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1. Executive Summary: Findings

1.1 Introduction

The CIAT Board of Trustees commissioned a governance and management review of the CGIAR research program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). The review had been included in the original program plan for CCAFS and was timed to provide an early but informative assessment of governance and management as these occur within a CRP and in relationship to the center that serves as the fiduciary for the program. The review took place between January 1 and May 30, 2013.

The reviewers were asked to address issues in four areas:

- Programmatic structure, principally the relationship of the CCAFS program management committee (PMC), the Independent Science Panel (ISP) and CIAT board, in terms of developing strategy, addressing conflicts of interest and resolving conflicts.
- Governance and management structure, in particular its clarity, effectiveness and comparability
- Monitoring and evaluation, principally internal knowledge sharing and communication
- Assurance and financial management

The issues to be addressed with regards to programmatic structure are informed by and overlap with those in governance and management. The report addresses each of the issues raised by the ToR in these two areas, but in an order that is designed to present the issues in context and as fully as possible.

The report is organized into six sections:

1. Executive Summary: Findings
2. CCAFS Programmatic, Governance and Management Structures
3. Monitoring and Evaluation
4. Assurance and Financial Management
5. Recommendations
6. Additional Issues (including a comparison of CCAFS with GRiSP and CRP5: Water, Land and Ecosystems)

1.2 Findings

The review findings are presented in the order in which issues were raised in the Terms of Reference.
Programmatic Structure

1. The CCAFS Program Management Committee (PMC) and the ISP have developed effective mechanisms and practices for strategic decision making with respect to program priorities, performance and resource allocation. To manage the transition from a CG Challenge Program to a CRP has entailed the development and ongoing adaptation of management and oversight practices specific to the structure and demands of a CRP. To assure that the program benefited from as broad a base of knowledge and buy-in as possible one adaptation has been to extend participation at the management committee level to include the full management team. The management team and the ISP make good use of their respective roles to assure that research activities are focused and productive, and that resource allocations support the ongoing strategic alignment CCAFS research program.

2. The ISP and CIAT board have clarified the role of the ISP in CCAFS governance. Both the composition of the ISP and the transparency of its decision making minimize the potential for conflict. The management and governance design of CCAFS reduces the points at which vested interests—involving participating centers, donors or the lead center—might create real or potential conflicts of interest.

3. CCAFS management team has pursued a strategy in its relationship with participating centers and partners that emphasizes broad consultation, good communication, and transparency about the basis for decision-making. The conflicts that have emerged have been carefully resolved and used to improve practices or refine policies. This strategy will become increasingly important as resource allocations focus on development outcomes and on improving the strategic alignment of research activities. Good practices in this area should also support the respective roles of CIAT and the Consortium in the conflict resolution process in the event conflicts move beyond the PMC.

4. Boundary issues between CCAFS and other CRPs become clearer as all the programs move from planning to implementation. CCAFS has worked to resolve the most evident and uses its regional leaders and center contact points to uncover redundancies as well as opportunities for better collaboration and efficiencies. The centers and the Consortium have significant roles to play in recognizing and resolving overlaps or mis-assigned research activities.

Governance and Management Structure

5. CCAFS has the management structure it needs and has attracted the staff expertise required to lead and manage the program. There are high expectations for management performance and good mechanisms for evaluation and ongoing staff development. The regions have expanded from three to five. The identification of the full roster of directors for the regions is an opportunity to focus on building the capacity of these managers to deliver on outcomes. Center contact points have a critical role to play in
building productive relationships within participating centers and assuring that work plans and annual reports are timely and well focused. Orchestrating the work of 15 participating centers is no small task. CCAFS has invested in improving the quality of interactions with contact points and supporting the best performance possible through an annual meeting and consistent communication. Evaluation of center contact points is now informal, focused primarily on identifying underperforming relationships and quietly inducing DGs to motivate better performance or make changes in the assignment. CCAFS should consider whether a more formal evaluation process for contact points would add value.

6. CCAFS governance structure supports the effectiveness of the CIAT’s board as the legally accountable entity. The chair of the ISP reports annually to the board and recommends the program’s budget. There are good boundaries between the two governance entities and a healthy level of discourse between them. The quality and independence of the ISP members offer important assurances to the CIAT board that programmatic matters have been rigorously considered and the basis for decisions and recommendations is clear and free of conflicts of interest.

7. While the budgeting and financial management of CCAFS is excellent, the number of participating centers and differences in management systems that now exist make it extremely difficult for the CIAT board to look below the CRP level to assess and manage risk. Both the corporate services staff at CIAT and the CCAFS staff work diligently to generate accurate financial reports, but their work is dependent on the underlying quality and accuracy of the centers’ systems, which vary.

8. The most significant potential for conflicts of interest relate to the perception that decision-making within CCAFS and CIAT is biased in favor of CIAT as the lead center (or another center with undue influence). There are practical reasons for this risk to be minimal (CIAT is not the largest of the participating centers in the program) and the design of the PMC and the ISP—both populated without regard to the role of participating centers, donors or partners—offers additional assurances. As a matter of practice, all three bodies—PMC, ISP and CIAT board—have conflict of interest policies in place.

9. CCAFS governance and management structures establish a unique level of independence when compared to other CRPs (the review looked at GRiSP and CRP5: Water, Land, and Ecosystems). The members of the management team have been selected without undue deference to participating centers, and their time and their accountability is wholly allied to CCAFS. CIAT has established good mechanisms for fulfilling its duties with respect to the CRP but has a “lighter hand” than other lead centers in inserting its presence into the CRP’s management and oversight. In general, the emergence of CRPs has not changed the management role of CIAT as much as it has changed the role of the board. Strategy and priority setting within CRPs and by the Consortium will crowd the place of these functions in the boardroom. The impact of resource mobilization and allocation on management and governance are not as clear. In some respects, bilateral funding provides the
centers with leverage within CRPs, but that funding is also contingent on the priorities and expectations of donors. CIAT preserves its ability to influence strategy and structure by engaging actively with the CRPs in which it is participating and with the Consortium.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

10. The recent review of CCAFS by the European Commission looked closely at monitoring and evaluation at a number of levels within the program. CCAFS has established good mechanisms at the programmatic and management level to assess the relevance and quality of research, and identify indicators that would facilitate monitoring and evaluation. More generally, CCAFS has instituted an organizational culture in which reflection and learning are the norm. Constructive engagement and feedback are also part of the relationship with participating centers and partners in order to improve performance throughout the CRP. CCAFS continues to position the research activities of participating centers and partners to achieve closer alignment with the Consortium’s strategic framework and development outcomes, and to engage in the system-level processes for monitoring and evaluation under development.

11. CCAFS has developed an effective strategy for knowledge sharing and communications. It has been systematic in building internal communications and mechanisms for sharing knowledge, and has begun to use its external communications to build greater global and regional awareness of CCAFS and issues involving climate change and agriculture. The strategy relies heavily on leveraging the centers’ existing communications capacity and progress in this area has been steady.

**Assurance and Financial Management**

12. The processes for CCAFS budgeting, financial management and reporting demonstrate the quality and professionalism of the financial staff at CIAT and CCAFS. As a fast-tracked CRP, CCAFS has taken the lead on creating processes, formats and templates that have been adopted by other CRPs and the Consortium. With 15 participating centers (and 16 CRPs), these functions badly need to be harmonized using a common, system-wide platform for maintaining financial and management information. CCAFS reliance on Excel-based reports to collect and synthesize information is inefficient and time consuming, and an alternative solution is recommended until the implementation of a system-wide platform.

