

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

Meeting of the Executive Council (ExCo1)

November 2, 2001

Washington D.C.

**SUMMARY RECORD
OF
PROCEEDINGS**

*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington D.C.
November 27, 2001*

ACRONYMS USED

<i>AGM</i>	<i>Annual General Meeting</i>
<i>CAC</i>	<i>Central Asia and the Caucasus</i>
<i>CBC</i>	<i>Committee of Board Chairs</i>
<i>CDC</i>	<i>Center Directors Committee</i>
<i>CGIAR</i>	<i>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</i>
<i>CIP</i>	<i>Centro Internacional de la Papa</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Challenge Program(s)</i>
<i>CWANA</i>	<i>Central and West Asia and North Africa</i>
<i>ExCo</i>	<i>Executive Council</i>
<i>FAO</i>	<i>Food and Agriculture Organization</i>
<i>FC</i>	<i>Finance Committee</i>
<i>GFAR</i>	<i>Global Forum for Agricultural Research</i>
<i>GRPC</i>	<i>Genetic Resources Policy Committee</i>
<i>ICLARM</i>	<i>World Fish Center</i>
<i>NGOC</i>	<i>Non-Governmental Organizations Committee</i>
<i>OECD/DAC</i>	<i>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</i>
<i>PC</i>	<i>Program Committee</i>
<i>PSC</i>	<i>Private Sector Committee</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Science Council</i>
<i>SCTF</i>	<i>Science Council Task Force</i>
<i>SSA</i>	<i>SubSaharan Africa</i>
<i>TAC</i>	<i>Technical Advisory Committee</i>
<i>TAC/SC</i>	<i>Technical Advisory Committee/Science Council</i>
<i>SPIA</i>	<i>Standing Panel on Impact Assessment</i>
<i>TF</i>	<i>Task Force</i>
<i>TOR</i>	<i>Terms of Reference</i>

CONTENTS

	Page
Draft Timed Agenda	3
Agenda Item 1: Opening Session.....	4
(a) Chairman’s Introduction.....	4
(b) Adoption of the Agenda	4
Agenda item 2: Challenge Programs – Follow-up to AGM Decisions.....	4
(a) Presentation of CP Concept Notes	4
(b) Initiating CP Pilot Process.....	5
(c) Initiating Regular CP Process	7
Agenda Item 3: ExCo Committees	8
Agenda Item 4: Transformation of TAC into SC	9
Agenda Item 5: Preparation of an Integrated Business Plan for the System Office	10
(a) Next Step – Proposal on How to Move Forward.....	10
(b) Presentation on Communication Strategy	10
Agenda Item 6: Future Meetings	11
(a) ExCo Meetings in 2002.	11
(b) AGM Venue	11
Agenda Item 7: Other Business	11
(a) Extension of GRPC	11
(b) Calendar of Events.....	11
(c) Farmers’ Perspective	12
(d) Funding Request from CIP and CAC	12
Closing Session.....	12
Attachment: Membership of the CGIAR Executive Council, November 2, 2001	13

Draft Timed Agenda

- 09:00-09:10 **Agenda Item 1: Opening Session**
(a) Chairman's Introduction
(b) Adoption of Agenda
- 09:10-11:45 **Agenda Item 2: Challenge Programs – Follow-up to AGM Decisions**
(a) Presentation of CP Concept Notes (100 minutes)
- Coffee Break** (15 minutes)
- (b) Initiating CP pilot process (10 minutes)
(c) Initiating regular CP process (20 minutes)
- 11:45-12:00 **Agenda Item 3: ExCo Sub Committees**
(a) Establishing PC and FC – Membership and TORs
- 12:00-12:30 **Agenda Item 4: Transformation of TAC into Science Council**
(a) Establishment of Interim SC
(b) Working Group for TAC/SC transition – membership and TOR
- 12:30-1:00 **Agenda Item 5: Establishing System Office**
(a) Next step – Proposal on how to move forward
(b) Presentation on communication strategy (including follow-up on Future Harvest)
- 1:00-1:20 **Agenda Item 6: Future Meetings**
(a) ExCo Meetings in 2002
(b) AGM venue
(Dates – three days in period Oct. 28-Nov.1, 2002)
- 1:20-1:30 **Agenda Item 7: Other Business**
(a) Extension of term of GRPC

Agenda Item 1: Opening Session

(a) Chairman's Introduction

CGIAR Chairman Ian Johnson pointed out that each meeting of the Executive Council was expected to select a co-chair. On his suggestion, Bongiwe Nomandi Njobe was selected meeting Co-Chair by acclamation. The Co-Chairs welcomed participants (see Attachment) to the first ExCo meeting.

