research in this area by calling for an increased investment in climate change related research.

She emphasized the need for adopting flexible financing and programmatic mechanisms which would better allow the CGIAR to be nimble in developing initiatives and not miss opportunities, such as the one in Bali (13<sup>th</sup> UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference) presents, to highlight the relevance of the CGIAR to climate change.

Following the Alliance's statement of support for this approach and offer to produce a comprehensive white paper together with the Science Council and the CGIAR

Secretariat, the Membership conducted a lengthy discussion on the importance of the initiative.

***Discussion:***

- Initial comments indicated the need for further development of the stock take paper, indicating the importance of including a better balance of descriptions of natural resource management and policy work with crop productivity activities.
- The discussion highlighted the need to be strategic and identify the CGIAR Centers' distinctive competence or niche in the climate change research arena; the importance of maintaining a focus on impact on poor farmers; the need to undertake comprehensive mapping of existing climate change research activities to avoid duplication of efforts; the importance of working closely with a wide range of partners on the initiative; and the value of an innovative networked approach to collaborative research on the issue.
- Members unanimously agreed it was important not to miss the opportunity of Bali (UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference) to position the CGIAR in the climate change debate. Several Members noted that this emphasis was both welcome and long overdue.
- EIARD, Netherlands, Japan, GFAR, EC, and Denmark, identified Climate Change activities taking place in 2008 and 2009 in which the CGIAR should be involved, namely: DFID (UK Department for International Development), World Bank, Netherlands initiative to research the costs of adaptation, TICAD 4 & G8 Summit in Japan which will both have a climate change theme; GFAR Consensus Building and Advocacy for Action Initiative on Climate Change; European Union's Global Climate Change Alliance; EC Global Climate Change Financing Mechanism; The 2009 COP meeting in Denmark, and many others.
- There was an expression of concern at the decrease in the CGIAR's CWANA related research (from 9 to 8 percent), given the vulnerability of the region to climate change and a discussion of the issue of biofuels in which divergent regional impacts were highlighted.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the concept of a CGIAR strategic initiative on climate change.*
- *The Chair thanked Members for their support of the initiative and noted Membership's request for it to be strategic, and based on the CGIAR's distinctive competences within the context of the extensive pre-existing external activities. The Chair also acknowledged the Group's desire for a new more flexible, networked and collaborative approach to rapidly building a climate change initiative given the urgency of the issue and significance of the debate.*
- *There was agreement that the CGIAR should call for a doubling of funding for climate change related research at the 13<sup>th</sup> UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference in Bali, Indonesia.*

## 10. SSA Challenge Program: Progress Report

K. Sierra introduced the item by reminding Members that at AGM04, the CGIAR approved the Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program (SSA CP), in principle, for a 5-year period, subject to a successful assessment of its 18-month inception phase (review conducted in 2006). Following the review of the inception phase, at AGM06, the CGIAR requested Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) to develop an action plan that addressed the concerns raised by ExCo members and the Science Council on the findings of the inception phase review. As elements of the action plan, FARA was requested to, “present critical milestones for the three year post inception phase, undertake an evaluation of its existing skills gap, adjust the financial proposal for years 2007-09 to reflect the scaling back of the activities to three pilot sites from the proposed nine, and develop a research program that has clear cross-site linkages. The CGIAR also agreed to review progress achieved by SSA CP at AGM07 against the critical milestones and indicators that were requested as part of the action plan (adopted as the SSA CP MTP for 2007-2009).