13. A more robust internal audit function for CRPs is being developed at the Consortium level. The present center-focused internal audit practices do not address the needs of cross-center activities and functions such as CRPs. CCAFS is among the CRPs scheduled for internal audit in the coming year. This should provide the CIAT board with greater assurance than it can obtain presently.
2. CCAFS Programmatic, Governance and Management Structures

2.1 Context

The original incarnation of CCAFS as a challenge program provided the template for the program’s organizational design as a CRP, particularly its management and governance structures. As a challenge program, CCAFS functioned in a space within the CGIAR system that was “informal” in legal terms with a relatively small footprint with respect to governance, planning and evaluation. The University of Copenhagen served as the fiscal agent, providing financial and administrative services to the program as well as assuring compliance and transparency on fiscal matters to donors and partners. The program benefited from a steering committee that provided guidance and expertise on substantive matters, and, had CCAFS remained a challenge program, the program would have been subject to periodic external reviews commissioned by the CG Science Council and donors.

In becoming a CRP, CCAFS’ organizational framework has expanded and become substantially more complex:

- It is one of 16 CRPs operating as part of the Consortium, aligning its research within a system-level strategic framework, subject to a consolidated funding mechanism for the majority of its resources, meeting an evolving set of compliance functions, and, eventually, participating in new monitoring and evaluation processes.
- It now has a lead center, CIAT, with a more highly articulated role in governance and management than was the case when the university served in a similar role.
- Its budget has grown from $14 million in 2009 as a challenge program to $69.8 million in 2012 as a CRP.
- While its research framework remains the same in terms of comprising four overarching themes, it has expanded the regions in which it works from three to five.
- Fifteen centers now participate as partners, a level of center engagement that is shared by no other CRPs.

Although there are drawbacks to the complexity in which the program now operates, the benefits—to the achievement of CCAFS’ core mission and to the CGIAR’s larger mission as a result of these changes—are likely to be substantial. As a CRP, CCAFS enables an extraordinary alignment of climate-related research activity across the centers and the opportunity to leverage resources in the strategic and coherent pursuit of results. The accompanying shift in scale and focus also leverages the program’s capacity to be influential in global settings where the
impact of climate change on agriculture in vulnerable populations has not drawn sufficient notice.

2.2 Governance Structures

From its start, CCAFS was an outward facing program that drew key staff, advisors and partners from outside the CG-system. This was particularly true for its theme leaders, three of whom are associated with U.S. and U.K. universities, and for the composition of its steering committee, which was independent by design, and, with the exception of the Earth Systems Science Partnership (now Future Earth), did not include pro forma representation of either donors or partners.

In becoming a CRP, the program continues these practices, most notably preserving the independent character of the steering committee’s successor body, the Independent Science Panel (ISP), and maintaining the flexibility to engage broadly beyond the CG system for research talent and partners. In carrying these qualities forward into a new corporate structure and a reformed system, the program embodies many of the goals of system reform while also challenging the conventions of governance and management within the CG centers. While each element in the organizational life of CCAFS evolves—the role of the Consortium, the role of the CIAT board and the ISP, CIAT’s leadership, the leadership and management of CCAFS, and 15 center partners—the process is aided by the embrace of change, particularly at the leadership level within CIAT and CCAFS, and by the transparency, good will and general good nature that characterizes the working relationship of the DG and the program director, and their counterparts on the CIAT board and ISP.

2.2.1 CIAT as the Lead Center

CIAT was one of five centers that expressed interest in serving as the lead center for CCAFS. It was selected by the program’s Steering Committee in part because of CIAT’s commitment to the goals of the CG reform process and its willingness to be a highly engaged and constructive part of the ongoing development of new CG.

Among the issues the review is asked to address are conflicts of interest and conflict resolution. Unlike the position of the lead center in other CRPs, CIAT is not the largest of the participating centers in CCAFS, and within CIAT itself, CCAFS involves only 20 percent of CIAT’s research budget. The relative standing of CIAT in the program and the program within CIAT helps to minimize the potential for conflicts of interest as well as to moderate the potential sources of conflict that exist when the lead center has a dominant stake in the program.

This is not an advantage that can be easily accomplished in other CRPs, such as GRiSP or CRP5 (WLE), where locating the lead center anywhere other than IRRI or
IWMI would make little sense. Nevertheless, there is a considerable advantage to CCAFS in having a lead center that is a minority “shareholder” in the program, particularly if CIAT and its board are called upon to resolve conflicts between the program and participating centers.

### 2.2.2 CIAT’s Board of Trustees

Both in theory and, presently, in practice, there are carefully delineated spheres of authority and accountability between CIAT, as the lead center, CCAFS and the Consortium [Figure 1]. In the organizational chart, CIAT is clearly the gatekeeper—the board has unambiguous legal duties as the entity accountable to the Consortium for the performance of the contract under which the CRP is funded and CCAFS management reports through the center’s DG.

In addition to its duties with respect to the CRP, the board continues to fulfill a broader set of duties and responsibilities for CIAT as a whole, including shaping an overall strategy for CIAT and monitoring the significant percentage of its research agenda conducted through participation in CCAFS and other CRPs. The last adds a particularly deep wrinkle to the task of governance given that CIAT is currently a partner in 11 CRPs.

While the final decision to work within specific CRPs belongs to the CIAT board, the board’s role in priority setting and resource allocation is more subject than it was in the past to the role of the Consortium in strategy and evaluation, to decision making within the CRPs, and by extension, to the decision making of the lead centers responsible for the performance of CRPs. CIAT’s management and board navigate this shift in role by remaining active at the Consortium level and by playing the roles available to them in CRPs, whether as members of steering committees or members of advisory and oversight bodies. The board has also focused closely on understanding and managing the risks to CIAT that are inherent in its participation in multiple joint ventures and its role as the lead center directly accountable for the performance of CCAFS.

The composition of CIAT’s board reflects the center’s mandate and its relationship with the Colombian government [Figure 2]. It is a small board with seven elected members (one current vacancy), and four ex officio members, including CIAT’s DG. With the exception of a member with experience in climate matters, who has been recruited specifically to serve as the board’s representative to the CCAFS ISP, the CIAT trustees have been recruited for expertise in research, finance, strategy and corporate governance that is relevant to the center.

The board is attentive to its duties and prerogatives as the governing body for CIAT and as the fiduciary for the CRP. Without being obstructionist or indulging in micro-management of CCAFS, the board has engaged in robust discussions with the ISP chair about the panel’s terms of reference and about its programmatic
recommendations. To date, although it has supported the actions taken by the ISP, the board has not been a rubber stamp. The relationship appears to be working to the advantage of both CIAT and CCAFS.

While the relationship may benefit from the inclusion of a CIAT trustee on the ISP, the last year demonstrates that the relationship is clearly not dependent on it. The position, like other board assignments that come with responsibilities beyond CIAT’s own board room, requires CIAT to identify individuals who possess relevant expertise and the ability to accommodate the additional demands that conscientious performance requires.

The position has symbolic import and asserts the board’s stake in the quality and integrity of CCAFS work—neither of which is a small thing, particularly at the start of the program. But, it may be a governance mechanism with diminishing returns—hard to manage over time and yielding little value to the CIAT board not already accomplished through the independent character of the ISP itself. CIAT now controls the appointments to the ISP and is strongly motivated to maintain the integrity of its role and composition. The ISP’s work is subject to review and approval by the board. Again, the board is motivated and obligated to evaluate this work with great care. Based on this, it is not clear what additional advantage or assurance the board gains from this particular form of representation on the ISP, and the reviewers recommend that the CIAT board revisit representation on the ISP when the position is up for renewal [R-1].

