

Meeting Summary  
7<sup>th</sup> System Council Meeting  
15 and 16 November 2018

Purpose:

This document presents the Summary of the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the System Council held on 15 and 16 November 2018, as approved by the Council on a no objection basis with effect from 18 January 2019 (Decision Ref: SC/M7/EDP4)

Distribution notice: This document may be distributed without restriction.

Prepared by: CGIAR System Management Office

## Introduction:

This document presents a summary of the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the System Council (“Council”) held on 15 and 16 November 2018 at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, USA.

By way of overview:

- **Agenda items.** The meeting considered the fifteen (15) agenda items set out in the table of contents on the following page.
- **Decisions\*\*** The Council took twelve (12) decisions during its meeting, described in the text.
- **Agreed positions and actions\*\*** The Council agreed on seven (7) positions and actions during its meeting, described in the text.
- **Participants.** [Annex 1](#) sets out a list of meeting participants.

*\*\*The Decision Points and Agreed positions and actions noted in the text are included in the SC7 Chair’s Summary, as issued on 21 November 2018, available here: <https://www.cgiar.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/SC7-Chairs-Summary.pdf>*

## Contents

Item 1: Opening Session .....	4
Item 2: 2017 Performance .....	4
Item 3: Strengthening the partnership, creating impact:	
CGIAR System 3-year Business Plan (2019-2021) .....	5
Item 4: Implement and enhance the portfolio of CRPS and Platforms .....	6
Item 5: Recognizing the new Denmark-CGIAR antimicrobial resistance partnership .....	9
Item 6: Create Financial Sustainability and Growth in CGIAR .....	10
Item 7: Other Business Plan Actions to consider .....	12
Item 8: Pursue new cross-Center alliances .....	14
Item 9: Other Business Plan Actions to consider .....	16
Item 10: Align high-quality independent advisory services into System-level decision-making .....	18
Item 11: Strengthen collective resource mobilization and communication efforts.....	23
Item 12: Designing AR4D to address trade-offs between the SDGs.....	23
Item 13: Prepare a longer-term plan .....	24
Item 14: System Council decision session.....	25
Item 15: Other Business.....	28
Annex 1: List of meeting participants.....	29

## Item 1: Opening Session

1. The System Council Chair, Juergen Voegele, opened the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting welcoming all participants to Seattle. He extended appreciation to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for its generous hosting of the meeting and related events, noting that it was almost five years to the day since CGIAR's funders had last met at the Foundation to take decisions on CGIAR's research agenda and its strategic direction. A quorum was present.
2. Noting that there had been some changes in representation of System Council members, the Chair offered the opportunity for a brief introduction by those attending a Council meeting for the first time, including representatives of the African Development Bank, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, FAO and IFAD.
3. Decision SC/M7/DP1: The System Council **appointed** Tony Cavalieri, representative of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, as the non-voting Co-Chair for the meeting pursuant to Article 5.2 of the CGIAR System Framework.
4. The Chair tabled the provisional Agenda and accepted a request to return to certain matters reported under the funding agreements at SC6 in Berlin (as reported under item 9 in this summary).
5. Decision SC/M7/DP2: The System Council **adopted** the Agenda issued on 11 November 2018 (Meeting document [SC7-01 – Provisional Agenda](#))
6. There were no declarations of interests made.

## Item 2: 2017 Performance

7. The Co-Chair framed the session, reflecting on the advances already made in monitoring performance within CGIAR to demonstrate progress to stakeholders and take that information and analysis forward to increase impact and resources to make that impact.
8. The Executive Director set out five key take-aways from the inaugural 2017 CGIAR Performance Report, noting that:
  - a. A large number of CGIAR innovations were reported with two-thirds of those available for uptake or taken up by the 'next user';
  - b. External partnerships are integral to CGIAR's work, with nearly all innovations reported developed with partners;
  - c. Improving policies and investments is a major channel of CGIAR impact;
  - d. There is evidence of substantial progress towards System targets; and
  - e. Strengthened collective action has taken Gender research several steps forward this year
9. The Council saw a live demonstration of selected features of a beta version of the CGIAR Program Results Dashboard, under development through a collaborative

effort with Centers. It was highlighted that the dashboard is intended for a wide range of audiences including CGIAR's Funders, Partners and Centers, with planned further development ongoing through 2018 and 2019 to add data from all CRPs and results for 2018.

10. The Co-Chair invited input from the Council on the inaugural Performance Report and the ongoing development of the dashboard including on how each could be continually strengthened in future years. The following reflections were provided:
  - a. There was strong appreciation for the Performance Report, particularly its focus on outcomes and alignment to the Sustainable Development Goals. It was commented by a number of Funders that the report represents a 'step-change' in how CGIAR reports its achievements.
  - b. The challenges in measuring development and impact in research organizations were acknowledged, and an invitation issued to Council members to propose any indicators that are in use at other organizations that CGIAR could potentially also make use of at a future time.
  - c. It was suggested to consider the incorporation of benchmarks as a way to contextualize CGIAR's performance alongside the indicators used.
  - d. Additional consideration of the quality and meaning of partnerships was encouraged, in addition to reporting on the number that exist. It was also recommended to continue to report on numbers of beneficiaries.
  - e. It was observed that improved and more timely information uncovers where challenges in performance may exist or progress towards a particular target is not on track. In turn, this facilitates better targeting of focus and/or resources moving forward, including for consideration as part of thinking around the next iteration of the CGIAR Research Portfolio. It was suggested that additional analysis be undertaken in 2019 to understand what potential adjustments would improve progress towards targets.
  - f. The ability for CGIAR's stakeholders to be able to interrogate a dashboard tool on particular areas of interest, such as by country, cross-cutting dimension, System-Level Objective or SDG was highly-appreciated, with appetite expressed for access to the dashboard at the earliest possible opportunity.
11. In summarizing, the Co-Chair noted the important progress made and echoed appreciation for the collaboration that had enabled this.

### Item 3: Strengthening the partnership, creating impact: CGIAR System 3-year Business Plan (2019-2021)

12. The Chair framed the discussion, noting that the intention in this session was to seek some initial overall reflections on the CGIAR System 3-year Business Plan (2019-2021) ('Business Plan') before exploring it in more depth over the course of this meeting.
13. Recalling the Council's initial conversation during its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting in Cali - which provided the impetus to develop the plan in detail - and the consideration of a more structured concept in Berlin at its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Chair highlighted that the final

product under consideration represents a crucial moment to bring together the work across the System in a way forward towards 2030.

14. The System Management Board Chair echoed that the highly-consultative development of the Business Plan has brought together different strands of activity across the System for the first time under one plan. It was highlighted that it provides Funders with a compelling narrative on delivering shared outcomes through 2021 and further through development of 2030 Plan to sharpen CGIAR's focus on big programmatic efforts to drive impact and stay relevant in rapidly changing agricultural and food systems. It was emphasized that the Business Plan also serves as an institutional development plan on how we propose to work together as System. While being disruptive in many ways, it also focuses on continuity and a collective inclusive effort underpinned by a commitment to making CGIAR work as a System.
15. Noting that decision-making will take place in the final session of the meeting, initial reflections on the Business Plan and its development were provided, with strong support expressed for having moved to a System-focus, drawing on all of the elements of CGIAR's diverse partnership during the development process and via presentation of the final product.