### *Discussion:*

- Several Members expressed support for the SSA CP and commended FARA for the work that has been done so far, and urged the CGIAR to continue its support to the CP.
- It was noted that the international agriculture research for development model is a unique model that holds potential for learning and duplication in other regions, also for other CGIAR engagement to meet development challenges.
- EIARD noted the importance of the SSA CP and believes it deserves special attention and support. However, it is worried about that FARA and SC have not yet reached agreement on research protocol and encourages further dialogue to resolve any remaining issues. The SC Chair noted that progress has been made in resolving the issue of a feasible research agenda. More work remains but it is expected that an agreed agenda and program will be reached in due course.
- A question was raised on whether the steering committee of the CP has been phased, and what the governance implications are.
- FARA Executive Secretary, Monty Jones responded to some of the issues and questions raised. He extended thanks to Members and all who have supported the CP, noting that commitments for the program have been received through 2010. He stated that FARA welcomes the advice it receives from SC and is currently working to harmonize views on proof of concept and other issues. Based on SC advice, outcome indicators have also been streamlined. As the program moves to implementation, it seeks to improve effectiveness and efficiency by disbanding some of the structures put in place during inception, and to devolve responsibilities to sub-regional organizations in order to strengthen their capacity to manage and coordinate agricultural research. The steering committee has not yet been disbanded but there is plan to turn over its responsibilities to the program sub-committee of the board and retain an advisory group, which would include some members of the current steering committee.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *CGIAR thanked FARA for the progress report on the SSA CP.*
- *CGIAR expressed strong support for the SSA CP. It is one of the important mechanisms to meeting the needs of Africa.*
- *FARA should continue to work with SC to determine the correct research protocol and on evaluation of proof of concept for the program.*

**11. Evaluation (cont'd)**

**11.a. IITA EPMR**

K. Sierra invited IITA EPMR Panel Chair Cyrus Ndiritu (who participated through video conference) to make brief remarks. Unfortunately, technical problems resulting in video conference disconnection prevented him from participating further in the discussion.

R. Wang presented the ExCo13 recommendations.

***Discussion:***

- Members were pleased with the review panel's assessment that IITA is in good institutional and financial health.
- SC Chair R. Rabbinge remarked that IITA's research for development model/approach has unique features that should be shared with other Centers.
- EIARD expressed support for the panel's recommendations with regard to enhancing partnerships between IITA and CIAT, ILRI, and in particular, FARA. They also emphasized the important role of IITA in the regional MTPs.
- IITA Board Chair Brian Harvey assured Members that efforts are being made to resolve the cassava research issue with CIAT.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 6<sup>th</sup> IITA EPMR.*

**11.b. CIAT EPMR**

K. Sierra introduced the item by inviting CIAT EPMR Panel Chair Eduardo Venezian to make brief comments on the CIAT EPMR. E. Venezian noted the difficult time for the Center during the EPMR period, while commending the quality of scientific work and the scientific staff of the Center. The Center has been severely affected by financial problems in recent years and efforts by management to get the Center back on track were not successful. These have affected staff morale and weakened Center governance and management. Critical recommendations from the EPMR Panel included development of a strategic plan for the Center that would reorganize the program structure of the Center around a few outcome lines. Management and governance of the Center needs to be reinvigorated with strong attention to strengthening financial management. The recommendations need to be addressed urgently, but the Center has the opportunity to emerge from the crisis and become a stronger institute.

R. Wang presented the ExCo 13 recommendations regarding the CIAT EPMR.

*Discussion:*

- Members commended the staff at CIAT for maintaining high scientific quality during the difficulties faced by the Center.
- EIARD welcomed the work of the EPMR Panel and agreed with the recommendation for the Center to conduct a thorough strategic review as part of the reinvigoration plan. The EPMR has brought to light serious failings at the System level. The System needs to take seriously the lessons from the situation at CIAT and carry out a thoroughly documented case study as soon as possible. The CGIAR should use this opportunity to demonstrate that it is a learning organization and strives for continuous improvement to avoid repeating the situation in the future.
- The importance of CIAT's work to the region was noted, and Members generally welcomed the reinvigoration effort. However, serious concerns were raised about oversight responsibilities and how the System reacts to warning signs. Too little was done too late. It is essential for the CGIAR to respond quickly and concretely to the situation.
- It was suggested that the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance that was agreed to be established earlier in the meeting should be set up right away and one of its first tasks would be to address the situation at CIAT. Since time is of the essence, TORs and membership would need to be determined, work started immediately, and not wait for the May 2008 ExCo meeting. Another option would be to have a special meeting in January 2008 to address the situation. It needs to be addressed from a System perspective and not just by a few donors.
- The reinvigoration report prepared by CIAT needs to be developed further with more options that can be considered by the CGIAR. Risks associated with each of the options should also be included. In addition, the Center has a large number of special projects that are not fully costed and the reinvigoration plan asks donors to supply unrestricted funds to support those projects. This is not good practice and doing so would take money away from other well managed programs and set a bad precedent. As previously stated, the reinvigoration plan requires more options and Members would like the opportunity to submit questions and receive answers from the Center in writing.
- One Member noted that CIAT has been "red-flagged" on financial indicators for many years. However, the Center continued to develop program budgets that were unlikely to be funded and that had been marginally costed in terms of what was necessary to fund the programs.
- Staff morale at the Center has the potential to further negatively impact the situation. Many key scientific staff have left the Center, others are considering doing the same, and there is a lack of skill depth in many areas.
- The ExCo ad hoc committee on finance should assess the situation, but it also needs to be examined as part of the change process, since it goes beyond finance and includes issues such as System governance. The System has suffered similar