2.2.3 Independent Science Panel

CCAFS’ Independent Science Panel brings together the range of experience needed to provide programmatic oversight to the CRP. The ISP is a critical element in CIAT’s accountability for the quality, relevance and effectiveness of CCAFS research strategy. It has nine voting members, and three ex officio nonvoting members; its composition reflects geographic diversity and balance in terms of gender, and includes a global partner (Future Earth) [Figure 3]. With the exception of a CIAT trustee, the ISP does not include a donor, or a designated country or regional representative. The program plan for the CRP proposed including a representative from one of the participating centers and a representative of the Consortium as nonvoting, ex officio members, but the positions were not filled. One member of the panel currently chairs the ILRI board, but serves on the ISP in her capacity as the CEO of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network rather than for her role in ILRI.

The panel has a comprehensive mandate and meets twice a year [Figure 4]. The agendas for its meetings more closely resemble a governing board than a program or advisory committee, but it is clear from the timing of agenda items in the ISP's annual plan of work and from references in the minutes of its meetings that the ISP
closely aligns its work with the requirements of the CIAT board for timely reporting and decision making in connection with CIAT’s responsibilities as the lead center.

In its first meetings, the ISP has reviewed the overall strategic direction of CCAFS and has provided feedback to the program’s staff on the clarity and focus of the research agenda. Much of its initial round of meetings also dealt with the challenges of getting the program up and running, and addressing a range of policy issues with respect to participating centers use of unexpended funds, capital expenditures, and staying abreast of the Consortium-wide issues involving monitoring and evaluation. In addition to recommending overall budgets and budget allocations to the CIAT board, the ISP, after careful review, endorsed the addition of two regions for CCAFS (Latin America and Southeast Asia).

Setting the agenda for each meeting involves the chair soliciting feedback from members in advance of the agenda, maintaining a rolling list of proposed topics and agenda items that emerge from the meetings themselves, and consulting with the program director, who has in turn solicited suggestions from the Program Management Committee/Management Team.

The agenda is clearly evolving to address more nuanced issues, including a plan for CIAT/ISP commissioned reviews, and also working with management to develop the criteria against which research activities will be evaluated and resources allocated. In concert with the program’s management team, the ISP is positioning its work to contribute to the ongoing refinement of CCAFS strategic agenda and its priorities within the Consortium’s strategy and results framework and the development of system-level monitoring and evaluation.

The value of the ISP as part of a CRP involves both the quality of its work as an independent, expert body, and the composition of the panel itself. By 2014, the panel members who served on the challenge program Steering Committee and continued on to the ISP will have cycled off. This places pressure on the panel to work closely with CIAT to identify the quality and diversity of candidates that will enable the ISP to sustain its current character and role. To do this, a nominating committee has been formed that includes the ISP chair, CIAT’s DG, and the ISP representative from Future Earth.

The ISP has instituted a process for self-assessment, which is indicative of the standards to which the panel holds itself. It has also indicated that it plans to hold one of its meeting in conjunction with CCAFS’ annual science meeting to provide panel members with a deeper experience of the program.

With a membership currently numbering 12, including CCAFS program director ex officio, the board is large, particularly given that it now functions in a structure that includes CIAT’s governing body. The board should review the size of the ISP and consider reducing voting members from nine to seven [R-2]. A smaller size would
not deprive the ISP or CCAFS of the level of expertise it requires and over time might enhance the panel’s functionality.

While attendance is relatively good, each meeting has involved the absence of two to four members. With two meetings a year, uneven attendance will eventually affect performance. The ISP should institute minimum attendance or participation requirements [R-3].

In addition, the ISP needs to begin succession planning for the position of chair. Given the systematic efforts to increase the program’s partnerships and visibility at the global level, the chair has played an important and constructive role as a champion of the program and someone able to use his networks and reputation to advance its work. This is a demanding assignment and has required a substantial commitment on the part of the chair. If it is important to sustain this level of commitment and engagement as part of the chairmanship of ISP, it is necessary to begin to identify and cultivate potential candidates as quickly as possible to assure CCAFS and the ISP of the level of leadership it needs and to provide continuity [R-4].

2.3 Programmatic Structure

2.3.1 Strategic Decisions by Management (Program Management Committee)

The review asked for an evaluation of the “mechanism by which programmatic strategic decisions are made by the Program Management Committee (PMC) and the Independent Science Panel.” In order to address this element of the review, it is important to broaden the lens to look more generally at how the program’s management team works on both strategic and administrative matters. The decision making function has become more relevant to the review than the mechanism.

Although the PMC was intended to serve as the strategic focal point for the program at the management level—aligning, supporting, evaluating, and refining the program’s strategies, activities and results from the vantage point of the program’s major research themes—it has come to share that assignment more broadly with the management team, including the regional directors and members of the program coordinating unit (CU). Technically, the PMC comprises six people—the program director, the theme leaders and one of the regional directors. These continue to be the voting members, whose role at this point only emerges to determine a quorum for doing business, and, if there is no consensus within the larger group, to vote to reach decisions.

The broadening of the group reflects a number of practical realities:

- The number of decisions CCAFS needed to make as one of the first CRPs to be funded—everything from the contracts with each center to the formats for submitting work plans, budget requests, budget reports and program reports
• The articulation of the organizational values and internal accountability of the management team and the program management unit
• The need to clarify and strengthen the way theme leaders and regional leaders would work together
• The development of policies in response to unanticipated but significant resource utilization issues, including unexpended funds and the inclusion of major capital purchases in budgets
• The expansion of the regional structure to include two additional regions
• Useful discussions about the benefits and drawbacks of consolidating working relationships with centers versus increasing the extent to which staff and programs would be lodged within CIAT
• The need to stay connected and uniformly well informed about activity at the Consortium level

The team meets monthly usually by videoconference. Twice a year a smaller group meets in person in conjunction with ISP meetings. Additionally, the team participates in an annual meeting with center contact points.

Attendance at the management committee meetings is exceptionally high. Absences are noted in the minutes and it is rare to see a member of the team absent on a regular basis. The program director sets the standard in this regard, conscientiously making the meeting a priority on his own calendar.

The net result of this broader and more collaborative management process is a remarkable level of coherence, collegiality and knowledge across the program. It is evident watching the group at work and reading the minutes of meetings that as an issue or question is raised, a proposal is made or a concern is expressed, there is an expectation that team members will participate and the space is provided to do so. The meeting is orderly and productive: decisions are made, assignments and next steps are clear, the agendas are continuous (issues don’t appear to get lost from meeting to meeting).

In terms of strategic decisions, CCAFS management is clearly in the process of negotiating the transition from a large, unwieldy inventory of 157 existing activities and commitments that centers “mapped” to the CRP under the heading of climate change to a more coherent portfolio of activities that is more strategic in intent and anticipated results. The transition, still underway, relies on:

• the management team’s systematic review of end-of-year reports to assess progress toward outcomes and commitment to program priorities, and
• the evolution of more robust and informative processes at the front end for centers to outline their research activities and work plans.

The task of bringing activities into alignment will be enhanced by the Consortium requirement that programs develop and use IDOs (Intermediate Development
Outcomes), which more clearly articulate the results that are expected to be achieved. CCAFS management is beginning the process of sharing this outcome-oriented framework with participating centers and engaging them in defining the program’s IDOs. It used the March meeting of center contact points to explore CCAFS theory of change, and the five draft IDOs that had been developed within the management team.

CCAFS management team is alert to the consequences to centers of its decisions with respect to clarifying both CCAFS’ strategy and intended outcomes. As the management team reviews and discusses work plans and reports, the management team is called upon to communicate better with the centers, provide coaching and feedback to improve the quality of the reports themselves, and to compare notes with each other about where activities failed to reflect program priorities or to be of sufficient quality to warrant continued support.