#### Item 4: Implement and enhance the portfolio of CRPS and Platforms

##### *Flagship on Common Bean*

16. The Co-Chair recalled deliberations at the Council's 5<sup>th</sup> meeting on the absence of common bean in the CGIAR Portfolio and the request made at that meeting that the System Management Board consider how a flagship program might be incorporated and additional funding attracted to support this. It was noted that proposal before the Council at this meeting (as set out in meeting document [SC7-03](#)) was recommended by the System Management Board to commence from 1 January 2019 as an additional flagship in the Grain Legumes and Dryland Cereals ('GLDC') CRP.
17. Acknowledging that ISPC's assessment of the revised proposal (meeting document [SC7-03b](#)) had resulted in a rating of 'weak', the ISPC Chair offered some additional reflections in the context of the ongoing development of the Crops to End Hunger breeding initiative ('Breeding Initiative'). It was noted that although the way in which the common bean proposal addressed driving demand for new cultivars through agronomy and market development had been considered weaker, the Breeding Initiative being put forward provides an opportunity to address this.
18. In discussions that followed, several Funders expressed strong support for the inclusion of common bean as part of the Portfolio, acknowledging the potential for improvement to market connections through the Breeding Initiative. A concern was raised regarding the consistency of application of criteria for allocation of funding given the weak rating, and it was noted that it would be possible to approve inclusion in the portfolio without an allocation of W1/2 funding, pending discussion on the financial plan later in the meeting.

19. The Chair reflected that the process had identified the need for a mechanism to ensure that weaknesses identified in proposal development could be addressed at an earlier stage before discussion by the Council and proposed that a conversation be held at an appropriate future meeting to explore such a mechanism.
20. Decision SC/M7/DP3: The System Council **approved** the proposal for a flagship on common bean, “Strategic and applied research to meet the demand for beans in Africa and Latin America” for inclusion in the CGIAR Portfolio from 1 January 2019 on the proviso that the 2019-2021 Financing Plan has a ‘US\$ 0’ indicative allocation for Window 1 and Window 2.

*Elevate gender equality to a new Research Platform*

21. By way of framing, the Council saw a video presentation by Claudia Sadoff, System Management Board Gender Champion, on the response from the System Management Board to the action point identified during the Council’s 6<sup>th</sup> meeting in May 2017<sup>1</sup>. The video presentation accompanied meeting document: [SC7-E – Gender Equality in Research](#).
22. The System Management Board Chair echoed the messages presented by Dr. Sadoff as reflecting the institutional position of the System Management Board and emphasized the Board’s commitment to strengthening gender equality in CGIAR research and in the workplaces of CGIAR Centers and System entities. He reiterated the appreciation to Funders for their support to the process outlined in the video, with an overall objective of closing the gender gap in equitable access to resources, information and power in the agri-food system by 2030.
23. The Co-Chair invite comments from the System Council, with the following key points emerging:
  - a. The work since SC6 in Berlin was applauded, including the way in which various

---

<sup>1</sup> **Action Point SC/M6/AP1: Agreed position**: The System Council endorsed the concept of the currently named ‘CGIAR Collaborative platform for gender research’- housed in the CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions, and Markets (PIM) - becoming a fully-fledged CGIAR Platform, thus the equivalent status of the Excellence in Breeding, Big Data and Genebanks Platforms, to deliver:

- Global leadership on gender equality and agriculture research that has transformative impacts
- Greater visibility for innovative work on gender equality research conducted across CGIAR
- Stronger convening power of the Platform
- Full embedding of gender equality in the fabric of CGIAR
- Greater ability to absorb and deploy finance to leverage gender equality integration across CGIAR
- Facilitating more extensive engagement of CRP directors and other program elements
- Access to a wider set of funding pathways
- More prominence in System reporting

**Related Action:** By not later than the System Council 7th meeting (15-16 November 2018) the System Management Board (‘SMB’) will advise the System Council on the outcome of SMB discussions/decision-making on the following themes for a Gender Equality Research Platform, with the same status as the three other CGIAR Platforms:

- Arrangements: hosting, leadership and partnerships and timing
- Funding modalities
- Scale and scope of activities

- stakeholders across the System, including Funders, have worked together to drive progress on this important topic.
- b. The Board was urged to make sure that some of the issues which limited the current collaborative platform are well addressed as the new Platform is set up.
  - c. Recognizing that there should be some way for the positive and productive partnerships and practices by the current collaborative platform to not be lost, there was a call for insecurity and disruption to be minimized to the extent possible as the new Platform is created.
  - d. It was observed by a Center Representative that the video message represents the collective voice and a broad and deep acceptance that we need to do better and respond more quickly to the issues raised.
  - e. The need to continue to address the organizational dimensions with respect to gender was highlighted.
  - f. While the timeline was endorsed, it was expressed that there still need to be a greater sense of urgency applied to this important work being put in place.
24. Action Point SC/M7/AP1:  
Agreed Position: The System Council **endorsed** the System Management Board recommended timeline and process to call for an elevated 'Gender Equality in Food Systems Research Platform', to commence from 1 January 2020.  
Related Action: The System Council **requested** that, in developing the call for proposals, the 2015 agreed criteria for assessment of a CGIAR Platform be revisited, and if required, that the System Council be requested to approve revised proposal assessment criteria before the call is issued

*Deepen the portfolio through new thematic strategies and initiatives*

25. The Executive Director introduced the thematic strategies and initiatives presented as 'companion documents' to the Business Plan, highlighting that a number of these had been developed through cross-Center thinking with the support of the System Management Board.
26. Two video messages were presented to the Council on the Crops to End Hunger breeding initiative, presented by Michael Quinn, leader of the Excellence in Breeding Platform, and on Rapid Response Preparedness, presented by B.M. Prasanna, Director of the Maize CRP. The Executive Director emphasized that, along with the additional companion documents on climate change, biofortification and anti-microbial resistance, these are not conceived as an alternative to the CRPs or adding new areas of our work, but as ways to responsibly strength implementation of this portfolio and build that capacity to be relevant in the future.
27. The Co-Chair noted that a number of the thematic issues covered in the documents had generated Funder interest during the 'Foresight@CGIAR' ISPC event held shortly before the Council meeting and sought reflections on these, with the following being raised:
  - a. The need to recognize synergies and trade-offs as part of a wider food systems approach and therefore the risks involved in considering separate initiatives, particularly regarding financial allocation trade-offs;

- b. That the opportunity to provide more detailed written feedback on specific initiatives would be appreciated; with it being confirmed that this would be welcomed after this meeting;
  - c. In response to a question raised on how the list of initiatives had been arrived at, it was advised that they had arisen as a result of a number of conversations and inputs across the System intended to evolve over time and not a fixed set of priorities;
  - d. Several Council members shared experiences of work ongoing in their own countries and institutions around the themes of climate change, anti-microbial resistance and response to pests and diseases, and noted the importance of engagement with NARS and regional partners in implementation and to incorporate learning from those diverse experiences;
  - e. The need to carefully consider the role of CGIAR in relation to others working in the various fields, particularly around rapid response preparedness, in order to most effectively target CGIAR's resources; and
  - f. It was noted that the Crops to End Hunger breeding initiative has a different genesis than others in that it came about through a Funder group, and it was reflected that learnings from the experience of this initiative could be incorporated or replicated in other areas of focus.
28. The System Management Board Chair welcomed the rich inputs provided and noted that others would be shared following the meeting to further develop and strengthen the proposals. It was noted that the strategies and initiatives would be further considered by the System Management Board at relevant moment over the coming months regarding implementation activities to take forward, along with a continuing conversation on where potential synergies lie to strengthen the current portfolio.
29. [Action Point SC/M7/AP2](#): System Council members were **requested** to provide inputs on the proposed implementation plan to the System Management Office by close of business Paris time on Friday 30 November 2018, to facilitate deliberations on the implementation plan by the System Management Board at its 13 December 2018 meeting.

### Item 5: Recognizing the new Denmark-CGIAR antimicrobial resistance partnership

30. The Chair framed the discussion by highlighting two key elements of the Council's role; firstly to oversee the performance of CGIAR Research and consistently seek to improve implementation as characterized in the discussions in the previous agenda item; and secondly to continually look to the future at global issues that affect CGIAR's work and that it is well placed to respond to, citing Anti-Microbial Resistance ('AMR') as a prominent example. He noted that CGIAR has worked in the AMR space for some years, and that there is the need for a strategic conversation about how CGIAR can contribute to tackling AMR as part of a One Health approach.

