

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Third Meeting of the Executive Council

September 24, 2002

Washington, DC

Summary Record of Proceedings



*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington, DC
October 7, 2002*

ACRONYMS USED

<i>AGM</i>	<i>Annual General Meeting</i>
<i>AIARC</i>	<i>Association of International Agricultural Research Centers</i>
<i>AsDB</i>	<i>Asian Development Bank</i>
<i>BoT</i>	<i>Board of Trustees</i>
<i>CBC</i>	<i>Committee of Board Chairs</i>
<i>CCER</i>	<i>Center Commissioned External Review</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>DG</i>	<i>Director General</i>
<i>EPMR</i>	<i>External Program and Management Review</i>
<i>ExCo</i>	<i>Executive Council</i>
<i>FAO</i>	<i>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</i>
<i>FC</i>	<i>ExCo Finance Committee</i>
<i>GFAR</i>	<i>Global Forum for Agricultural Research</i>
<i>GPG</i>	<i>Global Public Good</i>
<i>GRPC</i>	<i>Genetic Resources Policy Committee</i>
<i>IBP</i>	<i>Integrated Business Plan</i>
<i>ICRAF</i>	<i>International Center for Research in Agroforestry (World Agroforestry Center)</i>
<i>ICW</i>	<i>International Centers Week</i>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>International Fund for Agricultural Development</i>
<i>IFAP</i>	<i>International Federation of Agricultural Producers</i>
<i>IFAR</i>	<i>International Fund for Agricultural Research</i>
<i>IITA</i>	<i>International Institute of Tropical Agriculture</i>
<i>ILRI</i>	<i>International Livestock Research Institute</i>
<i>IP</i>	<i>Intellectual Property</i>
<i>IPGRI</i>	<i>International Plant Genetic Resources Institute</i>
<i>IPR</i>	<i>Intellectual Property Rights</i>
<i>IRRI</i>	<i>International Rice Research Institute</i>
<i>ISNAR</i>	<i>International Service for National Agricultural Research</i>
<i>MTP</i>	<i>Medium-Term Plan</i>
<i>NARS</i>	<i>National Agricultural Research System</i>
<i>NGO</i>	<i>Non-Governmental Organization</i>
<i>NGOC</i>	<i>Non-Governmental Organizations Committee</i>
<i>NRM</i>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i>
<i>ODA</i>	<i>Official Development Assistance</i>

<i>OED</i>	<i>Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank</i>
<i>PC</i>	<i>ExCo Program Committee</i>
<i>PS</i>	<i>Private Sector</i>
<i>PSC</i>	<i>Private Sector Committee</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Science Council</i>
<i>SNC</i>	<i>Search and Nomination Committee</i>
<i>SO</i>	<i>System Office</i>
<i>SPIA</i>	<i>Standing Panel on Impact Assessment</i>
<i>SSA</i>	<i>Sub-Saharan Africa</i>
<i>SWP</i>	<i>Systemwide Programs/Initiatives and Ecoregional Programs</i>
<i>TAC</i>	<i>Technical Advisory Committee</i>
<i>TAC/iSC</i>	<i>Technical Advisory Committee/interim Science Council</i>
<i>TOR</i>	<i>Terms of Reference</i>
<i>UN</i>	<i>United Nations</i>
<i>USAID</i>	<i>United States Agency for International Development</i>
<i>WARDA</i>	<i>West Africa Rice Development Association</i>
<i>WB</i>	<i>World Bank</i>
<i>WG</i>	<i>Working Group</i>
<i>WSSD</i>	<i>World Summit on Sustainable Development</i>

Contents

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session.....	1
Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report.....	1
Agenda Item 3. Program Matters	3
3.a. Pilot Challenge Programs.....	3
3.a.1. Water and Food	4
3.a.2. Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition.....	5
3.a.3. Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource-Poor.....	5
3.a.4. ExCo Recommendations to CGIAR	6
3.b. Challenge Programs—Regular Process	7
3.c. Systemwide Programs/Initiatives and Ecoregional Programs	7
Agenda Item 4. Governance Matters	7
4.a. Establishing SC	7
4.b. Review of GRPC.....	9
Agenda Item 5. Evaluation.....	10
5.a. CIP EPMR.....	10
5.b. ISNAR EPMR.....	11
Agenda Item 6. Planning ExCo Business	13
Agenda Item 7. Other Business	13
7.a. AGM 2002 Session on Representation of Civil Society Perspectives in the CGIAR	13
7.b. Update on WARDA.....	13
7.c. International Fund for Agricultural Research (IFAR)	14
Attachments	
Draft Agenda.....	15
List of Participants	17
Finance Committee Meeting Minutes.....	19
Program Committee Meeting Minutes.....	24

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

Chairman's Introduction

Ian Johnson opened the meeting and thanked ExCo members for traveling to Washington to attend the meeting. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 2)

Election of Meeting Co-Chair

Gilles Saint-Martin was elected co-chair of the meeting.

Adoption of Agenda

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

- AGM 2002 session on representation of civil society perspectives in the CGIAR
- Updates on WARDA
- International Fund for Agricultural Research (IFAR)

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report

CGIAR Reform Program, WSSD, AGM 2002

Francisco Reifschneider gave an overview of the CGIAR reform program, WSSD and AGM 2002.

- On the *reform program*, he noted that activities are mainly on track and only minor adjustments are being made to the timeline as necessary.
- As a result of *WSSD*, the CGIAR is pleased that agriculture and rural development issues are back on the development agenda. The CGIAR lent active support to the preparatory process leading up to the Johannesburg summit. In addition, on the resource mobilization front, the Netherlands and the United States of America formally announced its pledge to increase funding support to the CGIAR at Johannesburg. This follows Canada's recent announcement to double its contribution and indication from several other members to increasing funding as well.
- A large turnout is expected at AGM 2002 in the Philippines. The meeting will consist of a two-day Stakeholders Meeting, followed by a one-day Business Meeting where ExCo inputs will be considered. Overall planning for AGM is on track. AGM will be preceded on October 25th by a McNamara Seminar in Japan which will highlight the work done by Centers and their impact, mainly in Africa. The seminar will be attended by researchers, policy makers, etc. and the members of CGIAR are all invited to attend. A final program is due to be released soon.