problems in the past and it is essential to examine mechanisms that can help avoid future problems.

- This EPMR has highlighted the critical role that governance plays and how it affects Center performance with respect to research. Future EPMRs should give more attention to governance.
- It was clarified that it is erroneous to see the problem as one of unrestricted funding, but more as one of full cost recovery.
- R. Wang reiterated the System responsibility to deal with the situation at the System level. He noted that he visited CIAT shortly after becoming CGIAR Director and met with staff at CIAT and others, and the appeal he received for assistance in helping CIAT resolve the situation. Since the situation at CIAT is critical, perhaps it is best to separate lessons for the System from the urgent need to stabilize the Center and ensure its long term health. If the CGIAR waits to act, options currently available may disappear. One of the options that should be put on the table, is the possible realignment of CIAT research functions with other Centers or organizations. He agreed with the earlier suggestion to have a special meeting on CIAT in January 2008.
- CIAT Board Chair Yves Savidan addressed the Group expressing disappointment that the current EPMR panel composition did not have more expertise on finance and governance. The Center had put in place some changes recently as the result of its own commissioned external review, and was looking forward to feedback on the effectiveness of these changes. He noted that the Center board has strengthened its capacity on finance and now has three finance experts serving on the board. Renewal of management is underway. Geoff Hawtin has been appointed as interim DG and will serve in that capacity until a new DG is appointed. The search for a new deputy DG on finance is underway, and the search for the deputy DG on research will start soon. The situation at CIAT is an opportunity to put in place a new strategy where the Center will not be just an independent Center, but a unit of the CGIAR System. He thanked all who have supported the Center through the crisis.
- Interim DG Geoff Hawtin stated that he appreciates the difficulty faced by Members on deciding how to support the Center. He is sensitive to the issues but reiterated that the situation is urgent. The board has put in place measures needed to get CIAT back to financial health. He noted that the EPMR commended the excellent scientific staff at CIAT, but he is concerned about staff morale and the potential departure of additional staff. The strategic planning process will start soon and involve NARS and other partners.
- The SC Chair welcomed the decision of the interim DG to start work on a comprehensive strategic plan to help strengthen and revitalize the Center and the morale of staff.
- The Alliance has discussed the CIAT situation and what it can do to avoid crises in the future. It has agreed that finance directors will look at the situation and work more closely to see what can be done to identify such situations.

### ***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 6<sup>th</sup> CIAT EPMR.*
- *To demonstrate its commitment to taking fiduciary and accountability standards seriously, the CGIAR requested CIAT to develop a more specific reinvigoration plan that includes options and takes into account Members' concerns. Members were requested to send written comments on the existing reinvigoration plan to the Center, copied to the finance team at the CGIAR Secretariat within one week.*
- *A special meeting on CIAT will be held at the end of January 2008 to examine details of the reinvigoration plan and make decisions on next steps, including consideration of the option of realignment, if necessary.*
- *The ExCo ad hoc committee on finance should be established immediately and tasked with examining the CIAT reinvigoration plan, including on governance issues in addition to finance. Its analysis will be an input into the special January 2008 meeting on CIAT .*
- *The CGAR Secretariat was requested to develop TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance and suggested membership, to be approved virtually so the ad hoc committee may start its work as soon as possible. (This decision supersedes the decision in an earlier agenda item (2. CGIAR Change Management Process) for the Change Management Working Group on funding mechanisms to develop TORs for the ExCo ad hoc committee on finance.)*
- *ExCo 14 (May 2008) will take stock of progress on CIAT.*
- *There is also the need for a serious analysis of how to avoid similar situations in the future. The System must use the CIAT case and the outcome of the January 2008 meeting to improve donor behavior and financial management of Centers.*
- *A paper on lessons learned on what could have been done to avoid the current situation will be commissioned. It should be available for discussion at the May 2008 ExCo meeting, and also serve as an input into the governance part of the change management process.*
- *The CGIAR commended the scientific community at the Center for their resilience in the face of severe problems, and for the scientific excellence of their research.*
- *The CGIAR also expressed thanks and support to the Board Chair and Interim DG and their efforts to improve the situation.*