These deliberations increasingly inform tough decision-making. In 2013, the management team after reviewing draft work plans rated: 3% of proposed activities to be not strategic; 40% as somewhat strategic; and 57% as highly strategic. The differences among centers relative to the research relevance of activities were also significant. The ratings clarified with centers the need to bring better strategic alignment to activities, and also made clear the basis for decisions to modify allocations.

This is a consistent feature of CCAFS culture and organizational strategy: to communicate clearly and transparently with centers, and when gaps appear in the focus or quality of the work to address them. In communicating the adjustments that would be required to 2013 allocations, CCAFS management laid out the weightings that would factor into decisions [Figure 5]:

- Strategy (strategic fit)
- Reflection of CCAFS principles (partnerships, communicating CCAFS, intercenter synergies)
- Ambition (bilateral support, ambition of activities and deliverables, reporting of outcomes)
- Administrative efficiency (timeliness)

Similarly, for 2014, CCAFS has articulated a set of criteria that will guide resource allocation:

- Outcomes/IDOs are going to rule how CCAFS does business
- Gender and social differentiation will matter (papers, outcomes, serious shift in emphasis)
- Raising bilateral funding needs to happen
- Improved partnerships need to be evident (partnership budgets rise to 30%)
- Inter-center collaboration in the regions also need to be evident
The process for arriving at the criteria and then using them to make decisions reaches consensus within the management team and then is shared with the ISP, CIAT’s management, the participating centers and eventually with CIAT’s board.

2.4 Managing Conflicts of interest/Conflict Resolution

2.4.1 Conflicts of Interest

CIAT Board of Trustees

Between the CIAT board’s composition and its practices, CIAT has at the governance level a framework that minimizes the potential for conflicts of interest between the center and the CRP for which it is the lead as well as between the center and the other participating centers in the program. The board has also demonstrated a relationship with the ISP within which the value of the ISP is maintained even as the CIAT board continues to explore the larger questions concerning the role of center governance in relation to the Consortium and CRPs.

ISP

The composition of the ISP also serves to mute the potential for real or perceived conflicts of interest. Additionally, each meeting of the ISP includes a declaration of any potential conflict along with the proposed remedy (usually refraining from acting on matters that might appear to be, or would constitute, a conflict).

CCAFS Program Management Committee/Management Team

Early in the management team’s work, members addressed the issue of conflicts of interest by creating a hierarchy of action:

- a PMC member or participant with a conflict would be asked to withdraw from the meeting;
- if a quorum could not be obtained due to withdrawals related to conflicts of interest, the PMC would postpone the meeting until a quorum was possible;
- if no quorum could ever be achieved because too many PMC members had conflicts of interest, the conflicts would be very carefully documented in the minutes and the case for the choices made would be detailed.

Participating Centers/Host Centers

An additional area in which conflicts of interest emerge involves centers’ commitment to seek bilateral support for their activities within CCAFS. As CRPs have become operational, there is motivation to “divert” resource mobilization to
the CRP for which a center is the lead rather than follow through on commitments to seek the bilateral support that informed initial planning and budgeting within the program. CCAFS has limited capacity to engage in resource mobilization and cannot depend wholly on CIAT or the Consortium to play this role. Increasingly, CCAFS has incorporated the willingness to raise bilateral support for activities mapped to the program as an indicator of a center’s “ambition” for the activity and one of the criteria for allocating resources.

While not a conflict of interest in the traditional sense, the dual accountability of senior managers to CCAFS and to a host center does present some inherent conflicts. Theme leaders and regional directors are fully employed by CCAFS but technically employed by host centers. The capacity to preserve relationships with centers and the opportunity to build cross-center, cross-program synergies argue for utilizing host centers for these positions, but it also places the team member with management accountability to CCAFS in potential conflict with the person and organization that are technically supervisor and employer. The problem has not presented itself often, but it represents a challenge that accompanies the decision to distribute management personnel and related investments through the centers rather than consolidating the reporting structure through employment with the lead center.

### 2.4.2 Conflict Resolution with Centers

In addition to conflicts of interest, CCAFS has also had to resolve conflicts with the participating centers. These have typically involved a decision with financial consequences for the center or for CCAFS, and follow a path that seeks resolution at the lowest level of the CRP management and governance structure as possible. It is notable that in the examples shared with reviewers, the CIAT DG did not step in too early, trusting that the capacity to reach a resolution existed within CCAFS management. Communication about the nature of the conflict and its resolution was shared throughout the process with CIAT’s management and board, and with the chair of the ISP. Each instance of conflict was scrutinized for lessons to be learned and adjustments made to the way CCAFS does business if necessary. This approach is likely to be important as decisions are reached with respect to 2014 resource allocations if, in the course of assessing strategic alignment or program ambition, decisions affect a center’s bottom line.

### 2.5 CCAFS Overlap with Other CRPs

Climate change is a big envelope within the CG system. The extent to which CCAFS overlaps with other CRPs has two aspects: the intermediate effects of the initial process by which centers “mapped” their activities to CRPs, and more persistent challenges with overlapping mandates and geography.
In “mapping” center activities to CRPs, it is clear that more activities were included in CCAFS than belonged there. The opposite is probably also true, particularly for lead centers that chose to retain activities rather than assign them to CCAFS where they might more appropriately or logically belong. For CCAFS, mismatches will be resolved as part of aligning resources with the research strategy. At a broader level, the assignment issues will resolve themselves, or be resolved, as the CRPs evolve, as existing restricted funding expires, or as the Consortium begins the process of renewing or modifying contracts for CRPs.

For CCAFS, the more complicated boundary issues involve other natural resource CRPs—Water, Land and Ecosystems, and Forests, Trees and Agroforestry—or one of the “systems” CRPs. When it can, CCAFS has pursued a strategy to coordinate the location of research sites in those regions where multiple CRPs are operating, and has clarified the boundary with GRiSP on rice research. The latter may indicate a way to do something comparable in the other commodity-based programs. It has also built awareness with the center contact points of potential cross-center and cross-CRP partnerships and highlighted their strategic value or their potential benefits in terms of cost-sharing or capturing economies of scale.

Overlap, redundancies and inefficiencies may be evident to program directors, but the ability to resolve them at the level of CRP management may be limited. Center DGs would appear to have the bird’s eye view of the problem, particularly given the multiple CRPs in which most centers participate. By now a center’s research staff must be acutely aware of where overlap creates inefficiencies or hampers results. It is not clear whether the role of lead center or the size of a center’s stake in one or another CRP favors the status quo and inhibits the process of minimizing overlap or clarifying boundaries. To the extent that these issues involve significant resources or influence the quality and productivity of research, center management and boards will be required to play a more direct role in finding a resolution or have the responsibility for this broader alignment rest with the Consortium.

2.6 Management Structure

2.6.1 CCAFS Program Director in the CIAT Management Structure

As noted early in the review, CIAT’s DG and CCAFS program director have a strong and respectful working relationship. The character of the relationship relies less on the organizational chart than on a good sense of what each will be held accountable for accomplishing. This insight into what really matters, supported by good practices, makes this a productive relationship. In many respects, the relationship between the DG and the program director shows CIAT to be equally a model partner and a model lead center.
There is little benefit either to CIAT or CCAFS in attempting to make the relationship function in a way that conforms to CIAT’s internal management structure. Communication between the DG and the program director is strong as is the communication between the CCAFS and CIAT staff at other points in the working relationship. As it happens, one of the leaders of Theme 1 in CCAFS is a director of CIAT’s Decision and Policy Analysis research area and is a member of the CIAT management team, which facilitates the additional flow of high-level information between the program and the lead center.