Referring back to the Annual General Meeting of the previous day, Ian Johnson said that most of the items on the ExCo agenda were based on decisions reached by the Group that required follow-up action. The ExCo therefore had the responsibility of ensuring that the momentum created at and by the AGM was maintained. In this connection, a major task for the ExCo at its first meeting would be to receive presentations on Challenge Programs already on the table and review the process by which some or all of them could be accelerated as pilot programs, on a one-time basis. The Chairman looked forward to a decisive meeting, with substantive discussions.

(b) Adoption of the Agenda

The draft agenda was adopted, with the addition of the following items to be discussed as Other Business:

- Extension of GRPC;
- CGIAR Calendar of Events;
- Farmers' Perspectives;
- Funding Requests from CIP and CAC Program.

Agenda Item 2: Challenge Programs – Follow-up to AGM Decisions

(a) Presentation of CP Concept Notes

Ian Johnson noted that at AGM2001 the CGIAR had decided to initiate the Challenge Program development process. The agreed process assigns several responsibilities to ExCo and the Science Council in facilitating the identification of CP themes and development, evaluation and approval of full CP proposals. For ExCo, these include in the first instance: (a) initiating the regular CP process by starting Phase 1; (b) initiating the process for identifying up to three pilot CPs from among ten candidate CP proposals submitted prior to or at AGM2001.

The proponents of the ten candidate pilot CP proposals made brief presentations (10 minutes, each) of their concepts to the ExCo. These included the following:

- Agriculture and Combating Desertification
- Animal Diseases, Market Access, Food Safety and Poverty Reduction
- Climate Change

- Development of Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems in Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC)
- Global Genetic Resources: Conservation, Management and Improvement for Food and Nutritional Security, Agrobiodiversity and Sustainable Livelihoods
- Global Initiative on HIV/AIDS, Agriculture and Food Security
- Global Mountain Program
- Harnessing Agricultural Technology to Improve the Health of the Poor: Biofortified Crops to Combat Micronutrient Deficiency
- The African Challenge Program
- Water and Agriculture

There was no discussion of the individual presentations. Instead, ExCo discussed steps and timelines for initiating the two processes.

(b) Initiating CP Pilot Process

Francisco Reifschneider presented an accelerated timeline for identifying pilot CPs. As agreed at the AGM, the ten candidate pilot CP proposals would be subjected to a thorough technical review by TAC/SC. This review would be based on all criteria applicable to Phases 1 and 2 of the agreed CP process, plus additional factors significant for piloting CPs. Following the technical review by TAC/SC, ExCo would select the pilot CPs, which would then start full proposal development. The full proposals would be reviewed by the SC and its external peer review panels. Following their endorsement by the ExCo, successful CP proposals would be submitted to the CGIAR for final approval and financing. ExCo would provide close oversight of the development of the pilot CPs.

The discussion centered on three aspects of the piloting process:

- Where should the pilot CPs start the process?
- What additional criteria should be considered in selecting pilots?
- What would be an ideal timeline, balancing the need for thorough review with the desire not to lose momentum from the reform program.

Regarding the first, a few speakers noted that the recommendations of the CP Task Force should be used as a guide, meaning that the selected concepts would start the process at the beginning of Phase 2. Thus, if a CP concept is selected through the TAC/SC review as a pilot, an open call for proposals should be issued for interested institutions to submit pre-proposals. Others argued that this would provide little acceleration of the process. As the objective of the exercise is learning, one should move to implementation as quickly as possible. Besides, each of the CP proposals being considered for piloting combines a CP concept with a specific initial consortium. Uncoupling the concept from the consortium would only delay the process.

Ian Johnson and other speakers said that their understanding of the conclusion reached at the CGIAR Business Meeting was along the lines of the latter argument, which would indeed allow for initiation of one or more CPs during 2002.