### **11.c. CIP EPMR**

K. Sierra opened the discussion and noted that EPMR Panel Chair Eduardo Moscardi could not join the discussion, but at his request panel member Donald MacKerron would join through audio conference. He gave a brief overview of the review.

R. Wang presented the ExCo 13 recommendations.

### ***Discussion:***

- Several Members expressed support for CIP's response to recommendations 11-14. EIARD supported the Center's response since partnerships and cross sectoral research are vital to enhance research development impact.

- Some Members highlighted CIP's impact in the distribution of potato seeds and the importance of its work.
- It was noted that a number of EPMR recommendations seem to be anti-SWEPs and that raises the question on value of the programs. The CGIAR should have a more in depth discussion on their effectiveness and how best to meet needs of the System.
- CIP Director General Pamela Anderson thanked the SC for its flexibility on recommendations 11-14. CIP is committed to thinking more strategically on the issue of partnerships within the context of SWEPS.
- R. Rabbinge commented that SC conducted an evaluation on 17 SWEPs finding that these are useful with some exceptions. The evaluation paper will be presented at ExCo 14. He reinforced the importance of SWEPS as a mechanism for promoting partnerships.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 6<sup>th</sup> CIP EPMR.*
- *The SC review on SWEPs was welcomed as a basis for a more in depth discussion on partnerships.*

**11.d. Challenge Program External Reviews (CPEs)**

Markus Palenberg, a member of both the Challenge Program on Water and Food (CPWF) and HarvestPlus external review panels, represented the panels in the discussion on the reviews' findings and recommendations. He gave a brief overview of the issues that the panels focused on in the reviews.

R. Wang presented the ExCo 13 recommendations.

***Discussion:***

*CPWF:*

- The value added by the CPWF, in the view of some Members, is the important network capital that is created.
- The review panel's recommendation regarding the revision of the governance structure aimed at increasing independence of the CPWF from CGIAR Centers was welcomed. A view was expressed that ownership of CPWF stakeholders must be strengthened, and that staff of the CPWF should not be exclusively managed by IMWI.
- EIARD expressed concerns about financial management issues raised by the review; agreement with IWMI for service support needs to be adjusted.

*Harvest Plus:*

- Members congratulated Harvest Plus for a very positive review; they were pleased with the progress that has been achieved.

- The main issue that the CP needs to address is the imbalance in the source of funding. EIARD is concerned that the CP may be a victim of its own success by losing support of traditional donors.
- One Member also noted the importance for the CP to consider children under the age of two years.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 1<sup>st</sup> CPWF and HarvestPlus CP External Reviews.*
- *The CGIAR must take a closer look at an appropriate balance between funding by traditional and non-traditional donors.*
- *The CGIAR must consider a minimum set of standards and principles on governance for Challenge Programs. Experience to date, lessons learned, and the first set of external reviews can serve as input. The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to present to ExCo 14 some thoughts on a minimum set of guidelines/principles for governance of the CPs, also incorporating inputs from the workshop on institutional issues of research partnerships, scheduled to be held in France in February 2008.*

**11.e. Options to Streamline the EPMR Process**

Jason Yauney (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the item. At ExCo 10, ExCo requested the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to undertake a meta-analysis of recently conducted EPMRs to derive lessons learned. During discussion of the item at AGM06, the CGIAR concluded that options to streamline the process of handling EPMR discussion at meetings of SC, ExCo, and AGM should also be considered. An examination of recently conducted EPMRs showed that the entire EPMR process took an average 15 months to complete, with some taking longer due to follow-up actions requested by ExCo. At ExCo 13 (October 2007), CGIAR Secretariat presented the following three options on streamlining the EPMR process:

Option 1: No change to current process (i.e. discussion of EPMR reports by SC, ExCo, AGM)

Option 2: Discussion of EPMR reports by SC and ExCo (CGIAR delegation of decision making to ExCo with resulting schedule changes)

Option 3: Discussion of EPMR reports only by SC (as suggested by the CGIAR EPMR meta-evaluation)

ExCo recommended a modified Option 2 which would reduce the average time need to complete the process to nine months. The CGIAR Secretariat was requested to revise the option to include ExCo's additions for discussion at AGM07. The modified option would contain provisions that all EPMR reports and ExCo decisions would be transmitted to all CGIAR Members. ExCo would also bring EPMRs to AGM for discussion if they contained broader lessons for the System. Centers would also have the opportunity to request their EPMR be brought to AGM for a larger discussion.

***Discussion:***

- Several Members expressed support for Option 2 as it has adequate safeguards and flexibility built into it to maintain accountability standards. It also frees up meeting space at AGMs that Members can use to discuss strategic issues. Discussion on past EPMRs often mirror discussion at ExCo, resulting in too much duplication of effort. EPMRs also lose value with time.
- It was suggested that a standard be used by ExCo to determine which EPMRs should be brought forward for discussion at AGM.
- EIARD supported delegating decision making responsibility to ExCo, but believes all EPMRs should be discussed at AGM to provide an opportunity for learning and a discussion on strategic issues identified by EPMRs. Donors should also commit to harmonize review requirements to avoid the need for multiple reviews.
- Some Members stated that there should be space somewhere on the AGM agenda, perhaps at the stakeholders meeting or an item at the business meeting, where the key strategic findings important to the System could be presented, i.e. a feedback loop to interested stakeholders.
- The change management process should also explore the roles of ExCo and the CGIAR at AGM in the EPMR process.
- The Alliance noted that the quality of EPMRs still varies and believes identification of panel members should start early to not rush the process. Centers should also be given the opportunity to comment on factual inaccuracies in reports. SC noted that following further analysis of the situation by the Alliance, discussion will be held on variability of quality of EPMRs, panel composition, etc. SC also agreed Center should have opportunity to comment on EPMRs, but only on factual inaccuracies.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *It is important to use the EPMR process to maintain fiduciary and accountability standards, and as a feedback mechanism for learning.*
- *The CGIAR endorsed Option 2 to maintain fiduciary and accountability standards:*
  - *CGIAR delegated to ExCo decision making responsibility on Center and Challenge Program external reviews;*
  - *Those EPMRs (and/or CPERs) that require, in ExCo's judgment, full discussion by the CGIAR should be brought to AGM;*
  - *All EPMR reports should be sent to CGIAR Membership including those not requiring full discussion at AGM as determined by ExCo;*
  - *ExCo should recommend discussion of a particular EPMR at AGM, if ExCo feels the EPMR contains either positive or negative lessons for the System;*
  - *Centers should also be given the option to request an EPMR report be discussed at AGM;*
  - *ExCo's decisions should be transmitted to the CGIAR following discussion at ExCo meetings;*

- *EPMRs should be scheduled so that submission of the report would coincide with SC meetings to prevent undue time delays in handling EPMRs.*
- *For feedback and learning from EPMRs:*
  - *CGIAR requested the CGIAR Director to give a presentation at AGM business meeting on the common themes and issues that arise from EPMRs.*
  - *Issues that emerge from EPMRs that contain lessons for the System should be shared at the AGM stakeholders meeting. This must be done in a responsible and useful manner.*
  - *ExCo should also examine quality of the reviews as part of the feedback mechanism.*
- *CGIAR encouraged individual Members to harmonize review requirements to avoid multiple reviews, within the framework of the Paris Declaration.*

## **12. Updates from CGIAR Committees**

### *Private Sector Committee*

PSC Chair Bill Niebur updated the CGIAR on PSC activities. He noted that the PSC has been revitalized with a clear agenda and purpose and a very diverse membership. PSC held a meeting in October 2007 and has identified a work plan consisting of three main pillars:

1. High-level dialogue: it is essential to meet with chief technology officers in the private sector. A February 2008 meeting is being planned to meet with a group of chief technology officers to explain the changes that are underway in the CGIAR and explore ways of how to better connect and communicate with them.
2. Enhance research productivity: aimed at Directors of Research, a June 2008 workshop is being planned to focus on project management that will use case studies.
3. Scientific and Knowledge Exchange Program (SKEP): a list of potential SKEP topics has been received from Centers. PSC is working to partner these individuals with private sector counterparts for skill enhancement to drive greater research productivity.