The working relationship at the leadership level between the CRP and the lead center is also helped by the management design of the program, in which CIAT may have accountability for CCAFS and a “superior” position in the organizational chart, but does not insist that the relationship of the program director be substantively subordinate to CIAT’s DG or a deputy director as is the case with other CRP management arrangements. It is difficult to imagine that the latter model would be effective in attracting or retaining the talent and skill required to lead a program that is both new and complex. CCAFS represents about two-thirds of CIAT’s total budget, but CIAT’s research stake in the program, while significant, does not make it a majority “shareholder.” Given this, the relationship between the directors should be cordial and collegial, which it fortunately is, and not subject to notions of “command and control.”

2.6.2 Managing for Results

CCAFS senior management team is expected to be comfortable with management and prepared to do it well. The leaders within the four themes, with one exception, work full time for CCAFS, as do the five regional program leaders. Even though hosted by other centers and technically employed by the host center, the leadership and management commitment is to the program—to help manage for results, to engage in planning and priority setting, partnership development, coordination, finance and budgeting. These are assignments that require the skills to bring out the best in partners and colleagues, to motivate performance, listen and communicate, and build productivity.

The clear accountability of the management team to the program enables the program director to manage for results. Managers have annual performance goals and are evaluated each year using a multi-source process that invites feedback from the people with whom the manager must successfully interact. Designed to be constructive, there is nevertheless a frankness to the process that has been bracing and also disconcerting to some on the management team. Managers who need additional help to develop certain skills are given ways to acquire them, but also given the space to determine if management at this level is the role they wish to play.
CCAFS has fostered a learning culture, where feedback is repeatedly solicited and taken seriously. It consults broadly when hiring for a position but the program director has carefully reserved the prerogative to hire for what he believes are the skills and temperament needed to succeed in a particular job. He has not hired exclusively from within centers, and even when inviting a center’s participation in the hiring process, doesn’t relinquish his role in making the decision.

2.6.3 Center Contact Points

The ability to choose the team does not extend to the center contact points, who are assigned this role by the centers for a job that requires anywhere from 25 percent to 50 percent of the individual’s time.

These individuals are a critical link in CCAFS’ relationship with participating centers. The contact point has substantial responsibility to facilitate the relationship between CCAFS and its partner centers, transmit information to the centers, and make sure that work plans, budgets and reports meet the program’s expectations and are timely [Figure 6]. In the case of a serious conflict that emerged between CCAFS and a center, a part of the grievance could be traced to a contact point who failed to communicate and failed to be responsive when it mattered. It is a tough assignment and there are 15 people who hold it. It is also a position that requires some finesse and standing within the center to gain compliance in submitting plans and reports.

CCAFS holds an annual meeting that brings the contact points together to stay informed and engaged, but also to build ties to the program and the people who work in it. A subtext for the meeting is the opportunity to build good will and teamwork between the centers and CCAFS, and establish the mutual accountability and reciprocity that fuels a productive culture. The most recent meeting conveyed a clear sense of the direction of the program and the factors that would shape the 2014 budget allocations. The group was given the opportunity to develop familiarity with CCAFS theory of change and to work directly on the IDOs with regional and theme leaders. This level of understanding and buy in will be critical as the draft IDOs guide strategy, resource allocation and evaluation of the work of CCAFS and the centers.

In 2012 and again in 2013, contact points were asked to provide feedback about the effectiveness and quality of program management and the program coordination unit. The most recent survey provides a healthy give and take about the program’s strengths and weaknesses, which management takes seriously. In a parallel vein, the performance of the contact points also needs to be assessed periodically in an equally transparent way. At the moment, the quality and timeliness of center reporting provide an indirect way to assess performance and reveal to the management team when a contact point is not pulling his or her weight. Feedback to the DGs has been informal and generally effective. This may be the best path
given that 15 centers are involved with CCAFS. At a minimum, the benefits of more formal evaluation should be considered to determine if they would add value or just add to the program’s managerial tasks [R-5].

2.6.4 CCAFS Regional Structure

The most unwieldy place in CCAFS management structure is at the regional level. The expectation is that through this structure coherence can be achieved “across themes from field to regional level,” partnerships can be facilitated and center activities managed to produce substantial outcomes and impact. This is an enormous assignment that often involves establishing working relationships in areas where centers have operated without much coordination in the past, and where there is a lot of jostling for partners. The survey of contact points reflected some dissatisfaction in the working relationships between the centers and the regional structure, and acknowledged problems on both sides that led to frustration about communications and coordination.

If the regional strategy offers an important opportunity to produce outcomes, more needs to be done to support the way the regional programs operate.

CCAFS has expanded its regional programs from three to five and needs to focus on building capacity within this part of the program and management structure to assure that it functions effectively in its front-line role. In the same way that CCAFS has nurtured the capacity of the center contact points, it needs to focus specifically on how to support the success of its work at the level at which it expects to achieve significant outcomes, and faces both the biggest challenges and biggest opportunities in working with centers and partners [R-6].

3. Monitoring and Evaluation

3.1 Program and Management Evaluation

Earlier sections of the review describe a strong commitment to evaluation within CCAFS and the development of practices that continuously hone the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of both the research program and CCAFS management. The ISP provides a level of oversight and expertise that is rigorous and balanced; the program management committee has a good grasp of CCAFS strategy and goals, and is diligent in assuring that the quality and focus of the work supports them; as a management team, the program director, the CU staff, and the theme and regional leaders are committed to being effective as managers and responsive to those who rely on them to be efficient, timely, transparent, effective communicators, and good partners.
The recent review of CCAFS by the European Commission considered the multiple levels at which monitoring and evaluation occur within CCAFS and at the Consortium level. As CRPs begin the process of implementing the Consortium’s strategic framework, the Consortium Office is focused on developing a system-level approach for monitoring and evaluation. The EC noted the need to moderate the demands of evaluation processes on program and research staff as well as the risk that quantitative, outcome-based evaluation would lead to risk-averse decision making within the CRPs.

CCAFS’s leadership and management are comfortable with the need to define development outcomes for the program, work closely with the centers to enhance their capacity to work successfully within this framework, and establish mechanisms for evaluation that conform to the Consortium’s goals and expectations.

### 3.2 Knowledge Sharing and Communications

In building a strategy for knowledge sharing and communications, one emphasis has been on identifying products with the ability to attract attention and to build the brand and influence of CCAFS and the CGIAR in the global climate change community. Another emphasis is on building the internal capacity of the program to communicate effectively, share information and support good decision-making.

CCAFS has had some notable successes, described as “quick wins” in the CIAT 2012 annual report, getting attention for its work and building its reputation. To give two examples, the report of the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change was downloaded 30,000 times; and the Big Facts website (870 million people are chronically undernourished) had 10,000 unique page views in the month after it launched. In the 2012 survey of contact points, CCAFS external communications was rated “good,” but CCAFS struggles to get centers to flag upcoming publications for promotion and distribution, and to co-brand their work with CCAFS on a regular basis.

At the center contact point meeting in March, the communications team used the opportunity of having so many centers in the room to ask participants to look ahead and list the reports and publications that were scheduled to appear in the next six months. This surprisingly low-tech appeal for work or activities that would benefit from getting noticed generated a healthy outpouring of ideas.

At this stage, CCAFS is demonstrating that it can be an effective communicator and a rewarding partner by getting the CG work on climate change noticed. It needs to accelerate the recognition within centers that the program’s communication capacity and skills add value to the work the centers do, and raise the profile not just of CCAFS but also of center contributions to climate change research. Progress
to date has been good and likely to continue given the competence and focus of the program coordinating unit in this area.

4. Assurance and Financial Management

4.1 Financial Oversight and Risk Assessment

The engagement of 15 centers and four universities in CCAFS places formidable challenges on CIAT and the program for financial oversight and risk assessment. While the results-based strategic framework and strategic level outcomes unify work across CRPs, a CRP that undertakes contract management, budgeting and financial oversight with 19 entities faces administrative burdens in these areas that exceed what other CRPs must contend with. The burden for the leader center to provide oversight and manage risk is equally taxing.