It was recognized by all, however, that the proposals presented were at different stages of conceptualization and development. Some could be considered to be at the end of Phase 2 (i.e., had advanced in pre-proposal development), whereas others were only at the start of Phase 2 (had done little beyond describing a concept). For equal treatment (and objective evaluation) by TAC/SC, the latter should be given an opportunity to bring their proposals to a level comparable with that of the former. ExCo agreed that this could be done by asking the proponents of each candidate pilot CP to prepare three documents:

- a 2-page concept note (covering the same set of questions);
- a 10-15 page pre-proposal (as described in the agreed process) for review by TAC/SC;
- a plan for full proposal development, with a request for support, if needed, up to \$200,000.

Thus, following review by TAC/SC and subsequent discussion by ExCo, the selected pilot CP(s) would be asked to develop full proposals, taking into account comments by TAC/SC and ExCo.

On the second point, ExCo members offered suggestions of criteria that should be considered by TAC/SC in identifying pilot CPs. Ian Johnson noted that these are in addition to the normal set of criteria outlined in the Integrated Proposal and are designed to capture features specific to pilot CPs. Four criteria were identified for consideration by TAC/SC:

- the potential for learning-by-doing about the CP development and implementation process through the candidate pilot;
- the extent to which stakeholders were involved in drawing up the proposal;
- the degree to which the proposal had built-in elements of competition;
- whether the pilot CP would generate funds additional to those already available to the CGIAR.

Several ExCo members also noted that TAC/SC would need to modify the relative weights of the regular CP selection criteria for Phase 2 in order to underscore the pilot nature of this exercise and the importance of learning from the pilots.

Regarding the third point, the members agreed with the following approximate timetable, recognizing that TAC/SC and the CGIAR Secretariat would need to fine-tune it based on workload and other considerations:

November 2, 2001

November 9

November 30

Concept notes and/or longer proposals received by TAC.

TAC issues note to the 10 pilot CP proponents.

Deadline for submission by proponents of candidate pilot CPs of the following three documents to the TAC Secretariat:

- (i) Concept Note (two pages);
- (ii) Pre-proposal (10-15 pages);

(iii) Plan for full proposal development, with request for support, if needed, up to a maximum of \$200,000.

**Dec. 1, 01
to January 30, 2002**

TAC/SC analysis:

- by TAC and outside experts in the field;
- based on matrix of proposal x criteria x weight;
- leading to recommendation by TAC/SC for advancing up to three CP pre-proposals to Phase 3.

**January 31
to February 15**

ExCo selection:

- ExCo selects and endorses pre-proposals from those recommended by the SC;
- ExCo requests SC to call for the development of the endorsed pre-proposals into full program proposals.

Process continues to next stages.

(c) Initiating Regular CP Process

Francisco Reifschneider presented a suggested timeline for initiating the regular CP process. Members stressed that the open-book nature of the regular process was essential, and suggested that this could be an opportunity for a well-advertised campaign for the CGIAR. It was also noted that idea generation would be a continuous process, although assessment of the ideas would be done at certain times during the year (probably 2-3 times, depending on the volume of ideas received). The CGIAR Secretariat, as part of the System Office, was asked to initiate the process on behalf of the ExCo. Members suggested shifting forward the suggested timetable by about 30 days in order to make room for preparatory work up front. It was agreed that this would be a notional timetable, subject to change as the CGIAR gains experience.

The agreed timetable for the regular process, subject to minor adjustments is as follows:

Initiating Regular CP Process – Timeline

Phase 1 – Idea generation

Nov 15, 2001

ExCo issues call for concept notes (idea generation)

Jan 15, 2002

Deadline for receiving initial batch of concept notes by TAC/SC

Feb 15

TAC/SC recommends CP themes

Feb 28

ExCo endorses themes, submits to CGIAR

Apr 15

CGIAR makes final decision (no objection basis)

ExCo issues call for pre-proposals.

ExCo II review advances in preparation of regular CPs.

Phase 2 – Pre-proposal development

June 30

Pre-proposals received by SC

Aug 15

SC recommends pre-proposals to ExCo

Sept 30

- ExCo selects pre-proposals
- Approves funding for proposal development
- SC calls for full proposal development.

Agenda Item 3: ExCo Committees

Ian Johnson pointed out that ExCo had to be particularly engaged in the establishment of a Program Committee (PC) and Finance Committee (FC) which would be ExCo committees, as decided by AGM01. A process for moving forward the establishment of the PC and FC had accordingly been drafted for consideration at the meeting.