System Office

Gordon MacNeil, System Office Project Leader, gave an update on developing an integrated business plan (IBP) for the *System Office* (SO). Thus far:

- Most units have submitted drafts of 2003 business plans in a common format, which will form the basis for the structure of an IBP.
- Units have presented detailed service objectives for 2003, indicating clients, collaborators, and some performance measures.
- Budget requirements for all units in 2003 have been submitted; financing is not confirmed in all cases, as the various governance structures (CDC, Boards, Advisory Committees, etc.) will meet in October, in most cases.

At AGM a partial draft of the full IBP and broad resource information—budget requirements and expected financing sources, as well as some historical resource information will be available.

The following activities will be completed after AGM:

- Further development of two new units' business plans (Chief Information Officer and Strategic Advisory Service on Human Resources).
- Further development of the performance metrics for the full SO.
- Final budgetary and financing information, once all governance structures have met.
- Development of the operating plan by functional offering, to help identify potential gaps and overlaps; refine SO objectives and deliverables for the future.

2003 Financing Plan

Shey Tata presented the proposed *2003 financing plan*, which was developed collaboratively by ILRI, ICRAF and the CGIAR Secretariat. Kevin Cleaver presented highlights of the issues that came out of the ExCo Finance Committee's (FC) discussion of the 2003 Financing Plan on Monday, September 23, 2002. The meeting minutes of the FC are attached to the ExCo Summary of Proceedings.

Discussion:

- Positive comments were expressed concerning organization of the SO, especially for making the System more efficient in terms of overall services, i.e. to be more transparent and understand where there is overlap and where certain services should be permanent and others more temporary and to facilitate creation of a more dynamic system.
- Concern was expressed about the incentive structure for fundraising. In the past, pursuit of increased restricted funds in order to claim larger amounts of matching funds from the World Bank created distortions because centers were encouraged to increase funding even when the projects receiving restricted funds did not coincide with center goals and objectives. These concerns emanated from the FC meeting.

- A new incentive structure should be developed in which the allocation of unrestricted funds to each center is based on performance and impact, rather than on the ability of the center to raise restricted funds. Also, donors should provide a large percentage of the ir funds as unrestricted.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo expressed support for the proposed 2003 Financing Plan, and believes it highlights some very important issues. However, ExCo raised the following reservations regarding the financing plans of CIP and ISNAR:*
 - *For 2003, CIP has again proposed an expenditure program which exceeds its projected revenues, with no indication that the center has the reserve to cover the gap. The CGIAR should not finance the deficit. (See Agenda Item 5.a.)*
 - *A major increase in funding for 2003 for ISNAR (as indicated in the 2003 financing plan to be up to 40 percent over the 2001 level) is not tenable at this time. (See Agenda Item 5.b.)*
- *ExCo will submit the plan for approval by the CGIAR.*
- *ExCo endorsed the organization of a workshop on long-term financing proposed by the FC, which would look at both likely sources of funds and a performance based system for allocating unrestricted funds to centers. ExCo is pleased that IFAD has offered to host the proposed workshop.*

Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorses the CGIAR 2003 Financing Plan and recommends its approval by the CGIAR. ExCo has raised some reservations regarding specific aspects of the financing plans of CIP and ISNAR, which are detailed above.*

Agenda Item 3. Program Matters

3.a. Pilot Challenge Programs

Discussion of individual pilot CP proposals was preceded by a general discussion on the CGIAR's strategic move to fund CPs. Ruth Haug and Kevin Cleaver, Chairs of ExCo/PC and FC, respectively, summarized the discussion of this issue in their Committees. Points raised included: risks and opportunities, timeline for the regular process, and issues of funding. In addition, Peter Matlon raised a question of optimal portfolio of CPs.

Risks and opportunities: The CGIAR will need to balance the risks stemming from potentially adverse effects of CPs on funding for core programs of the centers, with the opportunity to make an impact in areas that reflect significant global challenges.

Timeline: The CGIAR will need to reconcile the need to learn from the pilots (by eventually slowing down the regular process) and the need to offer the donors and stakeholders a diverse portfolio of CPs to support or get engaged with.

Funding: There should be a minimum level of relatively firm up-front funding for the CGIAR to agree with the implementation of a CP proposal. Of the three pilot CP proposals under discussion, one has identified significant additional funding, one has some, and the third has little. The sentiment within ExCo was that, in order to move forward on a CP proposal, the proponents should have strong indications of support for at least 25 percent of the total requirements during the project period (usually 4-5 years).

Optimal portfolio: The incremental approach being used by the CGIAR for identifying CPs is not likely to ensure that the CGIAR will end up with an optimal portfolio of CPs in terms of meeting the needs and objectives of the System. This means that it would be useful to take a proactive approach, develop a vision of where the CGIAR wishes to end up over time, and identify CP themes that best fit that vision.

3.a.1. Water and Food

Emil Javier gave an overview of the CP and iSC recommendation, highlighting the necessity for the productivity of water in terms of food production to be increased for higher yields of crops, incomes for farmers, reduced poverty, and increased food security. The CP is organized around research themes tied to global public goods (GPGs). There are 18 key partners and The Netherlands has already pledged to contribute a significant amount of funding.

Discussion:

- There was general and broad support for this CP. The proposal demonstrates clear linkages with global work on water and food, demonstrates wide stakeholder inclusion, NARS participation is very high, and other partners are well represented.
- Some practical concerns in terms of manageability of the CP and funding were expressed.
- Some members expressed concern that adopting a river basin approach may exclude the rainfed dry areas from inclusion in this CP.
- It was pointed out that the CWANA region should be included in this CP since it represents a maximum water poverty area. To this end, ICARDA should be considered as a partner because of its critical role in the region.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo endorses this CP proposal and recommends its approval by the CGIAR.*
- *ExCo would like to convey to the CGIAR the concern about manageability of the CP and the need for ExCo to maintain light oversight of this and other CPs while the System learns about best ways of governing and managing CPs.*
- *ExCo also suggests that it would be necessary to pilot with the CPs a system of performance indicators as recommended by the FC.*

3.a.2. Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition

Emil Javier introduced the CP and highlighted its links to the global concern for nutrition, especially for those who suffer from hidden hunger. The CP shifts the research paradigm towards nutrient-dense crops that aim to increase the level of iron, zinc, and vitamin A in major staples. Preliminary work by the proponents demonstrates that biofortification has tremendous potential to address nutritional deficiencies among vast populations of the poor.