CIAT as the lead center has ultimate responsibility for financial oversight and prudent risk management. Its ability to fulfill this responsibility is greatly enhanced by the degree to which CCAFS program management and the ISP have shared in these tasks and facilitated the board’s work in these areas.

CCAFS coordinating unit has established a stand-alone capacity to manage contracts, budgets, financial reports, funds cash flow and policies and procedures that support consistency and transparency in CCAFS work with participating centers. This has been essential for ensuring timely and accurate reporting. The unit drew heavily on the expertise within CIAT corporate services to get the program’s contract and financial management off to a good start, and continues to benefit from a collaborative working relationship with CIAT’s Deputy Director General, Corporate Services, and the staff in these areas.

Separating this function from the lead center, while maintaining strong communication and cooperation between the unit and its counterparts in CIAT, has enabled CIAT and CCAFS to establish independent controls. It has greatly enhanced the ability of the program management team as a whole to use financial performance as a tool for monitoring results, establishing priorities, and allocating resources, which supports ongoing risk management.

CCAFS Program Director and the Senior Manager of Finance, Contracts and Liaison possess organizational and management skills that have contributed greatly to addressing both the financial complexity of the program and effective oversight. As one of the first CRPs funded, CCAFS shared its experiences with other CRPs as well as a set of financial tools and practices that could be adopted by them. The lessons learned by CCAFS and the resources it developed continue to be of value to other CRPs and to the Consortium as policies and procedures evolve.
The ISP also contributes in a significant way to financial oversight and risk management. With final review of budget allocations before approval by the CIAT Board, the ISP provides an important independent assessment of resource allocations, and shapes policies on significant financial matters such as the use of unexpended funds and capital expenditures. As noted elsewhere in the report, it not only provides “checks and balances” over management, but also represents the independent judgment of people without allegiance to any specific participating center.

The ISP reviews closely the balance of resources between themes and among regions, and with the program management team, monitors the quality and impact of research. Because it only meets twice a year, it has timed its work to assure that CCAFS can meet its contractual obligation to participating centers to provide six months notice if center allocations will be reduced. To do this, it approves conservative budget projections that provide the flexibility to add resources if they are available using criteria that have been established with the program’s management. In addition to assuring the CIAT board that budgets are prudent, the practice also minimizes the risk of conflict with the centers over shifts in allocations as the CRP sharpens and refines its strategy and steps up evaluation.

Short of audits, which are undertaken by CIAT’s board, CCAFS has in place an effective budgeting and financial system that facilitates good oversight and financial transparency for participating centers, and provides assurance for CIAT's board that internal controls are adequate and financial reporting is timely and accurate.

CCAFS’ system was not easy to put in place nor is it easy to maintain. Nevertheless the development of a system that must work with 15 participating centers, within a lead center that is itself participating in 11 CRPs, offers a unique learning opportunity for the CG system as a whole and a persuasive argument for adopting a common accounting platform and management information system that all CRPs use.

4.2 Budgeting, management and reporting

4.2.1 Contracts Management

The performance of CRPs and the associated reporting and management issues are carefully spelled out in a series of legal agreements—notably between the CRP and lead center, and between the CRP and participating partners. The CIAT contracts group does an excellent job of ensuring that appropriate contracts are in place, adequately address reporting requirements, and are amended when necessary.

The agreements covering CCAFS and participating centers specify:

- CCAFS coordinating unit’s responsibility for operational management
- Use of CGIAR Financial Guidelines, including cost allocation guidelines
- Financial recordkeeping and reporting
- Use and disbursement of funds
- Activity Plan and Budget, prepared and reviewed annually and based on PMC recommendations
- The right of the lead center to audit activities by participating centers
- Monitoring and evaluation by the lead center consistent with CGIAR reform principles

### 4.2.2 Budgeting

The budget process begins with CCAFS annual program planning process, including setting objectives, projecting outputs, establishing milestones and specifying activities across the four research themes. After a careful review of the resulting annual work plans, the activities are incorporated into a budget that undergoes additional review and refinement before being presented to the ISP.

The budgeting process and the release of funds to participating centers have been particularly complicated given the need to orchestrate the budgeting process with 15 participating centers and the delays and differences in funding originating from the Consortium.

The original assumptions about funding reflected in the five-year budget projections for CCAFS, envisioned a growth in the funds available through Windows 1 and 2, and a decreased reliance on bilateral funding over time. This has not been the case so far [Figures 7a and 7b]. Funding from Windows 1 and 2 has been lower than projected and centers, which agreed to generate bilateral funding in support of their research activities, have also fallen short in meeting budgeted commitments.

As noted elsewhere in the review, CCAFS management team has responded to these eventualities by budgeting conservatively and developing clear criteria for allocating available resources. Given the overall complexity of the process and the current framework, CCAFS is commended for the design and execution of the budget process.

### 4.2.3 Accounting and Financial Reporting

While the budget process is outstanding, the tools to compile the budget and produce financial reports are not ideal for the level of monitoring and evaluation that CCAFS requires. With an Excel-based budget model in place, the Senior Manager of Finance faces significant hurdles in gathering data and reporting results. Maintaining this model requires a great deal of manipulation and adjustment, and while it allows some automation, the model contributes to delays in processing, requires frequent reconciliations, and wastes valuable personnel time.
The Consortium requires biannual reporting of CRP program and financial matters by the lead center. These reports have changed, and expanded, so that for 2012 there were a total of nine reports for CCAFS. To complete these reports required collecting and consolidating information from 15 centers, which each had to download information from their accounting systems (or manually input it) into Excel-based reports. The CCAFS staff then had to further consolidate these reports into the reports to the Consortium. While the CCAFS finance staff is commended for developing a process and templates that enabled detailed and accurate reporting of the CRP’s financial performance, and for providing a model that other CRPs have been able to adapt for their own use, this painstaking approach is not a sustainable strategy for managing and reporting financial information for the program.

Two additional matters are worth noting: the potential for cascading overhead expenses and personnel expenses based on estimates. With diligence, the CCAFS staff has reduced the amount of overhead expense that was generated as centers subcontracted with other centers, but as the number of partners and activities expands, overhead can quickly multiply. With respect to personnel expenses, centers currently estimate their personnel costs in connection with CCAFS activity and there is no practical way to confirm actual personnel costs or to determine if personnel expenses are under booked or over booked given the extent to which center research staff are engaged in multiple CRPs. Given the reporting systems and the number of reports that need to be synthesized and reconciled, there is no easy way to address these issues on a straightforward basis.

Although the Consortium plans a system-wide adoption of the ERP system, Agresso, there have been delays in its implementation and concerns about the amount of time that will be required to have the system operational. Given the limitations and inefficiencies of using Excel, we recommend that CCAFS implement in the interim a cloud-based planning and forecasting tool, using the Agresso module if possible but other software if not [R-7]. This is urgently needed to enable more prompt, consistent reporting from participating centers, to decrease the time required for manual budget updates, and to provide the flexibility for the centers and the program to project the impact on research activities of differing funding scenarios.