The meeting reviewed and adopted the following process:

1. Chairman invites ExCo members to: (a) express their interest to serve on PC or FC; (b) recommend non-ExCo members to serve on PC or FC; and (c) make suggestions for TOR and procedures of these two committees (by November 30, 2001).
2. Secretariat integrates the inputs received; composition, TOR and procedures proposed for endorsement by ExCo (by Jan 15, 2002).
3. Agreed composition, TOR and procedures are sent to CGIAR for approval on a non-objection basis (by February 1, 2002).
4. Committees begin their work (March 15, 2002).

The meeting agreed that the following provisions should be included in the process:

- The Chairs of PC and FC should be drawn from ExCo;
- Diversity of perspectives should be a key characteristic of both committees;
- Procedures to eliminate conflicts of interest, such as provision for members to recuse themselves for discussions on a particular issues, should be prepared at the outset.

Agenda Item 4: Transformation of TAC into SC

The meeting considered the steps outlined in the IEC Integrated Proposal for the appointment of an interim Science Council (SC) for 2002, and the CGIAR decision at AGM2001 to request the ExCo to create a Working Group (WG) to facilitate establishment of the permanent SC.

The following points were made in the course of the discussion:

- The meeting selected TAC Chair Emil Javier as Chair of the Interim SC, by acclamation.
- TAC had not been reviewed as proposed by the CDMT prior to the establishment of SC. The WG should consider the need for such a review.
- Cosponsors had not met to consider this issue, but expected to do so via video conference.
- The WG should seek the views of cosponsors and take these into account. The cosponsors could play a due diligence role.
- The alignment of proposals from the WG with FAO's legal requirements should be carefully examined.

In the light of these discussions, the process initially proposed by the CGIAR Secretariat was modified, particularly the deadlines for the steps proposed, and reads as follows:

1. ExCo appoints an 11-member Interim SC for 2002, made up of the existing members of TAC who will not have completed their maximum terms (6 years) in 2001 and the Chair of SPIA. These include: Messrs: M. Cernea, E. Fereres, M. Fernandes, H. Gregersen, R. Harwood, A. de Janvry, O. Niangado, H. Uchimiya, J. von Braun, V. T. Xuan, and U. B. Zehr.

2. ExCo appoints a 5-7 person WG to prepare a detailed proposal including composition, function, alignment with ExCo and Systems Office, operational and administrative aspects of the transition. The WG should also address issues related to the transition from the TAC Secretariat to the SC Secretariat. This would be a hands-on WG made up of CGIAR members, experts on science networking, science policy formulation, assessment of science quality (including peer reviews), and strong emphasis on administrative aspects of interagency collaboration. At least one member of the SCTF should participate in the WG.

3. Steps to appoint the WG:

- (a) ExCo members suggest TOR points and possible members to the CGIAR Director (by February 28);
- (b) CGIAR Director recommends WG composition and TOR based on inputs received (by March 21);
- (c) Following endorsement of ExCo, WG is appointed and begins work (April 1).

Agenda Item 5: Preparation of an Integrated Business Plan for the System Office

(a) Next Step – Proposal on How to Move Forward

The CGIAR Director said that preparation of an integrated Business Plan is the most critical step in the establishment of a System Office, as approved by AGM01. The CGIAR Secretariat has prepared a Business Plan covering its own activities, which was submitted to and discussed by the IEC. Other components of the System Office may also have Business Plans prepared for their own use. Integration of these plans requires much more than collating them in a single document. The CGIAR Secretariat had therefore drawn up a process by which the various plans could be merged into a cohesive whole, with the assistance of professional expertise.

The following main points were made in the course of discussion:

- The Center Directors Committee is highly supportive of integration, and the CDC will be closely involved in the process, especially at Step No. 3 (see below);
- The integration process should include the SC Secretariat, including its costs, and due note should be taken of FAO's legal requirements;
- An estimate should be made of the entire System's overhead costs;
- An effort should be made to find out what donors would be willing to pay for, and how much, if total overhead costs of the System had to be shared.

The process set out below for creating an integrated Business Plan was adopted:

1. ExCo asks the CGIAR Director to orchestrate the preparation of the integrated Business Plan.
2. CGIAR Director initiates dialogue with each System Office component to take stock of where each stands and agree on a common framework for the System Office and component Business Plans.
3. A framework for an integrated plan is prepared, with help from professional management consultants and with full participation of the component units.
4. CGIAR Director submits the System Office Business Plan framework, including cost estimates, to ExCo possibly for discussion at ExCo2.
5. The framework as endorsed at ExCo, will be used for FY03.