Discussion:

- There was general support for the CP in terms of moving away from yields toward focusing on nutrition and food security. Some members expressed very strong support and the belief that biofortified crops are a nutritional safety net for those who are not able to afford a fully diversified and balanced diet. However, social acceptability of biofortified crops needs to be considered in more detail.
- A few members expressed reservations about the CP because of the political sensitivity of biofortified crops in certain parts of the world.
- There were concerns that the evidence for impact is not clear in the proposal.
- Concern was expressed on lack of true partnerships, particular from the South and lack of NARS participation, and also lack of linkages with the private sector.
- A suggestion was made that the CP should pay more attention to crops that are drought tolerant since drought affects many parts of the developing world.

Conclusions:

- *ExCo endorses this CP proposal and recommends its approval by the CGIAR. A notable aspect of the CP is that it pushes agriculture as a purveyor of health and not just food.*
- *The comments about the social dimensions of biofortified crops need to be considered during operational planning.*
- *Partnerships with the private sector and NARS must be explored more fully.*

3.a.3. Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource-Poor

Emil Javier introduced the item and outlined some of the reasons for the iSC to strongly endorse this CP proposal for the CGIAR's consideration. He noted that the CP proposal is very exciting from a scientific viewpoint. The planned outputs of the CP are intermediate technologies with great potential application. The consortium that is being put together includes some of the best institutions in this field and the formal joint venture agreement that is appended is exemplary.

Discussion:

- The proposal addresses a highly strategic issue for the CGIAR—one that would generate significant GPGs. The proponents should make every effort to put on the table a solid proposal.
- The focus of the CP needs to be rethought. Twenty two crops are considered, but there is only a single target (tolerance of drought stress). While relevant as a

model system, choosing only drought tolerance “sets the bar very high.” A few other model traits, for example those relating to disease and pest resistance, should also be included. If one focus is to be on drought, the CWANA region should be explicitly included in the CP, including its institutions with significant experience on this issue.

- Tapping partners from the private sector is essential for study of this subject—yet there has been no consultation with the PS in the preparation of the proposal.
- Greater partnership with research institutions from the South should be sought. Eighty one percent of the scientists listed are from the North. As capacity building is a major theme of the project; this would foster broader participation from the South in the future.
- The business proposition needs to be rethought. How will IP issues and fiduciary responsibility be addressed? What role/connection should the activity have with the Global Conservation Trust, which aims to carry out connected activities under a different umbrella?
- It appears that the activities planned are encompassed by the core mandates of the centers. How much of the proposed work would still be carried out if the CP is not approved? Why is competitive grant funding proposed only if there are additional resources beyond the base amount?
- No sources of additional funding have been identified, except anticipated WB funding of some amount. CPs at a full proposal stage should have strong indications of support for at least a modest amount (say, 25 percent) of its total requirements.

Conclusions:

- *In light of the range of concerns expressed, ExCo does not consider this CP proposal to be ready for approval. The proponents should develop the proposal further and re-submit it to ExCo, taking into account the issues raised.*
- *The revised proposal should bring greater clarity to IPR matters, crop improvement targets, initial understanding on partnerships, handling of fiduciary responsibilities, explicit financing plan, private sector role, differentiation from core programs of the centers, etc.*
- *The Secretariat and the Science Council should develop a revised timetable for preparation and consideration of the revised proposal.*

3.a.4. ExCo Recommendations to CGIAR

1. *ExCo endorses the Water and Food Challenge Program proposal and recommends its approval by the CGIAR.*
2. *ExCo endorses the Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition CP proposal and recommends its approval by the CGIAR.*
3. *ExCo does not consider the Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource-Poor CP proposal to be ready for approval by the CGIAR. The proponents should develop the proposal further and re-submit it to ExCo, which will follow the normal process for CP approval. The proponents should take into account the issues reported here as well as those identified by ExCo members.*

3.b. Challenge Programs—Regular Process

Emil Javier reviewed the progress to date in preparation and evaluation of pre-proposals for the regular process. There were 35 fresh submissions and 6 left over from the pilot process that were resubmitted, for a total of 41 submissions. Thirteen pre-proposals were accepted for consideration by iSC and are currently undergoing assessment. The iSC plans to endorse to ExCo a subset of these pre-proposals by October 18, 2002. ExCo is expected to consider these by December 6, 2002. This is expected to take place in a virtual mode after AGM when the iSC-endorsed pre-proposals will be presented to the whole group in parallel sessions during the Stakeholders meeting. The proponents of pre-proposals chosen by ExCo on behalf of the CGIAR would be invited to develop full proposals.

Discussion:

- There is need for strategic stocktaking and clarification of the directions the System is taking with the introduction of the CPs.
- Several members expressed the need to have a clear multi-program picture, so that they can make multi-year commitments to the programs they consider high priority.
- The portfolio of CGIAR CPs should include various types. The iSC had considered the following typology: (a) CPs addressing global challenges; (b) regionally driven CPs, developed through regional planning exercises; (c) CPs to take advantage of new opportunities offered by developments in science.
- The CDC raised the issue of time and resources spent by Center scientists and their partners on developing a large number of concept proposals. Development of a cost-effective process and timeframe which the Centers could follow in the future would help in this regard.

3.c. Systemwide Programs/Initiatives and Ecoregional Programs

Adel El-Beltagy gave a CDC progress report on systemwide programs/initiatives and ecoregional programs. The CDC and CGIAR Secretariat fully support the paper by Hank Fitzhugh, Lukas Brader and Meryl Williams on allocation of strategic funds to systemwide programs, which the CGIAR Secretariat will be implementing in 2003. Other donors are also encouraged to join the World Bank in supporting the Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs.

Agenda Item 4. Governance Matters

4.a. Establishing SC

Robert Bertram, a member of the ExCo Working Group on Science Council (WGSC), presented an overview of the Working Group's recommendations on behalf of its Chair, Mohamed Hassan.