### *Genetic Resources Policy Committee*

GRPC Chair Carlos Correa updated Members by providing a brief background on GRPC, including the composition of the committee, the environment within which it works and its mission. He also highlighted the activities GRPC is carrying out to align CGIAR genetic resources policy with the guidelines established in the myriad of international mandates on germplasm, genetic resources management and intellectual property rights, among others. GRPC is also considering a strategy to take advantage of the knowledge coming from more traditional, indigenous practices. It is also working on guidelines on

CGIAR Center intellectual property rights. He thanked Bioversity International and the CGIAR Secretariat for supporting the Committee.

***Discussion:***

- More interaction with the private sector can be a valuable asset to the CGIAR and it must make use of the opportunities provided through PSC.
- EIARD expressed concern that work of the GRPC and handling of genetic resources has gradually disappeared from the AGM agenda. It is also noted the confusion among Members about which guidelines have been updated and/or replaced. ExCo should treat the subject with priority and the issue discussed again at AGM.
- A question was raised on when the summary of the last GRPC meeting would be available. The GRPC Secretary noted that it would be posted on the website soon.
- The work of GRPC has importance beyond the System as the resulting research is used by a large number of people.
- One Member raised a concern on whether framing the intellectual property rights guidelines within the international treaties criteria will be welcomed by local farmers.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The Chair thanked the PSC and GRPC Chairs and committee members for their work.*
- *CGIAR requested GRPC to ensure there is no confusion about new guidelines in terms of communication.*
- *These issues should be included in the ExCo 14 agenda, in addition to the thinkpiece already requested by ExCo on deriving income from intellectual property.*
- *The output of GRPC work goes beyond the CGIAR and is a symbol of the value of global public goods produced by the CGIAR.*

## **13. Other Business**

*Future CGIAR Meetings*

R. Wang presented the following proposed dates for upcoming CGIAR meetings:

ExCo 14: Early/Mid-May 2008; venue to be determined

ExCo 15: Early/Mid-October 2008; venue to be determined

AGM08: December 1-4, 2008; Mozambique

AGM09: November 30-December 3, 2009; Montpellier, France

He informed Members that Mozambique has kindly offered to host AGM08. Members expressed strong support for the offer, noting that it would provide a platform for exchange with NARS and other African partners.

The Member from France also informed the meeting that France would like to host AGM09 in Montpellier, France. Members expressed strong support for the offer.

The Member from India expressed India's interest in hosting AGM2010. As it is still early, a decision would be taken at a later time.

K. Sierra thanked both Mozambique and France for their kind offers. She also reminded Members of a decision taken at AGM04 on having smaller business-oriented AGMs in alternate years and suggested that this option should be considered at AGM09. Some Members expressed support for this option, but a decision will be taken at a later time.

***Conclusion and Decisions:***

- *The CGIAR agreed to hold AGM08 in Mozambique (December 1-4, 2008) and AGM09 in Montpellier, France (November 30-December 3, 2009).*

## **14. Closing Session**

An electronic assessment on CGIAR business conducted between AGMs and on AGM07 was conducted.

K. Sierra closed the meeting by thanking Members for their participation and commended the quality of discussion and efficient decision making.

She thanked the Government of China and CAAS for their hospitality, organizational support and friendship to the CGIAR. She also thanked colleagues at the CGIAR Secretariat, SC Secretariat and System Office for all of their work in organizing AGM07.

The meeting was gavelled to a close.