31. As additional context-setting the Council saw a video message on CGIAR's work on AMR and potential opportunities moving forward delivered by John McDermott, Director, CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health.
32. The Council welcomed Ms. Ellen Trane Nørby, Minister of Health of Denmark, who delivered remarks echoing the importance to Denmark of a One Health approach to the issue of AMR and reiterated Denmark's commitment to working with key global partners and actively engaging across a number of sectors to tackle the issue. Recognizing the global nature of the impacts of AMR, the need for interdisciplinary and solution-oriented action was highlighted to ensure that the benefits of research activities in this area are shared globally. A number of areas of best-practice underway in Denmark were shared, such as systemic surveillance in agriculture to reduce antibiotic usage, and it was confirmed that Denmark plans to establish a global center on anti-microbial resistance and work towards a stronger partnership with CGIAR, through a Memorandum of Understanding signed at this meeting.
33. The Executive Director welcomed the Minister's remarks and expressed appreciation for the collaboration and commitment of Denmark to deepen engagement with CGIAR and bring together efforts, skills and partnerships in a more structured way.

#### Item 6: Create Financial Sustainability and Growth in CGIAR

34. At the Chair's invitation, the Executive Director framed the session, noting that the discussion would focus first on the proposed 2019-2021 CGIAR System Financing Plan (set out in meeting document [SC7-G](#)), before inviting Funders to share any news on plans and areas of focus for the coming year and beyond.
35. The Executive Director noted that when discussing the concept of a multi-year business plan at previous Council meetings, a key tenet of that concept was alignment of a funding cycle to a programmatic cycle. Building on that concept and as part of the Business Plan presented to the Council at this meeting, a three-year financing plan ('FinPlan') has been developed for the first time for the System. The FinPlan builds on extensive discussions with Funders to gain a better understanding of predictability and with Centers to understand the challenges faced.
36. The Director, Finance of the CGIAR System Organization set out the innovations in the 2019-2021 FinPlan, noting that:
  - a. A 3-year outlook aims to improve the predictability and stability of available funding, noting that while the plan is presented on a 3-year basis, proposed allocations of Window 1 funding will be updated annually;
  - b. Growth fundraising targets are built into the plan to increase the volume of funding available for CGIAR, resulting in annual increases to planned disbursements to Centers;
  - c. In-year 'linking' mechanisms between Window 1 and Window 2 have been eliminated to provide maximum incentive for additional Window 2 funding;
  - d. Mechanisms and additional funding targets have been proposed to support expansion of research initiatives (such as those discussed under agenda item 4) noting that these are placeholder amounts subject to change in line with

- implementation places to be developed; and
  - e. The current 'Balancing Fund' will be repurposed as a strategic 'Window 1 Liquidity and Stabilization Fund'.
37. The Director, Finance, acknowledged and expressed thanks to Funders for their transparency and collaboration during the consultation process, noting that this had served to strengthen the mechanism changes proposed.
38. Noting that the FinPlan is scheduled to be approved by the System Management Board at their 13 December 2018 meeting in advance of being submitted by year-end for System Council final endorsement, the Chair invited inputs from the Council to inform its refinement ahead of the Board's consideration. The following reflections were provided:
- a. Several Funders expressed support for a 3-year financial planning cycle, and for measures proposed to increase the proportion of funding available at the start of the year. Encouragement was expressed to other Funders to support Window 1 and Window 2 funding to the extent possible.
  - b. Particular appreciation to the World Bank for their consistent and significant Window 1 contribution to the System was expressed, in addition to their roles as Trustee and chairmanship of the System Council. The challenges in maintaining that degree of support were acknowledged, but it was also noted that the demonstrable progress in the past year had facilitated making the case for the maintenance of the World Bank's Window 1 contribution.
  - c. There was also broad support for an ambitious approach to funding targets, and the delinking of Window 1 and Window 2 funds to incentivize additional Window 2 funding.
  - d. Encouragement was given to think creatively about new funding opportunities and the offer of support made to develop these.
39. The Chair invited inputs from Funders on their intentions and experiences in making the case for maintaining or increasing support to CGIAR. Individual situations and views were expressed, and some common themes that emerged were:
- a. The importance of the World Bank's contribution in promoting the status of CGIAR as a System and a value proposition;
  - b. The challenges posed for members of developing country constituencies to increase contributions when there may be a rotation away from holding the member seat in a given year. It was noted that additional discussions with constituencies would be held to explore these challenges in more depth;
  - c. The value of a strong CGIAR narrative and program and results reporting to make a powerful business case and the need to maintain focus on further improving these;
  - d. That an amplified fundraising and resource mobilization strategy would be of importance (noting that the Council will discuss this in more detail at agenda item 11);

- e. That consideration could be given to how to best acknowledge significant in-kind investments or support to CGIAR; and
  - f. Particular appreciation was noted for the continued support of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation through their support to CGIAR's advocacy and communications efforts and via the Foundation's leadership, in addition to their financial contributions.
40. The Chair thanked Funders for their open and transparent reflections and the continued and overall positive support for CGIAR, and the System Management Board and Center leadership for their responsiveness to Funder concerns that has enabled progress on the challenges raised and facilitated a move towards increased stabilization of System funding.

## Item 7: Other Business Plan Actions to consider

### *Strengthen program performance management (Action 3)*

41. The Co-Chair framed the session by noting the importance of a robust way to evaluate the performance of the System for understanding impact and also to know what's going on to justify investments. Recognizing the work undertaken to date in this area it was highlighted as important to understand how this work would be taken forward in the context of the Business Plan.
42. The Executive Director recalled the Council's discussion at its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting in Berlin in May 2018 on a '12-Point Program Performance Management Framework' and its endorsement of that as a key element to be taken forward in the Business Plan. He noted that at this meeting, the Council's strategic input and endorsement is sought on one element of that framework – the first cycle of CGIAR Program Performance Management Standards (as set out in meeting document [SC7-H](#)).
43. In discussions that followed, System Council members welcomed the direction of travel proposed by the Performance Management Standards and acknowledged the high level of consultation with Centers and CRP Leaders, the Council's advisory services, the Strategic Impact, Monitoring and Evaluation Committee ('SIMEC') and other Funders. The inclusion of the Quality of Research for Development Framework was also welcomed.
44. [Decision SC/M7/DP6](#): The System Council:
- i. **Approved** the proposed 2019-2021 CGIAR Program Performance Standards as set out in document SC7-H, taking note that the System Management Board is expected to approve the assessment levels for each of the Standards at the System Management Board 12<sup>th</sup> meeting on 13 December 2018; and
  - ii. **Agreed**, based on the recommendation of SIMEC, that the evaluation senior specialist in the new CGIAR Advisory Services Shared Secretariat is the responsible officer for undertaking the periodic independent assessment of whether programs met the standards, working across other advisory bodies as required to obtain expert data.

45. Action Point SC/M7/AP3: Taking note that it is the System Management Board that is the approval body for the 'rubrics' (assessment levels) for each of the approved program performance standards, **System Council members are requested** to provide inputs on the draft rubrics by not later than close of business Paris time on Friday 30 November 2018.