Discussion:

- There is need to clarify how the Science Council would link to the other components of the CGIAR system, in particular the future relationship between the CGIAR members, Centers, and SC should be more clearly defined. The following were also suggested: a) further elaboration of the rationale for a standing panel on priorities and strategies, b) a more open debate on what constitutes science quality and its measurement in the case of relevant development work, c) broadening the scope of mobilizing global science, with more holistic approach and emphasis beyond traditional agricultural research, d) clarity on the linkage between SC's work plan with the rest of the System, and e) use of the term "international development assistance community" instead of "international agricultural research community."
- The synergy as well as the overlap with the Global Forum on Agricultural Research should be highlighted. There should also be a broader notion of science to include particularly the type that relates directly to development.
- Instead of saying that the CGIAR would "harness the best in the international scientific community" it was suggested that the CGIAR should tap counterparts in research and development in the rest of the world who might be able to contribute to implementing the CGIAR research agenda. SC's advisory role should be more focused on scientific issues relevant to the CGIAR. There was, however, support for the view that the SC should exercise leadership in world agricultural research community and address controversial global issues.
- It was also suggested that SC should assist in helping to develop performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation.
- On the proposed standing panel on impact assessment (SPIA), it was strongly suggested that the Chair and members should be appointed by the CGIAR, similar to the SC chair and members.
- Concern was expressed about the small size recommended by the WGSC and suggestions to ensure North and South balance in constituting the SC. The Cosponsors' role in the search and nomination process for SC Chair and members would also need to be clarified.

Conclusions:

- *The Exco endorsed the WGSC report and commended the WG for its excellent work. The changes suggested by the ExCo should be considered during the transition to the SC.*
- *In moving forward with the recommendations, a proposal for the search and nomination process was presented by Francisco Reifschneider and discussed. A Search and Nomination Committee (SNC) should be appointed, supported by a human resources recruitment expert and the System Office. The Cosponsors should be represented in the Committee. The Committee should submit to the ExCo short lists of candidates for SC Chair and members. An initial list of candidates for chair and members of the SNC have been identified. ExCo members are invited to submit additional names to the CGIAR Secretariat on or before October 11, 2002.*

- *Since it is expected that the new Science Council would be constituted and become operational only in mid-2003, the ExCo would recommend to the CGIAR extension of the appointments of the current iSC members up to June 30, 2003.*

Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorses the recommendations of the Working Group on the Science Council in broad terms. Adjustments to the Working Group's recommendations should be made following the report's discussion by the CGIAR at the AGM and taking into account comments made by ExCo members.*
- *ExCo recommends CGIAR approval of the extensions of the appointments of the current iSC members until June 30, 2003.*

4.b. Review of GRPC

A two-member ExCo Panel composed of Carlos Correa and Ian Bevege was created in May 2002 to review the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee in the context of the CGIAR's new governance structure. Manuel Lantin, who served as Secretary of the Panel, presented an overview of the recommendations on behalf of the Panel.

Discussion:

- CDC agreed to most of the recommendations but pointed out the following: a) the GRPC could do more to help individual Centers to implement genetic resources policies but pointed out that the proposal would have resource implications; b) there appears to be no significant role for the GRPC as a resource for NARS; c) a more "permanent" committee secretariat might need to be established and IPGRI has served in this role, but there might be other options to explore. While it agreed that a modest budget be allocated to GRPC, the CDC did not want to see this being funded by a levy from the Centers. It suggested that a special activity account be set up and funded through the donors.
- There was a desire to explore fully a connection with the SC as opposed to having a separate standing committee. It was suggested that a panel of the SC on genetic resources might be a good alternative to the current GRPC. An opposing view was that the issues tackled by the GRPC are more political in nature rather than technical or scientific. Several members also emphasized the importance of preserving stakeholder participation in such an advisory body. They would especially not want to lose the inputs from NGO and private sector perspectives.
- A smaller committee than what is being recommended should be considered.

Conclusions:

- *The recommendations of the GRPC Review Panel received broad support from ExCo. A multi-stakeholder GRPC should continue. Suggestions particularly on links with SC, IPGRI's Genetic Resources Policy Unit and on size should be considered in constituting the new GRPC. A modest budget should be allocated for the operation of the Committee.*

Recommendation to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorses the recommendations of the GRPC Review Panel in broad terms. Adjustments to the Panel’s recommendations should be made following the report’s discussion by the CGIAR at the AGM and taking into account comments made by ExCo members.*

Agenda Item 5. Evaluation

In their meetings on September 23, ExCo/PC and ExCo/FC had both discussed their respective roles on evaluation. A major outcome of these discussions is that the Committees see a major vacuum in the System in the *follow-up of evaluations*—particularly the EPMRs. ExCo/PC and FC *recommend* that there should be regular reporting by the centers on progress with the implementation of the agreed recommendations of review panels. Review panels should be asked to attach to their recommendations appropriate timelines, milestones and indicators of progress.

ExCo members broadly agreed with these suggestions. Adel El-Beltagy noted that the centers normally prepare matrices showing progress with implementation of review recommendations for discussion with their boards. These could be shared with ExCo.

Another point raised by members in connection with reviews was that the CGIAR should be able to make decisions that “stick.” Centers that pay only lip service to them should bear the consequences of their actions. Donors should not reward non-compliance. The System should demonstrate its commitment to reform and ability to change.

Conclusions and Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the establishment of a more systematic review follow-up mechanism involving periodic reporting by centers on progress with the implementation of the most recent external review of that center.*
- *The System Office should develop such a mechanism. ExCo should review the reports by centers on a regular basis to ascertain the need for any follow-up action by the CGIAR.*

5.a. CIP EPMR

Ruth Haug, Chair of ExCo/PC, reported on the Committee’s discussions and conclusions. The PC concurs with the review recommendations and sees an urgent need to implement them, particularly on the need for a vision and strategy that integrates crop improvement and protection, NRM and social science. The PC is concerned that the need for strategic planning and priority setting was flagged by the previous EPMR (chaired by the current Board Chair). The PC concurs with iSC that a CCER on the structure of CIP’s breeding program should be conducted not later than 2004. (See attached report of ExCo/PC for details.)

Kevin Cleaver, Chair of ExCo/FC, noted that the FC is also concerned that CIP has not acted on past review recommendations to improve financial management. For 2003, CIP has again proposed an expenditure program, which exceeds its projected revenues, with no indication that the center has the reserve to cover the gap. The CGIAR should not finance the deficit. The FC also suggested that a performance-based allocation of funds would send better signals to the centers than the current matching system.

ExCo/FC stressed the need for CGIAR oversight of center boards. The EPMR has raised a number of governance issues (the DG's length of tenure, procedures for nominating board members, overall effectiveness of the board in providing oversight of center management). The System should pay more attention to effectiveness of center governance and take measures to improve the effectiveness of center boards. (See attached report of ExCo/FC for details.)