## Summary: CGIAR Member Feedback on AGM07

<b>AGM07 Stakeholders Meeting Assessment</b>	<b>Average</b>
1. The Stakeholders Meeting (Science Forum) was a productive use of my time. (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)	5.25
2. The Stakeholder meeting session I attended and enjoyed the most (i.e., the most productive use of my time) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Opening Session Presentations (e.g. World Food Situation, World Development Report, etc.)</li> <li>b. Parallel Sessions</li> <li>c. Lunchtime Presentations</li> <li>d. Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture</li> <li>e. CGIAR Science Awards</li> </ul>	19 8 1 6 0
3. The Stakeholder meeting session I attended and enjoyed the second most (i.e., the most productive use of my time) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Opening Session Presentations (e.g. World Food Situation, World Development Report, etc.)</li> <li>b. Parallel Sessions</li> <li>c. Lunchtime Presentations</li> <li>d. Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture</li> <li>e. CGIAR Science Awards</li> </ul>	10 7 7 11 3
4. The Stakeholders Meeting should allocate more, the same, or less time to plenary sessions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Less Time</li> <li>b. Same Time</li> <li>c. More Time</li> </ul>	3 30 5
5. The Stakeholders Meeting should allocate more, the same, or less time to interactions at exhibits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Less Time</li> <li>b. Same Time</li> <li>c. More Time</li> </ul>	6 16 15
6. The Stakeholders Meeting should allocate more, the same, or less time to break-out sessions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Less Time</li> <li>b. Same Time</li> <li>c. More Time</li> </ul>	7 20 10

### Change Management Forum

<b>(1 = strongly disagree; 4 = neither agree, nor disagree; 7 = strongly agree)</b>	<b>Average</b>
1. The Change Management Forum was a productive use of my time.	5.67
2. Time allocated to the Change Management Forum was sufficient. (1=not enough, 4=just about right, 7=too much)	4.20
3. CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues.	4.89
4. The objectives of the Forum were met.	5.49

### AGM07 Business Meeting Agenda Items

	Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.  1=not enough 4=just about right 7=too much	CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.  1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree nor disagree 7=agree strongly	Outcome as summarized accurately reflects the discussion.  1=disagree strongly 4=neither agree, nor disagree 7=agree strongly
<b>AGM07 Agenda Item</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Average</b>
2. CGIAR Change Management Process	4.21	4.95	5.78
3. CGIAR Status Report	4.20	5.29	6.00
4. Medium-Term Plans and 2008 Financing Plan	4.27	4.23	5.62
5. CGIAR External Review	3.74	4.58	5.39
6.a. IWMI EPMR	4.54	5.58	5.89
6.b. WARDA EPMR	4.61	5.57	6.23
6.c. ILRI EPMR	4.50	6.06	6.17
7. Report from Science Council	4.61	5.03	5.97
8. Perspectives from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers	4.49	4.68	5.61
9. CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Climate Change	4.43	4.95	5.71
10. SSA Challenge Program: Progress Report	3.85	4.89	5.86
11.a. IITA EPMR	3.73	3.91	5.35
11.b. CIAT EPMR	4.24	5.14	5.81
11.c. CIP EPMR	4.00	5.48	5.88
11.d. Challenge Program External Reviews	4.30	5.08	6.08
11.e. Options to Streamline EPMR Process	4.62	5.64	5.87

### Business Between AGMs

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

Average

1. Decision making by the CGIAR between AGMs was facilitated by ExCo.	5.61
2. ExCo's conduct of business is transparent to CGIAR Members.	5.57
3. ExCo provided adequate oversight of the implementation of CGIAR decisions.	5.22

### Business Between AGMs (non-ExCo Members only)

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

Average

1. Decision making by the CGIAR between AGMs was facilitated by ExCo.	5.32
2. ExCo's conduct of business is transparent to CGIAR Members.	4.78
3. ExCo provided adequate oversight of the implementation of CGIAR decisions.	4.33

### AGM07 Business Meeting Assessment

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

Average

1. Decision making by the CGIAR at AGM07 was facilitated by ExCo's guidance and recommendations.	5.86
2. The AGM07 documentation provided (in electronic and printed formats) enabled me to discuss and decide CGIAR matters adequately.	5.81
3. The decision making process during the Business Meeting was effective.	5.55
4. The Business Meeting was a productive use of my time.	5.55

Full AGM07 Feedback Results available at [http://www.cgiar.org/meetings/agm07/agm07\\_business.html](http://www.cgiar.org/meetings/agm07/agm07_business.html)