*Improve people management (Action 4)*

46. The Executive Director introduced the way forward on people management as set out in the Business Plan, recognizing that there had been significant development in thinking since the Council's feedback at its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting that there was a need to raise up the level of ambition and coordination in this area. He highlighted the three key areas of focus of this overall approach, and noted that conversations are already underway among the cross-System convening bodies and mechanisms that will steward much of this work including the HR Community of Practice and the Center Audit Committee Chairs group, as well as Center Boards and management:
- a. Developing a people management strategy;
  - b. Reinforcing and strengthening CGIAR's shared ethical frameworks; and
  - c. Designing and implementing a gender, diversity and inclusion framework.
47. In discussions that followed, a number of Funders shared their experiences of moving towards gender equality in their own organizations. In addition, it was observed that:
- a. There remains significant work to be done to reach the targets on gender representation in CGIAR's workplaces as recommended in IEA's 2017 evaluation of Gender in the workplace. A call was made to Centers to strive to meet these and specifically target those Centers who are most behind in doing so;
  - b. There is a need for clear policies and approaches to ensure an appropriate balance between the responsibilities of Boards and management to implement and oversee actions in support of goals in these areas; and
  - c. It was confirmed that there is commitment from Centers to move forward with work in these areas and advised that the General Assembly will discuss the topics at their forthcoming meeting in January 2019. Funder feedback will be communicated as an input to those discussions.
48. Action Point SC/M7/AP4: The System Council:
- i. **Strongly recommended** that CGIAR Centers adopt and strive to reach the overall goal of a minimum of 35% representation of women across all professional roles by end 2020, building on the findings and conclusions from the 2017 Evaluation of Gender at the workplace; and
  - ii. **Requested** that an update be provided at the Council's 8<sup>th</sup> meeting on progress against this target based on end-2018 data, disaggregated by Center.

‘Fireside discussion’ with Mr. Bill Gates, Co-Chair and Trustee, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

49. Prior to the commencement of the formal agenda on the second day, Mr. Bill Gates participated in an informal conversation with Nicole Birrell, Convener of the CGIAR Center Boards of Trustees Chairs about CGIAR and the importance of the areas covered by its mandate. Their discussions touched on the Foundation’s motivations for its long-standing investment in agricultural research for development and CGIAR. In a free-flowing conversation, it was commented that no other investment comes within a factor of ten of alleviating climate change’s negative impacts than improving agricultural systems, including through better seeds. In reflecting on the challenges faced by smallholder farmers, it was emphasized that better seeds are a necessary, but not a sufficient modality that needs to be introduced alongside tools, landscapes and market elements. A call was made to ensure that CGIAR’s funding is raised to a level that can allow it to maximize the potential of its comparative advantage and work alongside partners to improve best practice across the board and thereby achieve the greatest impact.

Item 8: Pursue new cross-Center alliances

50. By way of framing, the System Management Board Chair shared thoughts on building a ‘shared agenda’ across CGIAR, noting that this thinking is crystallized in the Business Plan being considered at this meeting, and the Funder appetite for a ‘One System’ approach as expressed in a number of interventions over the course of this meeting. He noted that this encompasses a shared research agenda in addition to institutional and process considerations.
51. The Chair noted appreciation for the energy within the System to catalyze discussions in these areas and invited inputs on behalf of Centers who are currently undertaking specific alliance and collaboration discussions.
52. Matthew Morell, Convener of the Centers’ Directors General and Director General of IRRI, shared a statement on behalf of AfricaRice and IRRI, outlining the status of development of a concept for a Pan African Rice Alliance to conduct joint research and development that better serves the needs of smallholder farmers, and national rice sectors in Africa. It was noted that the managements of Africa Rice and IRRI have established a joint task force to further develop the Alliance, under guidance from the deliberations of their respective Boards.
53. The Council also heard a video message from Ann Tutwiler, Director General of Bioversity International, on the nature of ongoing activities by Bioversity and CIAT to establish an alliance between the two Centers. It was advised that in the week prior to this meeting, the Boards of both Centers had met to decide on the appointment of the CEO of the Alliance of both Centers, and that at a meeting scheduled in late November, hosted by the World Bank, the two Boards will meet to sign a Memorandum of Understanding to create the Alliance. It was confirmed that the Alliance will have one Board, one CEO, one vision, mission and strategic results

framework focused on nutrition, climate change, resilience and sustainable food systems. It was advised that meetings between scientific leadership and senior management of both Centers had taken place among a number of other initiatives and informal conversations at all levels within each Center. Thanks were expressed to early supporters in particular the governments of Germany and the Netherlands, the World Bank, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation as well as the System Management Office.

54. The Chair expressed congratulations to the leadership and staff of Bioversity and CIAT for their efforts over a short period of time, focused on alignment around where synergies exist, to build towards a historic moment for the System.
55. The Director, Finance of the CGIAR System Organization, identified that the Business Plan includes a proposed special funding initiative, set out in meeting document [SC7-J](#), that aims to provide a rationale and modality for Funders to support the co-financing of specific pre-alliance exploration and transition costs for these initiatives, by removing any barriers to attracting additional funding that may currently be in place. He confirmed that access to the funds would be consistently managed to ensure that quality business cases are supporting the investments in advance, and that it would require ongoing monitoring and reporting of progress and return on those investments. It was noted that if this is seen as a successful approach, it could also be a template or model for consideration in future years to support co-investment in shared services or other operational effectiveness and cost efficiency initiatives.
56. In discussions that followed, there was broad support for the direction of travel towards greater alignment, and a suggestion made for the System Management Board to consider whether a more strategic approach or desired 'end point' to the discussions might be warranted. It was also noted that the CGIAR System Reference Group (comprised of representatives of the Funders and the System Management Board) would be an important forum to discuss the question. The desire for such discussions was acknowledged, recognizing however that the success of the discussions and alliances begun thus far had been their development through energy and drive within the Centers concerned.
57. It was noted that the exploration of where programmatic and strategic synergies exist between Centers had been the key driver of discussions underway to date. Some inputs during discussions indicated that to attract Funder support, the cost efficiency elements of such alliances should also be well-explored.
58. The excitement and strong support among the Council for the alliance conversations and activities taking place was noted, and it was confirmed that the proposed special funding initiative concept would be further developed based on the inputs received ahead of its discussion by the System Management Board at their 13 December meeting.

59. On the same theme of achieving more alignment in activities where appropriate, Matthew Morell provided a summary of the proposed process to develop an action plan on shared services (as set out in meeting document [SC7-K](#)). He noted the strong signals from Funders in moving in the direction of increased cooperation and efficiency, and that Centers themselves have an inherent interest in reducing their underlying cost structure and transaction costs. It was therefore recognized that there was a need to reevaluate what services would be most appropriate and beneficial. He advised that the three-phase process proposed would be discussed in more detail at the General Assembly in January 2019, with an updated plan to be provided to the Council at their May 2019 meeting.
60. In discussions that followed, the Council noted that:
- a. The direction of travel was appreciated, however there should be a more proactive and coordinated approach, rather than allowing evolution over time; and
  - b. Lessons should be learned from existing shared services where some Centers opted not to join, with some disappointment being expressed that this was the case.

### Item 9: Other Business Plan Actions to consider

#### *Enhance collaboration with delivery partners (Action 6)*

61. The Director, Funder and External Engagement, framed the four-point approach to the overall action as outlined in the Business Plan, noting that the sub-actions focus on research partnerships and the connections that we strengthen and maintain with national programs and governments and other research organizations and systems, and on delivery.
62. Taking each in turn:
- a. **On Country Collaboration** it was noted that this encompasses firstly the collaboration of CGIAR entities within a country, and secondly the collaborations between CGIAR and other partners in that country, and the country itself through the government and its institutions. It was noted that it is critical that this is not just an introspective effort to align CGIAR centers but about embedding CGIAR within the totality of the ambition of a country, or region to access the most effective research for development efforts. In discussions that followed, the following inputs were raised:
    - i. A suggestion to revisit priority countries to consider whether there are some where CGIAR is over- or under-represented;
    - ii. That partnerships with FAO and UN country teams could be better explored and lessons on partnering from the GCARD3 process should be revisited;
    - iii. That partnerships with regional geographical entities should also be explored in greater depth; and
    - iv. The focus on achieving impact on the ground in specific countries was appreciated.