Discussion:

- Regarding center boards, the Secretariat has revised the paper discussed by ExCo2 on measures to improve the appointment of CGIAR nominees. It is being reviewed by CBC and CDC and will be brought to the ExCo and to the CGIAR following these consultations.
- The CGIAR should move towards systematic and periodic measurement of the performance of the centers, possibly through a self-assessment process.
- The System Office should appraise ExCo of ways of addressing systemwide issues flagged by the CIP review and discussed at the ExCo meeting held in London (e.g., mechanisms for handling *grievances* and transparency of information on *compensation*).

Conclusions:

- *ExCo endorses the conclusions and recommendations of its Program and Finance Committees regarding follow-up actions concerning the CIP EPMR.*
- *The System Office should bring recommendations to ExCo on matters of Systemwide significance emanating from the CIP review and its discussion at ExCo (e.g., CGIAR nominees on center boards, mechanisms for handling grievances, transparency of information on compensation, and systematic and periodic measurement of center performance).*

Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo recommends that the CGIAR endorse the recommendations of the EPMR, with the adjustments made by ExCo.*

5.b. ISNAR EPMR

Ann Waters-Bayer, who had chaired the ExCo/PC's discussion of this item on September 23, reported on the Committee's discussion and conclusions. On the critical question of the future of ISNAR, the PC recommends that the CGIAR appoint a change team to explore all options (including decentralization and devolution of some activities, expanded partnerships, networking arrangements, "virtual center", etc.) for implementing

the mandate and functions of ISNAR in an efficient manner. In addition, the PC recommended holding in abeyance the search process for a new ISNAR DG. (See attached report of ExCo/PC for details.)

Kevin Cleaver, Chair of ExCo/FC, reported on the parallel discussion of the EPMR by FC. FC was not satisfied with ISNAR's follow up to the previous review and recommends that alternative institutional arrangements should be established to undertake ISNAR's important functions in the areas of research and services to NARS, phasing out ISNAR. The CGIAR should discuss with the ISNAR Board a plan for phasing out ISNAR over a three-year period. (See attached report of ExCo/FC for details.)

Discussion:

- The institutional strengthening function is important for the CGIAR and all centers have activities in this area. The key question is whether client countries are getting the services they need. In restructuring ISNAR one should identify the functions that (a) can be transferred to other centers; (b) can be eliminated; and (c) should be carried out by a modest CGIAR focal service.
- If the institutional strengthening needs are greatest in Africa, the CGIAR's main focus should be on SSA. Relocating ISNAR to an African location should be considered. It is increasingly difficult for the CGIAR to justify having its centers headquartered in developed countries.
- Institutional development can best be addressed at the regional level. Any restructuring of CGIAR activities should consider strong links with regional institutions with capacity in this area.
- Research on institutional innovation and development, including mutual learning, needs to go beyond the national and regional levels to allow international and interregional analyses.
- CGIAR members should not act in isolation *vis-à-vis* ISNAR. A common CGIAR action plan should be formulated. In this regard, funding decisions should be consistent with agreed actions by members.
- It was suggested that GFAR could play a role in the restructuring of ISNAR.
- The CDC also suggested it be represented on the proposed change team.

ExCo Conclusions on the ISNAR EPMR and Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo agrees with the Panel and iSC that "business as usual" is not acceptable.*
- *The ISNAR Board should slow down the DG recruitment process until there is greater clarity on ISNAR's future.*
- *CGIAR members should avoid major changes in ISNAR's funding until the institutional options are clarified. A major increase in funding for 2003 (as indicated in the 2003 financing plan to be up to 40 percent over the 2001 level) is not tenable at this time.*
- *Regarding the two options proposed by the ExCo/PC and FC on the direction of CGIAR follow-up action on ISNAR (i.e., (a) restructuring ISNAR as suggested by ExCo/PC, and (b) phasing ISNAR out over a three to five-year period as suggested by ExCo/FC), ExCo concluded that alternative institutional*

arrangements should be sought to have the priority functions of ISNAR carried out in a more decentralized, networking mode. A plan for restructuring ISNAR should be developed, looking at all innovative options, including operating as a virtual network, or transferring ISNAR's functions and programs to other institutions.

- *The CGIAR should appoint a small restructuring team made up of key stakeholders of ISNAR (e.g., donors, clients, the Board) to recommend a restructuring plan over a short period.*

Agenda Item 6. Planning ExCo Business

Selcuk Ozgediz reviewed the timetable and status of items in ExCo's business agenda. Two items were added to the business agenda:

- Development of a performance measurement system that can be implemented across the System, benefiting from the experiences of other institutions using such systems. The new performance measurement system should include indicators of not just quality of science, but also of outputs and impact, as well as finance and governance. The SO, SC, ExCo/FC and PC should play a role in developing such a system.
- Revision of the CGIAR's Long-Term Financing Strategy in light of recent changes which have made several of the assumptions in the current Strategy obsolete.

Agenda Item 7. Other Business

7.a. AGM 2002 Session on Representation of Civil Society Perspectives in the CGIAR

Following up on the decision of ExCo reached at the last meeting in London, the Secretariat has sent invitations to Via Campesina and IFAP to attend AGM02. A parallel session is being planned to enable these and other major organizations reflecting civil society perspectives to discuss (perhaps in a panel format) how best these perspectives could be represented in the CGIAR in the future. Conclusions reached at this session will serve as advice to the CGIAR. NGOC will be consulted in planning this session.

7.b. Update on WARDA

Francisco Reifschneider informed ExCo periodically throughout the day on the tense situation at WARDA. Support from the UN System was sought via the World Bank and Gilles Saint-Martin helped enlist support from French authorities as well. ExCo members expressed their deep concern and well wishes for the WARDA board members, staff, and their families located in Bouake.

Adel El-Beltagy suggested that, in the light of the current situation at WARDA, the System should consider standard evacuation procedures that would apply in any future cases. ExCo agreed to have such procedures developed through the System Office and CDC/CBC.