**4.3 Adequacy of the internal audit function to provide assurance on CCAFS activities beyond CIAT**

CCAFS is reported in CIAT’s annual budget, and is audited as part of CIAT’s annual external audit. The details of CCAFS’ budget, including the allocations to participating centers, are detailed in exhibits to CIAT’s financials, and the annual audit includes confirmation of funding from participating centers through “comfort letters” requested of each of the participating center’s auditors. These provide assurance that:

- The CCAFS expenditures for the participating center itemized on the attached schedule accordance with the participant agreement
• The expenditures are in accordance with CGIAR financial guidelines
• Nothing has come to the auditors’ attention requiring modifications

Consistent with the current CGIAR audit guidelines, which stipulate “the internal audit function remains the responsibility of the Center Board and management,” CIAT is responsible for the internal audit of its program and operations, including CCAFS. Given the complexity of auditing CRP activities taking place across 15 participating centers and four universities, CIAT’s board and management, even with access to internal auditors, has limited capacity to propose or oversee adequate audits of the CRP.

While the current audit guidelines are well documented, and apply and operationalize the standards adopted by the Institute of Internal Auditors, the focus is strictly on addressing a center’s needs, on behalf of the center’s board and its Audit Committee. These guidelines do not address to a sufficient degree the internal control and reporting issues for cross-center research programs such as CCAFS and other CRPs.

The matter of CRP audits is being addressed by the Consortium. Both Adam Avni, CGIAR Senior Internal Auditor, and Blanshard Marke, CGIAR Director of Internal Audit, affirmed that the CG is in the process of revising the Audit Guidelines. The CGIAR Internal Audit Unit (IAU) is in the process of establishing audit programs for CRPs, with the plan to commence audits in May 2013, and proceed with at least three audits by the end of 2013, including CCAFS.

In the past, CIAT has relied on the CG internal audit unit for access to audit services, rather than retain this capacity on a standing basis in the center. This has been an efficient way to undertake internal audits in the past. With the advent of CRPs, and to address the need for internal audits of CCAFS, CIAT should support the effort to bring all internal audits of the CRPs into a central Consortium unit, reporting to the CGIAR Director of Internal Audit. In making this shift, the CIAT board should retain a reporting relationship for this function that includes the chair of the Audit Committee. Centralizing CRP internal audits will help prevent duplication of work and standardize audit procedures. It also represents an opportunity to reduce the costs of internal audits. This would address CIAT and other centers’ need for this level and type of independent assurance, while still allowing centers to continue to undertake internal audits of a center’s programs and functions [R-8].

Internal audits are often conducted on a cyclical basis (every three years, every five years, for example). The CIAT Board and management should encourage a new approach that focuses initially on assessments of CRP and center risks as the basis for selection of specific centers and CRPs, and uses that assessment to prepare a tailored audit work program designed to address those risks [R-9].
This new approach will allow the Director of Internal audit to provide stronger assurances regarding the reporting reliability and internal controls associated with a CRP to a center’s Audit Committee as well as to participating centers.

The reviewers note that current CG audit guidelines reflect standards developed by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO), a joint initiative of five private sector organizations, including the Institute of Internal Auditors and Financial Executives International. COSO is dedicated to providing thought leadership on the development of comprehensive frameworks and guidance on internal controls, risk management and fraud deterrence. With COSO issuing a new framework in May 2013, we highly recommend the adoption of this model by CCAFS [R-10]. It will enable the program to develop and maintain systems of internal control that are effective and efficient as well as reflective of emerging standards of practice in this area.

5. Recommendations

This review occurs early in CCAFS organizational life and that of CRPs. Management and governance practices are evolving and adapting quickly to address ambiguities, improve processes, or correct for differences between the theory of the program and actual practice. CCAFS operates with a unique and compelling lack of inherent conflicts because of an organizational design put in place early and respected by its lead center. It must also contend with the complexity of working effectively and achieving results with a large number of participating centers.

CIAT and CCAFS confronted the challenges of being among the first CRPs to get off the ground and worked their way through a thicket of issues that have informed the way other CRPS approach identical or similar tasks. The experience of the program has also highlighted the need for greater harmonization of common functions across the CRPs, principally in the financial arena but also in HR and knowledge management. The reviewers have attempted to remain focused on CCAFS, and to avoid straying to issues outside the scope of the review. With that in mind, the recommendations primarily focus on things that CIAT and CCAFS can implement rather than on things that should or might happen elsewhere in the CG system.

1. The CIAT board should revisit its representation on the ISP when the position is up for renewal. The position may be a governance mechanism with diminishing returns—hard to manage over time and yielding little value to the CIAT board not already accomplished through the independent character of the ISP itself. CIAT now controls the appointments to the ISP and is strongly motivated to maintain the integrity of its role and composition. The ISP’s work is subject to review and approval by the board. Again, the board is motivated and obligated to
evaluate this work with great care. Based on this, it is not clear what additional advantage or assurance the board gains from representation on the ISP.

2. **The board should review the size of the ISP and consider reducing voting members from nine to seven.** With a membership currently at 12, including CCAFS program director *ex officio*, the board is large. A smaller size would not deprive the ISP or CCAFS of the level of expertise it requires, and over time might enhance the panel’s functionality.

3. **The ISP should institute minimum attendance or participation requirements.** While attendance is relatively good, each meeting has involved the absence of two to four members. With two meetings a year, uneven attendance will eventually affect performance.

4. **The ISP needs to begin succession planning for the position of chair.** Chairing the ISP is a demanding assignment and requires a substantial commitment. If it is important to sustain this level of commitment and engagement as part of the chairmanship of ISP, the process to identify and cultivate potential candidates should begin as quickly as possible.

5. **CCAFS’ Program Director should assess the benefits of a more formal performance evaluation process for center contact points to determine if such a process would add value to program management.** Center contact points play an important role in supporting the effectiveness and productivity of participating centers. Assessment is now informal and problems are communicated by the program director to the center DG. While adequate at this stage of the program’s development, a more informative process may have mutual benefits for CCAFS and the contact point.

6. **CCAFS Program Management Committee needs to focus on building the capacity of the regional directors and the regional programs to assure that this part of the program and management structure functions effectively in its front-line role.** The addition of two new regions and regional directors provides CCAFS with the opportunity to strengthen and support management at the level at which it expects to achieve significant outcomes.

7. **Given the limitations and inefficiencies of using Excel, CCAFS should implement a cloud-based planning and forecasting tool, using the Agresso module if possible but other software if not.** Although the Consortium plans a system-wide adoption of the ERP system, Agresso, there have been delays in its implementation and concerns about the amount of time that will be required to have the system operational. CCAFS urgently needs to enable more prompt, consistent reporting from participating centers, to decrease the time required for manual budget updates, and to provide the program and the centers with the flexibility to project the impact on research activities of differing funding scenarios.
8. **CIAT should support the effort to bring all internal audits of the CRPs into a central Consortium unit, reporting to the CGIAR Director of Internal Audit.** In making this shift, the CIAT board should retain a reporting relationship for this function that includes the chair of the Audit Committee. Centralizing CRP internal audits will help prevent duplication of work and standardize audit procedures. It also represents an opportunity to reduce the costs of internal audits. This would address CIAT and other centers’ need for this level and type of independent assurance, while still allowing centers to continue to undertake internal audits of a center’s programs and functions.

9. **The CIAT Board and management should encourage a new approach to commissioning and scheduling internal audits that focuses initially on assessments of CRP and center risks as the basis for selection of specific centers and CRPs, and uses that assessment to prepare a tailored audit work program designed to address those risks.**

10. **CCAFS should adopt the frameworks and guidance on internal controls, risk management and fraud deterrence the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO) will release May 2013.** This will enable CCAFS to develop and maintain systems of internal control that are effective and efficient as well as reflective of emerging standards of practice in this area. The current CG audit guidelines reflect earlier standards developed by COSO.

### 6. Additional Issues

#### 6.1 Comparison to GRiSP and CRP5: Water, Land and Ecosystems

The Terms of Reference included a request for a comparison between CCAFS governance and management structures and those of two other CRPs. **Figure 8** provide an overview of these structures for GRiSP, which like CCAFS was approved for funding early in development of the CRPs, and CRP5 (WLE), which has a level of complexity comparable to CCAFS in terms of the number of participating centers.