- b. **On deepening private sector collaboration**, outlining a plan to establish a new community of practice across CGIAR that brings together legal and intellectual property expertise as well as business development to strengthen CGIAR's capacity to engage appropriately with the private sector and understand the private sector's needs, demands and opportunities; and proposes a mechanism to engage on innovations and technology within CGIAR through a technology fair. Inputs from the Council included:
    - i. A suggestion to also consider social enterprises as well as private sector organizations in this approach;
    - ii. That efforts may be better targeted if driven by opportunities that arise rather than a centralized approach; and
    - iii. That there would be great benefit in sharing learning with the System Council's Intellectual Property Group.
  - c. **On the establishment of new multilateral development bank co-operation platforms**, it was advised that a dialogue is being established with multilateral development banks to better understand the different mechanisms that are available to us, noting the existing strong partnerships with the African Development Bank already through TAAT, the World Bank and IFAD. It was highlighted in discussions that there are lessons from these experiences that can inform other areas of work, such as how to ensure responsibility and accountability from private sector partners for their contribution to shared delivery.
  - d. **On a CGIAR 'Rome hub'**, which sets out the rationale for a modest System Organization presence in Rome, building on capacity from Centers already there, to strengthen relations with partner organizations and others in the food security sector.
63. The Executive Director welcomed the rich inputs provided on each aspect and those on the need for a flexible, open approach in general outside the four focus areas. The appetite for a more in-depth conversation on collaboration with partners was noted as an important topic for the next meeting (SC8).

*Align and enhance assurance systems (Action 7)*

64. The Director, Board and Council Relations, framed the proposed approaches to align and enhance assurance systems, as set out in meeting document [SC7-N](#), acknowledging the importance to CGIAR's Funders and stakeholders that transparent and robust assurance systems are in place. It was noted that the four areas of focus for the Business Plan period are:
- a. **Coordinating information and internal audit planning** to share information on areas of risk focus and ensure that there is not duplication in the work of the System's Internal Audit Function;
  - b. **Evolving risk maturity** including reflection on areas of focus to raise standards across different organizational areas each year;

- c. **Increasing the value of our internal audit** including through an external assessment of internal audit teams that is currently ongoing, overseen by Center Audit Committee Chairs; and
  - d. **A more coordinated approach to internal controls**, which will be considered in detail by Center Audit Committee Chairs at their February 2019 meeting to work through processes and streamline policies, aligned with the work on safeguarding and related policies.
65. The Co-Chair noted the Council's appreciation for the work that was ongoing; and advised that a lunch session would be held for interested Funders to review a pilot CGIAR Annual Integrity Report and an update on reported incidents in 2018. That lunch session addressed the request at the start of the meeting that there be an update on efforts that the System is undertaking to strengthen its internal controls, with information from that lunch session having been shared with the System Council following the meeting via email.

#### Item 10: Align high-quality independent advisory services into System-level decision-making

66. The Chair framed the session, inviting the Chair of the Council's Strategic Impact, Monitoring and Evaluation Committee ('SIMEC Chair') to share reflections on four key areas of SIMEC's work including conclusions of deliberations at the Committee's meeting held on Monday 12 November 2018.
- I. On better linking the work of the System Council's Intellectual Property Group ('SCIP Group') into System Council discussions**
67. The SIMEC Chair set out the key recommendations from discussion on this topic, including:
- a. A more strategic use of our Intellectual Property ('IP') tools in the future in terms of delivery of CGIAR innovations to achieve outcomes at scale;
  - b. Better integration of the SCIP Group's work into the System Council deliberations including at least one standing agenda item from or with the SCIP Group per year;
  - c. A proposal to the Council that the work of the SCIP Group be funded where necessary through System funds, on the basis that SIMEC considers the SCIP Group to be an advisory service to the System. It was noted that in the current situation that is only relevant in one case as two members of the group are employees of System Council members.
  - d. That the current membership composition of the SCIP Group be maintained until at least the end of the first Business Plan period (end-2021) noting that there is high satisfaction with the work of the current group and there is not felt to be a good rationale for rotation at this time.
68. In discussions that followed, several Funders indicated support for the proposals as set out and for the work undertaken by the SCIP Group to date. In developing the

revised terms of reference, caution was noted to ensure appropriate management of potential conflicts between compliance and advisory roles of the group.

69. Action Point SC/M7/AP6: The System Council **requested** that a revised Terms of Reference for the System Council's Intellectual Property ('SCIP') Group, and a formal decision regarding continuing membership for the initial 2019-2021 Business Plan, be presented to the System Council for electronic approval by end 2018.

## II. Seeking System Council strategic inputs on advisory services priority actions for 2019-2021

70. The SIMEC Chair noted that in the Committee's discussions, they had considered: (i) the need to have flexibility built in when it comes to the design given that 2019 is a transition year; (ii) that the budgets as received would have benefited from being more granular and there may be the potential for savings on the budget amounts proposed for the transition year; and (iii) that the workplans should better outline how the work of the advisory services will be integrated with each other and with the System under the Business Plan.
71. It was confirmed that SIMEC recognized the importance of stability for the advisory services and therefore recommended to the Council that the advisory services operate on a three-year basis including for contracts, but that the workplans and budgets be revisited annually. It was advised that the recommendations at this meeting are therefore for 2019 and that activities for 2020 and 2021 would be revisited in 2019.
72. For each workplan and summary budget specifically:
- a. For the Independent Science for Development Council ('ISDC') the focus for 2019 should be on continuing with the foresight work looking towards development of the 2030 Plan, and development of a process and protocol for doing horizon-scanning.
  - b. For the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment ('SPIA'), the Council was asked to consider three broader questions; firstly, how much it wishes to spend on ex-post impact assessment in the System, recalling key messages from the morning's discussion with Bill Gates and input from previous meetings on the importance of measuring outcomes and impact and satisfaction with SPIA's previous work in this area. Secondly, the question was raised on whether this work should be funded from the cost-sharing percentage ('CSP') mechanism; and thirdly whether there was satisfaction with the three work areas proposed given the costs associated with each. The Council heard some additional background information on these from the SPIA Chair before providing inputs. There was support expressed for the work of SPIA and the need to adequately fund that work, and a call made to put in place a mechanism to ensure that the best value from resources for SPIA's work was being obtained. The constraints on the CSP mechanism were acknowledged and ideas exchanged on possible alternative approaches.

- c. For the independent external evaluations that are commissioned by the System Council and managed by the Shared Secretariat the Council heard that there had been some concerns raised by SIMEC that the workplan was not sufficiently differentiated from the previous approach to evaluations in that it was focused on programmatic evaluations rather than more targeted evaluations or assessments that give concrete progress information against SRF targets. It was also proposed that the program of evaluations should also provide information on whether CRPs are delivering on the performance standards. It was noted that a consultation meeting has been scheduled for early-2019 and appreciation expressed to the collaborative way in which the workplan development had been undertaken to date. The Head, IEA provided some additional reflections on the process of developing the workplan, noting that there had been a focus in doing so on addressing accountability and learning needs across CGIAR, aligned to the information needs of the 3-year business cycle.