7.c. International Fund for Agricultural Research (IFAR)

Francisco Reifschneider briefed ExCo about the revitalization and reorientation of a dormant non-profit entity, IFAR (International Fund for Agricultural Research), set up by the CGIAR more than a decade ago in the U.S. The reorientation responded to the need for consolidating under a single program of Promoting Excellence and Partnerships, the ongoing program of CGIAR awards, a forthcoming CGIAR professional development program for promising young scientists from Southern partner institutions and potential new initiatives such as a CGIAR Open University. IFAR would hold the CGIAR reserve funds of about \$4 million reported in the 2001 Financial Report and temporarily held by the Association of International Agricultural Research Centers (AIARC) which administers the payroll, pension and medical insurance plans for most internationally recruited Center staff. A revitalized IFAR, following arrangements cleared with the World Bank's legal department, would have the CGIAR Director and Financial Officer serving, pro-bono, as office holders of IFAR along with Hank Fitzhugh, recently retired DG of ILRI. The CGIAR Chairman would annually approve IFAR's operating program. The direct financial control of IFAR by the Secretariat would better serve its fiduciary responsibilities for the reserve. Adel El-Beltagy welcomed the initiative as it addressed one of the key priorities of the Centers in terms of developing a strong pipeline of young talent from the South as partners and potential staff members.

Draft Agenda

09:00 – 10:45

1. Opening Session (15 min)

- I. Johnson's introduction (5)
- Election of Meeting Co-Chair (5)
- Adoption of the agenda (5)

2. CGIAR Status Report (60 min)

- Report from F. Reifschneider:
 - WSSD: CGIAR involvement, outcomes, implications (10)
 - CGIAR AGM (10)
 - Organizing System Office (G. MacNeil) (10)
 - 2003 CGIAR Financing Plan (S. Tata) (15)
 - Other matters
- Discussion (15)

3. Program Matters

3.a. Pilot Challenge Programs (105 min)

- 3.a.1. Global Challenge Program on Water and Food
 - Overview and iSC recommendation (E. Javier) (10)
 - Discussion (20)

10:45 – 11:00

Coffee Break

11:00 – 13:00

3. Program Matters

3.a. Pilot Challenge Programs (continued)

- 3.a.2. Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition
 - Overview and iSC recommendation (E. Javier) (10)
 - Discussion (20)

- 3.a.3. Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource-Poor
 - Overview and iSC recommendation (E. Javier) (10)
 - Discussion (20)

3.a.4. ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR (15)

3.b. Challenge Programs—Regular Process (25 min)

- Progress report, review of pre-proposals, next steps (E. Javier/F. Reifschneider) (10)
- Discussion (15)

- 3.c. Systemwide Programs/Initiatives (20 min)
 -- Progress Report by CDC/System Office (10)
 -- Discussion (10)
- 13:00 – 14:00 Lunch
- 14:00 – 15:40 **4. Governance Matters**
- 4.a. Establishing SC (40 min)
 -- Overview of WGSC recommendations
 (R. Bertram) (10)
 -- Discussion (30)
- 4.b. Review of GRPC (25 min)
 -- Overview of Review Panel recommendations
 (M. Lantin) (10)
 -- Discussion (15)
- 5. Evaluation**
- 5.a. CIP EP MR (35 min)
 -- Recommendations of ExCo/PC and ExCo/FC (15)
 -- Discussion and ExCo guidance to CGIAR (20)
- 15:40 – 16:00 Coffee Break
- 16:00 – 17:30 **5. Evaluation** (continued)
- 5.b. ISNAR EP MR (60 min)
 -- Recommendations of ExCo/PC and ExCo/FC (20)
 -- Discussion and ExCo guidance to CGIAR (40)
- 6. Planning ExCo Business** (20 min)
 -- Review of ExCo business agenda and timetable (10)
 -- Assignments to PC and FC (10)
- 7. Other business**
- 8. Closing Session**

Attachment 2

List of Participants Second Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council

<i>Chairman:</i>	Ian Johnson	
<i>Cosponsors:</i>	Jacques Ekebil	FAO
	Kevin Cleaver	World Bank
	Shantanu Mathur	IFAD
<i>CDC:</i>	Adel El-Beltagy	CDC
<i>CBC:</i>	Moise Mensah	CBC
<i>TAC/SC:</i>	Emil Javier	TAC/iSC Chair
<i>GFAR:</i>	Jean-Francois Giovannetti	GFAR
<u><i>OECD/DAC:</i></u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Jonathan Conly	U.S.
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Toshinori Mitsunaga	Japan
<i>Europe</i>	Gilles Saint-Martin	France
	Ruth Haug	Norway
	Klaus Winkel	Denmark (absent)
<u><i>Developing Countries:</i></u>		
<i>Americas</i>	Alberto Portugal	Brazil
<i>SSA</i>	Bongiwe Njobe	South Africa (absent)
<i>Asia-Pacific</i>	Dongyu Qu	China (absent)
<i>CWANA</i>	Magdy Madkour	Egypt
<i>Regional Fora</i>	Abdel Nabi-Fardous	AARINENA
<u><i>Foundations:</i></u>	Peter Matlon	Rockefeller F.
<u><i>Partners:</i></u>		
<i>Civil Society</i>	Ann Waters-Bayer	NGOC Co-Chair
<i>Private Sector</i>	Sam Dryden	PSC Chair

<i>Executive Secretary, ExCo:</i>	Francisco Reifschneider
<i>CGIAR Secretariat:</i>	Fiona Douglas
	Manuel Lantin
	Gordon MacNeil
	Selçuk Özgediz
	Ravi Tadvalkar
	Shey Tata
	Jason Yauney

Observers:

Shawki Barghouti
Robert Bertram
Dana Dalrymple
Monica Kaporiri
Shelleemiah Keya
Keri Wright Platais

World Bank
USAID
USAID
NGOC
TAC/iSC Secretariat
CDC

**Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
September 23, 2002**

Chairman: Kevin Cleaver, World Bank
Secretary: Shey Tata, CGIAR Secretariat

Members Present: Mr. Jacob Thoppil (Canada)
Mr. Gilles Saint-Martin (France)
Mr. Shantanu Mathur (IFAD)
Mr. Toshinori Mitsunaga (Japan)

Absent: Ms. Bradford Philips (AsDB)
Ms. Bongiwe Njobe (South Africa)
Mr. Roy Metherell (United Kingdom)

Observers: Mr. Abdel Nabi-Fardous (AARINENA)
Mr. Dana Dalrymple (USAID)
Mr. Shawki Barghouti (World Bank)

Following welcoming remarks from the CGIAR Chairman to a joint assembly of the Executive Council's two committees (Program and Finance), the FC withdrew to a separate room to commence its deliberations.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1. The Chair offered a motion to adopt the agenda as proposed. It was agreed to amend the agenda to include a discussion of the role of the Science Council in program reviews and vis-à-vis the two ExCo committees.