(b) Presentation on Communication Strategy

An interim report on an integrated communication strategy for the System was presented by Ian Bevege, on behalf of a special System-wide Communications Strategy Task Force (TF) that was established post-MTM2001. Emphasizing that the current draft report of the TF was a "work in progress," he outlined the rationale for greater harmonization, the criteria and principles for an integrated strategy, the System's strategic objective, and its target group, and potential program activities. He indicated that the TF expected to use the following three building blocks for the development and implementation of an integrated strategy for resource mobilization and communication:

- Comprehensive analysis of information needs, from a users' perspective;
- Coordination of efforts by all appropriate System components;
- Development of a strategy and Business Plan.

The Business Plan will include a budget, and a timeline for implementation of the strategy, and establish a monitoring and evaluation program.

The work of the TF was commended, and the TF was encouraged to proceed with and complete its endeavors. In doing so, the TF was requested to seek NGOC input and consultation.

ExCo suggested that the next step should be for the TF to place its interim report on the System web site for comment and suggestions. These should be sent to the TF convener.

Agenda Item 6: Future Meetings

(a) ExCo Meetings in 2002

The next ExCo meeting will be in Spring 2002. A suitable date and venue will be explored, and full account will be taken of the invitation from ICLARM to hold the meeting in Penang, Malaysia.

(b) AGM Venue

The dates approved by AGM for its next meeting are three days in the period October 28-November 1, 2002. The Secretariat will explore alternative venues through dialogue with interested members. A suggestion was made that preference be given to Southern locations.

Agenda 7: Other Business

(a) Extension of GRPC

The term of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) was extended by one year. A review of the GRPC will be conducted prior to AGM02

(b) Calendar of Events

ExCo decided that there was a need to develop a time chart to align and integrate the activities undertaken by ExCo. The proposed time chart will be circulated among ExCo members.

(c) Farmers' Perspective

The meeting endorsed the view that a farmers' perspective should be specifically included in CGIAR discussions, and discussed the most effective means for doing so. The NGOC Chair informed the ExCo that she regards herself as only a temporary holder of the ExCo seat for civil society, and that the seat would be held by a person from a farmers' organization when mechanisms can be set up for direct representation of farmers' perspectives within the CGIAR.

Several options including the creation of a separate Farmers' Committee were discussed. The meeting agreed that GFAR should be requested to examine the options for the most appropriate representation of civil society perspectives, including farmers' perspectives, in CGIAR deliberations. GFAR should do so in consultation with NGOC, PSC, CDC, and Cosponsors, and submit recommendations to the ExCo. The issue will be further discussed at the next ExCo meeting.

(d) Funding Requests from CIP and CAC

As the ExCo has no funding authority, these requests were submitted for information and were duly noted.

Closing Session

Concluding the meeting, Ian Johnson thanked his Co-Chair and all participants for contributing to the meeting's success.

Membership of the CGIAR Executive Council
(November 2, 2001)

<i>Chairman:</i>	Ian Johnson	
<i>Cosponsors :</i>	Jacques Eckebil	FAO
	Robert L Thompson	World Bank
	Rodney Cooke	IFAD
<i>CDC:</i>	Meryl Williams	CDC Chair
<i>CBC:</i>	John Vercoe	CBC Chair
<i>TAC/SC:</i>	Emil Javier	TAC/SC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Raj Paroda	GFAR Chair
<u><i>OECD/DAC:</i></u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Jonathan Conly	U.S.
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Tishinori Mitsunaga	Japan
<i>Europe</i>	Gilles Saint-Martin	France
	Ruth Haug	Norway
	Klaus Winkel	Denmark
<u><i>Developing Countries:</i></u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Alberto Portugal	Brazil
<i>SSA</i>	Bongiwe Njobe	South Africa
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Longyue Zhao	China
<i>CWANA</i>	Issam El-Zaim	Syria
<i>Regional Fora</i>	[To be identified]	
<u><i>Foundations:</i></u>	Robert Herdt	Rockefeller F.
<u><i>Partners:</i></u>		
<i>Civil Society</i>	Ann Waters-Bayer	NGOC Chair
<i>Private Sector</i>	Sam Dryden	PSC Chair

<i>Executive Secretary, ExCo:</i>	Francisco Reifschneider
<i>Secretariat Support:</i>	Selçuk Özgediz