73. Decision SC/M7/DP7: The System Council, pursuant to article 6.1(u) of the CGIAR System Framework:

- a. **Agreed** that for 2019 a certain degree of flexibility is needed for the operations of the Advisory Services and the Shared Secretariat and that workplans and budgets for 2020 and 2021 will be re-assessed in 2019 by the System Council supported by SIMEC.
- b. **Endorsed** the workplan of the ISDC for 2019, and asks the ISDC to largely focus on foresight activities and developing a protocol on horizon scanning;
- c. **Endorsed** the workplan and high budget scenario of SPIA, with the understanding that SIMEC will work with the Assurance Oversight Committee for a value-for-money review of the budget; and SIMEC will work with the System Management Office on the means of funding of the budget, with that proposal to be presented by not later than 3 December 2018 for approval by the System Council by electronic means<sup>2</sup>;
- d. **Requested** further refinement of the workplan and budget of the evaluations work stream of the Shared Secretariat, with an updated workplan to be developed that takes into account the feedback provided during the System Council meeting session; and
- e. **Endorsed** the budget envelope for staffing of the Advisory Services Shared Secretariat based on 3-year employment contracts for staff.

---

<sup>2</sup> The 2019-2021 Financing Plan, at footnote 3, references that in the first quarter of 2019, a formal proposal will be brought to the System Council for approval to facilitate part of the SPIA budget being funded through a Window 2 arrangement. It is noted that the value for money exercise was completed to the satisfaction of the System Council's Assurance Oversight Committee, as communicated to the Secretary of the System Council on 15 December 2018, drawing on support of the CGIAR System Internal Audit Function, and a virtual meeting with the SPIA Chair and the senior SPIA support team member within the ISPC Secretariat.

### III. Tabling ‘Draft 0’ Independent Science for Development Council member criteria and Terms of Reference for the ISDC Chair

74. The SIMEC Chair introduced a proposed set of measures (as set out in meeting document [SC7-07B](#)) to further clarify the role of ISDC members; set out required competencies; and provide for the uninterrupted delivery of expert independent scientific advice as the System transitioned between its Independent Science and Partnership Council (term ending 31 December 2018), and the new ISDC. All followed on from the System Council’s electronic decision, effective on 4 October 2018, to approve terms of reference for the ISDC, SPIA and a new Advisory Services Shared Secretariat. Taking the presentation of these materials as information, it was agreed that the formal decisions would be taken during the “decision session” of the meeting, as reported in item 14 below.
75. Noting that there would be a consultation process on the ‘draft 0’ material on the ISDC member terms of reference and key competencies, it was suggested that in any next draft, there would be benefit in permitting some flexibility in term appointments so that the ISDC Chair is able to ensure that the required range of skills and expertise is maintained during member transitions (with a formulaic approach not providing this facility).
76. [Action Point SC/M7/AP5](#): To inform development of the terms of reference for the ISDC Chair and its members, and an advertising strategy for the ISDC Chair role, **System Council members are requested** to provide an initial round of inputs on the materials set out in meeting document [SC7-07B](#) by not later than 30 November 2018, to inform SIMEC discussions and the presentation of the final documents for electronic approval by the System Council by end-December 2018.<sup>3</sup>

### IV. Revisiting past evaluations for System Council strategic direction and oversight

77. The SIMEC Chair recalled that SIMEC had undertaken a review of evaluations completed during the 2018 year on which the System Management Board had provided its commentary for System Council information pursuant to the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization<sup>4</sup>, but the Council had not yet formally tabled for discussion to provide strategic guidance to the System.
78. It was noted that a prioritized list of four evaluations had been agreed on and discussed at SIMEC’s recent meeting (as reported in meeting document [SC7-05](#)) and reflections on these evaluations were shared with the System Council by a SIMEC representative:
  - a. On the Evaluation of Partnerships in CGIAR: SIMEC noted that partnerships do not constitute an objective in themselves but are a means to an end to achieve CGIAR’s mission of contributing to development outcomes at scale

<sup>3</sup> Completed at the time of issue of this summary – refer footnote 2 above.

<sup>4</sup> Article 8.1(tt). System Management Board commentaries are included by IEA on the IEA website.

and their assessment should not, therefore, be removed from other processes of the system. It was proposed that partnerships are assessed in the future as part of the program progress assessments (to be coordinated by the Advisory Services Shared Secretariat) as well as by ex-post Impact Assessment conducted by SPIA. It was suggested that the System Council seek an update from the System Management Board on the progress on these recommendations during the November 2019 meeting and possibly annually thereafter.

- b. On the Evaluation of Results-Based Management: It was acknowledged that much progress has been made in the past two years with regard to rolling out program performance-based management approaches (noting that these differ to results-based management but are felt to be a good step into the right direction). It was acknowledged that the System reacted on the five recommendations of the evaluation, turning down recommendation 2 (decoupling budget allocation from results) and implementing others. SIMEC reported to the Council that the committee was of the view that the System can still be more ambitious in its results-orientation and should not be afraid of being held accountable to achieve development outcomes. It was also advised that SIMEC – as part of its mandate – will continue to oversee the process of further strengthening program performance-based management and results-based management in the System in the future.
- c. On the Evaluation of Gender in Research: Appreciation was noted that the System is making significant progress in strengthening gender equality in research. As that work progresses, it was recommended that the System ensure that the agreed target of spending at least 10% of Window 1-2 on gender research is being implemented, noting that this does not currently seem to be reported as the case<sup>5</sup>.
- d. On the Evaluation of Gender at the Workplace: SIMEC noted that according to the evaluation, the CGIAR will not achieve the target of having 45% women across all professional roles and 50% in senior professional and management roles by 2020 and that this distance from the target CGIAR set for itself was not felt to be acceptable<sup>6</sup>. It was recommended that the System do everything possible to at least achieve 35% female representation by 2020 (being the recommendation from the external independent Gender in Workplace evaluation) as a non-negotiable target, and that the Council review the progress on this target annually in 2019, 2020 and 2021.
- e. On the Evaluation of Capacity Development activities of CGIAR: It was suggested that the System still has to get better in tracking and reporting on its Capacity Development activities; and noted that a typology of Capacity

---

<sup>5</sup> The reference to 10% is based on the earlier 'CGIAR System' Consortium Level Gender Strategy that the former Consortium Board and Fund Council adopted, as accessible [here](#). 2013-2016 reporting is summarized [here](#).

<sup>6</sup> These targets were set in 2011, in the Consortium Level Gender Strategy, as referred to immediately above.

Development would be useful in achieving this. It was noted that Capacity Development as an objective of CGIAR's work is highly relevant for many Funders, however it is not always easy to access the required information and therefore recommended that it be made available via the Program Results dashboard.

79. The System Council Chair expressed appreciation to SIMEC for the volume and quality of work undertaken over the previous year on important issues to the System.
80. To bring this broader session to a close, and in anticipation that the new Advisory Services Shared Secretariat was anticipated to commence operations during the first quarter of 2019, the System Council Chair expressed the appreciation of the System to FAO for their hosting of CGIAR's ISPC Secretariat and IEA over past years, emphasizing the collaboration that had been experienced during this period and re-affirming the System's commitment to strengthen collaboration and partnership with FAO for the longer term.

### Item 11: Strengthen collective resource mobilization and communication efforts

81. In outlining the session, the Co-Chair remarked that several improvements in the presentation of CGIAR's message had been observed and encouraging signals heard from Funders over the course of this meeting. He acknowledged the challenges faced in ensuring adequate funding to deliver on CGIAR's mission and those ahead to ensure that CGIAR's programs are adequately focused to attract the funding needed.
82. The following inputs were provided by the Council in discussions that followed:
  - a. Acknowledging the cooperation and resources provided by Funders in support, it was suggested that additional resource mobilization capacity at the System level may be important, in addition to increased cooperation between other capacity in the System (with there being a significant number of Center-located staff who may be in a position to provide greater support to whole of System efforts);
  - b. That strong business cases on key products and visions, as well as clear targets for new potential funders, would be important; and
  - c. That a collaborative approach among existing resources targeting a few key events would be most effective.
83. The System Council Chair encouraged Funders who are aware of specific potential upcoming opportunities to approach the System Management Office to identify the best possible approach to work together to leverage these, including through World Bank channels where this would be appropriate.