II. SELECTION OF THE COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR

2. After the Committee Chair described the responsibilities of the Committee's Vice Chair, Mr. Shantanu Mathur (IFAD) was nominated and unanimously selected for this position.

III. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE

3. The TORs approved by ExCo and dated June 3, 2002 were discussed for clarification. The consensus was that, although the TORs had enough coverage, they were rather too "telegraphic" and not sufficiently explicit. Therefore, it was agreed to:
 - a. Propose the inclusion of Center and System **management** and **governance** issues to the Committee's mandate;
 - b. Propose inclusion of the allocation of CGIAR resources to various Centers and uses. The Committee would like to contribute more of a performance-

based allocation system, drop World Bank matching grants approach, and work to encourage more unrestricted funding by donors. ExCo and its two committees need to work together on a performance-based allocation mechanism (discussed more below);

- c. Propose that the Committee be able to suggest future changes to the TORs as needed, and as its work progresses.

IV. 2003 CENTER FINANCING PLANS

4. The Committee notes with satisfaction the considerable new donor funding the Centers are projecting for their 2003 programs, and the overall good financial health of the System. Overall, sources of funding are matched to uses. It notes the effective management of temporary cash flow problems of individual Centers by the CGIAR Secretariat.
5. However, the Committee notes that in the 2003 proposals from Centers, CIP's continues to be the most problematic as a result of its plan for deficit spending, its inadequate reserves, and the seeming absence of a willingness to act seriously to address this critical issue (discussed below).
6. The Committee notes that IITA and IRRI also have projected financial deficits, but each has reserves and/or a restructuring plan in place to address this problem. Nevertheless, the Committee feels that it would be prudent for these two Centers to plan for reduced expenditures to bring about an alignment of expenditures to resources in the coming years.
7. The CGIAR as a whole needs to maintain reserves both to manage cash flow, and unanticipated problems. It plans to do this, which The Committee believes is prudent.
8. The Committee's concern is that resource planning is distorted by:
 - a. Efforts by Centers to attract increased funding
 - b. Matching grant system for allocation of World Bank funds.

Pursuit of restricted donor funds may be diverting attention from priority research as established by the System to individual donor project priorities. The pursuit of restricted funding is important to Centers in part to obtain matching grants. In the past, World Bank funds had been allocated through the matching grant system not on the basis of performance of Centers or research priorities of the System but on the basis of Center fundraising ability. The Committee proposes to address this issue by establishing a performance-based resource allocation mechanism for unrestricted funds. This will result in the allocation of unrestricted funds on the basis of performance and strategic priorities, and not fundraising ability. Projects proposed by donors which detract from a Center's performance will be more likely to be rejected. The overall performance of the System and quality of resource allocation will improve. We also advise donors to increase

unrestricted funding. Finally, we propose a workshop in March 2003 to discuss the resource allocation system and to establish performance indicators.

V. LONG-TERM FINANCING STRATEGY OF THE CGIAR

The Committee reviewed the “CGIAR Longer Term Financing Strategy” which was endorsed by the Group at ICW00.

9. On the positive side, the Global Conservation Trust appears to be a promising vehicle for financing the CGIAR genebanks. There is some more partnering between individual Centers and the private sector. The first private sector member of the CGIAR – Sygenta – has arrived.
10. However, the Committee has the following concerns with the strategy:
 - a. Expanded Official Development Assistance (ODA), not the private sector or foundations, are the major source of CGIAR funding growth;
 - b. A strategy which focuses more on maintaining, and expanding ODA, and public sector contributions, including from Developing Countries, would be more important than an agenda targeted to the private sector, foundations, academics, and tapping the “new wealth” (the new wealth has disappeared).
 - c. Donors and Developing Country governments are interested in a development agenda, focus on the poor, and poor countries. Such an agenda will be less interesting to the private sector, but more in keeping with core CGIAR objectives.
 - d. CGIAR Centers need to associate more closely with the broad rural development agenda to maintain donor interest and directly mobilize incremental resources as a result. More CGIAR partnering in development programs is called for, but without resorting to restricted funding and the use of the CGIAR as a donor project execution mechanism. How to do this will be the major challenge for future resource mobilization.
11. The Committee believes that Challenge Programs have great promise to bring in new and innovative institutions, innovative research programs not already underway in the CGIAR System, and new money.
12. The Committee recommends revision of the long term financing strategy to take into account the above concerns.

VI. EXTERNAL PROGRAM AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

CIP

The main conclusions from the discussion were as follows:

13. The EPMR's recommendation and CIP's response are reasonable.
14. The Committee is, however, concerned that CIP has not acted on similar recommendations in the past to improve financial management, and overall management of the Center.
15. It notes that, for 2003, CIP again has proposed to the CGIAR an expenditure program which exceeds their projected revenues (by approximately \$0.8 million), and they have not indicated that they have a financial reserve to cover the gap. They should be required to submit a plan which balances expenditures and revenues. The CGIAR should not finance the deficit.
16. The Committee seeks clarification regarding the authority of the ExCo to intervene in Center activities when the Center's Board of Trustees (BoT) supports the Center. Governance issues at CIP (duration of CIP Director General's appointment, CIP Board Member nominating procedure, and effectiveness of its oversight) are at issue. But as important: the CGIAR System has not been effective in effecting measures to resolve these issues.
17. The Committee believes that a performance-based allocation of funds would send better signals to Centers like CIP regarding expected performance and outcomes than is done in the existing resource allocation system. If we are to move to more unrestricted funding rather than donor earmarking to specific projects, then all parts of the System need to be performing well in all aspects – science, impact, finance and governance.

ISNAR

The main conclusions from the discussion were as follows:

18. The Committee is not satisfied with ISNAR's follow up to the previous review of its performance. This again brings into question the role of the CGIAR System as a whole in Center governance. As a result of its assessment of the Center's performance the Committee believes that alternative institutional arrangements should be established to undertake ISNAR's important functions in the areas of research and services to NARS, phasing out ISNAR.
19. In accordance with the above, the Committee proposes that ExCo discusses with the ISNAR Board the plan for transferring its activities to other institutions following a three to five-year phase-out period. Its performing activities and staff should be devolved to other Centers, Regional Associations, NARS, Challenge Programs, and to other institutions.
20. The additional analysis proposed by the Science Council should focus on a detailed phase-out plan, including the duration of the phase-out period.

21. The Committee is concerned that ISNAR is advertising for a new Director General and has proposed an \$11 million 2003 program, assuming no phase-out. The Committee recommends to the ExCo to recommend to the ISNAR Board that their program should be a phase-out program, and their new Director General's mandate should be the implementation of the phase-out and transfer of functions.

Program Committee Meeting Minutes September 23, 2002

The Executive Council Program Committee held its inaugural meeting on Monday, September 23, 2002 at the CGIAR Secretariat Office. The following members participated in the meeting: Ruth Haug (Chair), Ann Waters-Bayer (Vice Chair)/Monica Kapiriri, Jock Conly/Rob Bertram, Jacques Ekebil, and Magdy Madkour. Attending as observers were Emil Javier, Adel El-Beltagy, Shellemiah Keya, and Abdel Nabi-Fardous.

General Comments/Recommendations on Center Reviews

- There is a need to clarify the issue of how the programmatic and management aspects of the reviews should be handled in the Center. Some members of the PC feel that there are good reasons for combining the two components together and it should benefit from the collaboration between the iSC and the System Office.
- In including EPMRs in its agenda, PC sees that part of its role is to look into the review reports in a holistic manner and identify cross-cutting systemwide issues. In the process, it will focus on points of contention (e.g. disagreements on specific recommendations by parties concerned) and gaps to be filled.
- PC recognizes the need for monitoring the progress of the implementation of the EPMR recommendations. It recommends that it be considered in planning the review process. The TORs of review panels should include recommendations on the appropriate timeline and identifying milestones/ indicators of progress. It is recognized that the Center Boards have the responsibility for follow-up action and monitoring of implementation of recommendations. However, PC finds it critical to communicate, on a regular basis, the progress of implementation to the CGIAR members and other stakeholders. It recommends that the Centers concerned incorporate this periodic report into their MTP submissions. It is further recommended that the System Office prepare a summary (in matrix form) of the reports and identify systemwide programmatic issues from the reports. This should be submitted to the ExCo/PC.
- At ExCo2 (London meeting), mechanisms for handling grievances and transparency of information on compensation were raised as systemwide issues identified by Center reviews (e.g. by the CIP EPMR). Although the issues are not, by themselves, programmatic in nature, the PC views them as important issues that have impact on program management. The PC is pleased to note that these are currently being examined by the CBC/CDC and looks forward to knowing the outcome of the discussions.

CIP EPMR

- PC reviewed the findings and recommendations of the CIP EPMR panel, and the Center's responses and iSC's commentary on the review report. It noted that the

- iSC agreed to all recommendations, and that CIP's responses to all but one recommendation were positive.
- PC concurs with the review recommendations. The members see an urgent need to implement the recommendations, particularly “the development of vision and strategic plan that will integrate crop improvement and protection, natural resource management and the social sciences.” PC members expressed concern that, as noted by the iSC, the need for strategic planning and setting priorities was already raised by the previous review (4th CIP EPMR).
 - PC endorses the iSC's recommendation that the configuration of CIP's breeding efforts should be evaluated by a Center-commissioned external panel no later than 2004.
 - PC flags publications in refereed scientific journals as a key indicator of the extent to which a center of excellence has been productive in its scientific work. PC joins the review panel in encouraging CIP to improve its record in this area.
 - CIP should draw a plan of implementation of the EPMR recommendations with clear timeline and targets; PC recommends the monitoring/reporting mechanism described above.

ISNAR EPMR¹

- PC is impressed by the forthrightness and directness of the ISNAR EPMR report. It concurs with the iSC's assessment that the report is of high quality (although with some inconsistencies).
- In examining the findings and recommendations of the review, the Committee noted that four recommendations were fully endorsed/accepted by the Center, two were endorsed with caveat, one was only partly endorsed (i.e. three out of four components were endorsed), and two were not endorsed. The iSC agreed to all the recommendations except one (i.e. the Panel's recommended option on ISNAR's future).
- The Committee's discussion focused on the following: the importance that the CGIAR attaches to the mandate and functions of ISNAR, how ISNAR has managed its mandate, and the options for the future.
- PC agrees with the Panel's conclusion that the mandate and functions performed by ISNAR continue to be of high importance to the CGIAR, perhaps even more now than before.
- PC recognizes that ISNAR has performed well in a number of areas but also notes serious shortcomings in others, much of which are programmatic in nature and directly relate to its core functions (research/generating knowledge and institutional strengthening).
- PC agrees that “business as usual” is not acceptable. However, it also agrees with the iSC that other options have not been sufficiently explored. It therefore recommends (as iSC recommends) that a change team be created to examine other options that will enable the CGIAR to carry out the above functions more

¹ At the request of Ruth Haug, Ann Waters-Bayer chaired the meeting when the ISNAR EPMR report was discussed.

effectively and efficiently. It supports the view that research and service functions should go together in the new mechanism. It should consider opportunities for decentralization and devolution of some activities, expanded partnerships and networking arrangements with other institutions (within and outside the CGIAR System), and the possibility of a “virtual center”. The Committee noted the CDC’s interest in participating in the change team proposed to be created.

- Noting the potential impact of any decision on the Center’s future, the Committee recommends to hold in abeyance the search process for a new ISNAR DG.

Programmatic Issues of Challenge Programs

The following questions about Challenge Programs were raised in the meeting. Recognizing that these are best addressed in the ExCo plenary, the Committee did not conclude or make any recommendations.

- How will the CPs impact on Centers’ core funding and heartland activities? To what degree will there be competition between CPs and Centers’ core programs? What are the risks to CGIAR in entering into a number of large, high resource-requiring and long-term CPs?
- Should the processing of CPs under the regular process proceed as scheduled? Would it not be prudent for the CGIAR to take some more time to learn lessons from the pilot process?
- Given the three pilot CP proposals endorsed by the iSC, are there indications that some members/funding agencies would like to have more CP options to choose from?
- If any, what is the minimum funding requirement that should be met before a CP is allowed to commence? It should be noted that some donors are able to indicate funding only upon program approval.

Other Business

The Committee also briefly touched on some issues concerning the recommendations of the Working Group on Science Council. The Chair decided that they are better discussed in the full ExCo meeting.