### Item 12: Designing AR4D to address trade-offs between the SDGs

84. The ISPC Chair presented an overview of the Science Forum 2018 held in October 2018, organized jointly with the Agricultural Research Council of South Africa. Some reflections from participants on the benefits of attendance were shared, along with

outcomes that they would like to see; these included:

- a. The inclusion of synergies and trade-offs in funding decisions;
  - b. That CGIAR Centers should abandon focus on mandate crops and address the SDGs in terms of synergies and trade-offs; and
  - c. Guidance for CGIAR Business Plan on how to have impact on the science/policy interface.
85. The overall conclusion of the forum was identified as the *“need to systematically incorporate the measurement of positive/negative interactions that can arise between SDGs in agricultural food systems in the development of the CGIAR 2030 strategy and use the analysis to prioritize and focus CGIAR research in areas in which the System’s comparative advantage in research can make a significant contribution to achieving the SDGs”*. The cost implications of doing this, and therefore tradeoffs involved, were noted.
86. The Council were encouraged to visit the Science Forum’s [website](#) which provides a number of background papers commissioned for the event, and appreciation was expressed to the ISPC Secretariat team.

### Item 13: Prepare a longer-term plan

#### *Insights from the CGIAR System Reference Group*

87. The Chair recalled the decision taken at the Council’s 6<sup>th</sup> meeting in May 2018 to form a ‘System Reference Group’ to take forward ‘quid-pro-quo’ conversations around the System’s capacity to rationalize itself to remove ongoing fragmentation, informed by dispassionate analysis on what the drivers of the issues are, and how they may potentially be solved<sup>7</sup>, and invited the System Management Board Chair to reflect on the progress of that group to date.
88. It was advised that the group had met twice; once in the margins of the SMB’s 10<sup>th</sup> meeting in Nairobi in September 2018, and once prior to this meeting, each time holding their discussions under the Chatham House Rule to encourage open conversations. The three broad areas of discussions at the most recent meeting were characterized as (i) the research agenda and CRP modality, recognizing that the development of the 2030 Plan will be the process to clarify this; (ii) the business model as a System and collection of Centers; and (iii) the evolving global context and how to respond to it.
89. To take those discussions forward the meeting was informed of the proposal for more substantive conversations in 2019, potentially in the margins of the General Assembly in Bogor in January 2019, and alongside the 8<sup>th</sup> System Council meeting in May 2019. The possibility of a bigger in-person ‘Bellagio’ meeting in summary 2019 was also discussed, with that potential to be progressed by the System Management Office on behalf of the Reference Group.

---

<sup>7</sup> Taken from action point SC/M6/AP5 agreed at the 6<sup>th</sup> System Council meeting (Chair’s Summary available [here](#))

90. The Co-Chair of the Reference Group's second meeting, Tony Cavalieri, reflected that the meeting had been a positive and constructive one, building on the momentum that exists in the System, and expressed appreciation of the System Management Board Chair's leadership of the work thus far.
91. The System Council Chair thanked the Reference Group for the work undertaken to date and offered a suggestion on specialized support for a future session as an investment to allow different methods of discussion and reflection to encourage further thinking among the group.

*Develop a '2030 plan'*

92. The Executive Director reflected that while developing the 2019-2021 Business Plan, it had become apparent that in parallel to ensuring the most effective possible implementation of the current portfolio, there was a need to set in motion a process of broad and deep consultation and reflection on how to take forward CGIAR's vision to 2030. The System Reference Group and the Partnership Forum were identified as key opportunities in that process – with a clear 2030 Plan needing to be approved by not later than end 2020. Recognizing the essential need for any 2030 Plan to be developed via a transparent consultative process, the Council was advised that work would be undertaken on how possibility to take the development of this plan forward, with the opportunity to comment on the possible approach during the first part of 2019.

Item 14: System Council decision session

93. The Director, Board and Council Relations in her capacity as Secretary to the System Council presented the proposed text of decisions arising from consensus point by the Council previously. These encompassed the following, and the decision points for each are recorded below:
  - a. Consequential drafting amendments required to the System's governing documents and its policy relating to the financing of System Entities (as set out in meeting document [SC7-06](#)), noting that these would require subsequent approval by the System Management Board and General Assembly;
  - b. Advisory services transition matters, (as set out in meeting document [SC7-07A](#)) proposing a pragmatic way for the Council to ensure uninterrupted delivery of expert independent advice during the transition from CGIAR's ISPC to the new 'Independent Science for Development Council'; and establishment of the CGIAR Advisory Services Shared Secretariat. It was recalled that SIMEC's support for this way forward had been expressed as part of discussions under Agenda Item 10; and
  - c. A proposed honorarium framework for external independent members of the System Council's standing committees – As set out in meeting document [SC7-08](#), recalling that the proposal set out for the payment of a modest honorarium (as provided for in the Council-approved terms of reference for

the AOC) had been sent to the Council for inputs by electronic means on 18 October 2018, which no amendments being requested at that time.

94. [Decision SC/M7/DP8](#): The System Council **approved** the amendments to the following documents as set out in the Annexes of meeting document SC7-06:
- CGIAR System Framework
  - Charter of the CGIAR System Organization
  - Policy on CGIAR System Cost Financing
95. [Decision SC/M7/DP9](#): As a transitional arrangement to move from CGIAR’s Independent Science and Partnership Council (‘ISPC’) to CGIAR’s new Independent Science for Development Council (‘ISDC’), and pursuant to paragraph 4.3 of the IDSC terms of reference approved by the System Council on 4 October 2018, the System Council **appointed**, for the respective terms and roles set out below, the following persons as members of the CGIAR System’s ISDC:

<b>Person</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Appointment end date</b>
Maggie Gill (F)	Interim Chair	30 June 2019
Jennifer Thomson (F)	Transition Member	20 March 2019
Patrick Webb (M)	Transition Member	30 September 2019
Rodomiro Ortiz (M)	Transition Member	30 September 2019
Holger Meinke (M)	Member	8 May 2020
Nighisty Ghezze (F)	Member	7 August 2020
Prabhu Pingali (M)	Member	7 August 2020 <sup>8</sup>

96. [Decision SC/M7/DP10](#): As a transitional arrangement to move from CGIAR’s Independent Evaluation Arrangement to CGIAR’s new Advisory Services Shared Secretariat arrangements for external independent evaluations commissioned by the System Council, and pursuant to paragraph 44 of the CGIAR Policy for Independent External Evaluation, the System Council **renewed** with retroactive effect from 1 October 2018 the appointment of the Head of CGIAR’s Independent Evaluation Arrangement (“IEA”) to 31 March 2019 on the same contractual terms and conditions as current, provided that:
- a. For the period to 31 December 2018, the mandate, work planning and other arrangements for evaluations apply as set out in Chapters 5 and 6 of the CGIAR Policy for Independent External Evaluation; and
  - b. For the period 1 January 2019 to 31 March 2019, the mandate, work planning, and other arrangements for evaluations apply as set out in paragraph 3.4 of the Terms of Reference of the CGIAR Advisory Services Shared Secretariat.
97. [Decision SC/M7/DP11](#): Subject to the Terms of Reference of the relevant committee or group expressly providing for the possibility of payment of an honorarium, the System Council **approved**:

<sup>8</sup> Subsequent to this decision, the Secretary of the System Council was notified that Prabhu Pingali would end his term on 31 December 2018 due to other commitments.

- i. The payment of a gross annual honorarium of \$USD 8,000 (pro-rated for the period served in any calendar year) to external specialist-skilled independent members of a System Council Standing Committee/Group. Such honorarium covers all duties in respect of membership of the Committee/Group, which may be above time estimates communicated, including any requested attendance at in-person meetings; or
  - ii. The payment of a gross annual honorarium of \$USD 12,000 (pro-rated for the period served in any calendar year) where an external independent member of a System Council Standing Committee/Group serves in the role of Chair. Such honorarium covers all duties in respect of membership and chairing of the Committee, which may be above time estimates communicated, including attendance at in-person meetings of the Committee and the System Council.
  
98. The Director, Board and Council Relations and Secretary to the System Council summarized the decision and action points agreed during the meeting, noting the following additional decisions arising as a consequence of those conversations:
  
99. [Decision SC/M7/DP4: Extend reconciliation of Funder seating](#)  
The System Council **agreed** to align the reconciliation of the 15 Funder seats of the System Council with the business plan concept, such that the reconciliation should take place at the start of the third year of each business cycle based on contributions made during the three prior calendar years; and accordingly **agreed** to extend the reconciliation period to end 2020 for this first cycle, such that the reconciliation calculations will be undertaken in Q1 2021 (to cover the period 1 January 2016 – 31 December 2020), and the revised System Council 15 Funder seats will operate with effect from 1 July 2021.
  
100. [Decision SC/M7/DP5: Consequential decision of Funder seat reconciliation](#)  
As a consequence of the approach set out in the approved CGIAR 3-Year Business Plan 2019-2021 to extend reconciliation of System Council Funder seating to end-2020, the membership terms of SIMEC members are **extended** until 31 December 2020 to align with this period as follows:
  - 1 - African Development Bank - Dougou Keita
  - 2 - Australia - Mellissa Wood
  - 3 - Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation – Tony Cavalieri
  - 4 - Germany and Belgium - Michel Bernhardt
  - 5 - South Asia - Rajendra Singh Paroda
  - 6 - Sweden - Philip Chiverton
  - 7 - United Kingdom - Alan Tollervey
  - 8 - United States - Eric Witte
  - 9 - Vacant (*interested voting member constituencies are invited to submit nominations*)
  
101. By way of summary, the System Council Chair confirmed the Council's overall approval of the CGIAR System 3-Year Business Plan (2019-2021):
  
102. [Decision SC/M7/DP12](#): The System Council **approved** the CGIAR System 3-Year Business Plan (2019-2021), as set forth in meeting document SC7-02.

103. Action Point SC/M7/AP7: The System Council **requested** that a report against progress markers on all 10 actions in the 2019-2021 Business Plan be provided annually as a means of understanding progress and identifying any areas where implementation support that may be required.

#### Item 15: Other Business

104. Details of 2019 System Council meeting dates were provided as follows:
- Wednesday 15 – Thursday 16 May 2019, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (Confirmed)
  - Wednesday 13 – Thursday 14 November 2019, Chengdu, China (Indicative)
105. The Chair offered some reflections on the meeting's proceedings, expressing appreciation to the Council for the energy and openness of their discussions.
106. The meeting was closed.

## Annex 1: List of meeting participants

<b>Meeting Leadership</b>
<b>Chair: Juergen Voegele</b>
<b>Co-Chair: Tony Cavalieri</b>

*Note: The symbols '\*' and '\*\*' shown against a name below indicates that voting member/active observer is being represented at the meeting by the alternate ('\*') or another delegated representative (\*\*').*

<b>System Council Voting Members (listed alphabetically)</b>	<b>Member representative</b>	<b>Member Alternates &amp; Other Delegation Members</b>
AfDB	<b>Martin Fregene</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Ken Johm</b>
Australia	<b>Andrew Campbell</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Mellissa Wood</b>
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	<b>Michelle Quibell**</b>	Other delegate - Neil Watkins
Canada	<b>Christophe Kadji*</b>	Other delegate - Santiago Alba Corral
East Asia & Pacific (voting member China)	<b>Weiping Hao**</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Syaiful Anwar (Indonesia)</b> Other delegate - Lijun Zhao (China)
European Commission	<b>Christophe Larose**</b>	
Germany and Belgium	<b>Michel Bernhardt** (Germany)</b>	Other delegate - Juergen Anthofer (Germany)
Japan	<b>Satomi Okagaki</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Motoaki Komiya</b> Other delegates - Masa Iwanaga; Satoru Muranaka; Naoko Oka
Latin America and Caribbean (voting member Peru)	<b>José Alberto Barrón López** (Peru)</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Pedro Machado (Brazil)</b>
The Netherlands	<b>Melle Leenstra</b>	
Norway	<b>Daniel van Gilst</b>	
South Asia (voting member India)	<b>Chhabilendra Roul (India)</b>	
Sub-Saharan Africa (voting member Nigeria)	<b>Yarama D. Ndirpaya (Nigeria)</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Adil Abdelrahim (Sudan)</b>
Sweden	<b>Eva Ohlsson</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Philip Chiverton</b> Other delegate: Anu Kekki Svensson
Switzerland	<b>Michel Evéquoz</b>	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	<b>Alan Tollervey</b>	
United States of America	<b>Rob Bertram</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Eric Witte</b>
West Asia & North Africa (voting member Turkey)	<b>Fatih Özdemir** (Turkey)</b>	
The World Bank	<b>Mark Cackler</b>	<b>Alternate Member - Michael Morris</b>

## Annex 1: List of participants

Non-voting Ex-officio members	Member	Other Delegation Members
Chair, System Management Board	<b>Marco Ferroni</b>	
Executive Director, CGIAR System Organization	<b>Elwyn Grainger-Jones</b>	
Center Representative 1: Convener of the Chairs of Center Boards of Trustees	<b>Nicole Birrell</b>	
Center Representative 2: Convener of the Center Directors General	<b>Matthew Morell</b>	
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	<b>Chikelu Mba**</b>	
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	<b>Donal Brown</b>	<b>Malu Ndavi</b>

Active Observers	Representative	Alternate Member & Other Delegation Members
GFAR	<b>Mark Holderness*</b>	
CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement	<b>Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin</b>	<b>Jenin Assaf</b>
CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council	<b>Maggie Gill</b>	<b>Leslie Lipper; Karen Macours (SPIA)</b>

Invited attendees	Representative
France - Host Country of CGIAR System Organization	<b>Bernard Hubert</b> (National Institute for Agricultural Research)
Trustee of the CGIAR Trust Fund	<b>Darius Stangu</b> (The World Bank)

**Session specific invitees**

**Agenda Item 5:** Ms. Ellen Trane Nørby, Minister of Health, Denmark and others from Denmark Delegation (Per Vestergaard Okkels; Dorthe Eberhardt Søndergaard; Sine Mutanu Jungersted; Paolo Drostby; Troels Mandel Vensild)

**Additional participants**

World Bank	Jonathan Wadsworth, Lead Agricultural Specialist
CGIAR System Organization <i>(Technical inputs for sessions; meeting management; logistics support)</i>	Karmen Bennett, System Council Secretary & Director, Board and Council Relations
	Jamie Craig, Director, Finance
	Olwen Cussen, Senior Associate, Board and Council Relations
	Peter Gardiner, Senior Advisor, Program Performance
	Rosa Lugos, Funder Engagement Officer
	Victoria Pezzi, Meetings and Events Associate
	Valerie Poiré, Senior Manager, Communications
	André Zandstra, Director, Funder and External Engagement

**Apologies: 7<sup>th</sup> System Council**

Constituency	Role	Name
Canada	Member	Michel Gagnon
East Asia & Pacific	Member	Xifeng Gong
FAO	Non-voting ex-officio member	Samy Gaiji
Germany and Belgium	Member	Stefan Schmitz
Germany and Belgium	Alternate Member	Hans Joppen
GFAR	Representative	Bongiwe N. Njobe
Mexico	Member	Jorge Rueda Sousa
UK	Alternate Member	Howard Standen
South Asia (Sri Lanka)	Alternate Member	N.A. Sisira Kumara
West Asia & North Africa (Iran)	Member	Rasoul Zare