This part of the review is not intended to provide an assessment of the adequacy or quality of governance and management of the two other CRPs. The review notes only where the structures are similar or different. The CCAFS review has focused on the questions raised in the Terms of Reference, the mandate of CCAFS and the role of CIAT as the lead center rather than comparisons to the structures or performance of other programs.

The reviewers note the following:
• The management functions and size of the program coordinating unit of CCAFS are comparable to CRP5 (although leadership changes in the program director’s position may change this). The administrative functions for GRiSP are provided by IRRI and the respective participating centers (CIAT and AfricaRice), and consequently are a smaller percentage of GRiSP’s budget (1 percent in the program plan).

• The CCAFS program management committee is smaller than its equivalents in the other CRPs, although it may be functionally the same size due to CCAFS decision to expand participation to the full management team.

• GRiSP and CRP5 populate the equivalents to the PMC with representatives of participating centers, including the lead center, and major partners. The latter are described in the program plans as having made a substantial financial or in-kind contribution to the programs.

• The oversight and governance equivalents of the ISP in GRiSP and CRP5 are a hybrid, including independent members and center/partner representatives. The majority of members and the chairs of these bodies are independent.

• GRiSP is reported to the boards of the participating centers through the inclusion of board members from those centers on the oversight committee. CCAFS is reported to the CIAT board through the ISP chair, although a member of the CIAT board is an ex officio member.

In maintaining the centers as the corporate unit of the CG system and re-aligning research across the system within the CRPs, management and governance functions have multiplied. CCAFS does not appear to have a management footprint larger than it needs to provide a robust level of planning and execution of its research mandate. It also does not appear that CIAT has surplus or redundant management capacity because CCAFS or other CRPs have developed or purchased duplicative capacity. This may not be true of other centers involved in fewer CRPs, but it is true for CIAT, which in addition to serving as a lead center, is a participant in 11 other CRPs.

6.2 Implications of CRPs on Center Governance

CCAFS has established a sound mechanism for the program’s oversight, but the ability of CIAT’s board to exercise the full scope of the role that center boards have traditionally played is a matter for debate.

The review focuses on how the current set of arrangements functions for one program and its lead center. It was difficult to avoid looking forward to see additional complexity emerging in the governance arena with very real questions about who does what. As the Consortium refines or expands its role in setting strategy, developing and allocating resources and evaluating for results, this
traditional sphere of responsibility within each of the centers is likely to substantially change.

When the comparable organizational charts for the 11 CRPs in which CIAT participates are stacked alongside the branching boxes and solid and dotted lines of the organizational chart for CCAFS, there is some question about the extent to which the CIAT board—or any center board—continues to play a meaningful role in strategy development or priority setting for those activities conducted within CRPs. The CIAT board clearly plays a role in assuring that CIAT’s mandate is met, and for developing and executing on a strategy for CIAT as a valued and influential leader in the region.

At the same time, the fiduciary responsibilities of the center boards remain in place. The review notes the current challenges that CIAT’s board faces in gaining the level of assurance it needs to fulfill its legal duties. In this area, there appears to be real progress being made at the Consortium level to establish resources that will enable the board to meet its responsibilities with confidence.

6.3 Post-Proposal Strategic Financial Planning for CRPs

The program plan that CCAFS submitted to the Consortium for approval and funding reflected the initial “mapping” of the centers’ existing climate change research to the CRP’s proposed research framework. This additive process, combined with additional budget projections for partnership, gender, capacity building, knowledge management and program administration, resulted in five-year budget projections that continue to appear in annual reports as originally calculated.

Each year the allocation of funds from Windows 1 and 2, the restricted funds from Window 3, and bilateral funding are compared to the projections in the original program plan. It is not clear how useful this comparison continues to be. CCAFS and other CRPs should be approaching the time when three and five year budget projects are not the sum of many pre-existing center “parts,” but instead reflect a coherent vision of what the program has the opportunity and the competitive advantage to achieve. This may need to be accompanied by a different strategy on restricted and bilateral funding, which currently holds CCAFS hostage to centers willingness to mobilize bilateral funding for the program.

At the moment, between reduced or flat allocations from the Consortium [Figure 9] and the unevenness of the participating center’s performance with respect to bilateral funding, the year-to-year comparisons between budgets and actuals based on the program plan communicate a picture of declining or flat support for the CRP within the Consortium. This may or may not be the case. CCAFS may have the level of resources it needs, but lacks the discretion to direct resources more strategically and effectively. Or, it needs substantially more but does not yet have the plan in
place that makes that clear. The financial projections that reflect a more strategic, less encumbered starting point are likely to provide a much stronger case for budget requests to the Consortium and for ongoing resource mobilization than the evidently outdated projections that still persist.
Annexes

A.1. Review Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE CGIAR RESEARCH PROGRAM ON CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY (CCAFS)

August 2012, prepared by CIAT BOT

Introduction

CCAFS was approved by the Fund Council of the CGIAR in November 2010. An external review was to be done in June 2012. However, given the longer than expected period of time taken to finalize all legal documents and initial disbursements throughout 2011, CIAT and CCAFS proposed in early 2012 to postpone the review until January 2013. The Consortium Board and Fund Council agreed to that proposal.

Objective

To undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the governance and management arrangements of CCAFS

Background

As outlined in the CCAFS Program Plan – the Lead Center CIAT will conduct a “governance and management review based on initial experience in CCAFS and fast-tracked CRPs (CGIAR Research Programs)”. The review was proposed during the program preparation stage in relation to comments received by the Fund Council and Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) on the governance systems (in particular the relationships between the CCAFS Independent Science Panel and the CIAT Board) and the complex multi-dimensional collaborations that have to be managed.

The review will address the following areas:-

Programmatic structure:

Reviewers will evaluate

1. the mechanism by which programmatic strategic decisions are made by the Program Management Committee (PMC) and the Independent Science Panel
(ISP) of CCAFS

2. the relationship between the CCAFS ISP and the CIAT Board of Trustees, regarding programmatic decisions and in particular how potential or real conflicts of interest issues are identified and resolved

3. the relationship between the CCAFS PMC and its center partners in relation to programmatic decision-making, and in particular how conflicts are resolved.

4. how the boundaries between CCAFS and other CRPs are managed in relation to programmatic directions and potential and actual overlap, redundancies and synergies

**Governance and Management structure:**

Reviewers will address the following questions.

5. Does CCAFS have an appropriate and efficient management structure and organization in place to shape and influence the evolving CCAFS research agenda and ensure its implementation throughout the CCAFS partnership structure? How does the matrix of regions and themes functions? How does the Center Contact Point System function? Is staff expertise appropriate to carry out the functions of CCAFS?

6. What is the relationship between the CCAFS governance structure and the governance structure of the Lead Center (Board of Trustees)?

7. Does the governance structure of CCAFS provide adequate financial oversight and risk assessment for CCAFS activities?

8. What perceived or real conflicts of interest between CCAFS and CIAT are likely to arise at the governance level and how effectively are they identified and addressed?

9. How does the CCAFS governance and management structure compare to that of other CRPs and what lessons can be learnt across CRPs? To what extent has CCAFS added another layer of management in the CGIAR? Has CIAT’s management role been reduced because of added CCAFS management layers or because of a reduced number of restricted projects as expected as part of the CGIAR reform?

**Monitoring and Evaluation:**

Reviewers are encouraged to take into consideration the ongoing evaluation by the EU of this item and add value to their recommendations.

Reviewers will address the following questions.
10. Is there an effective monitoring and evaluation system in place to track CCAFS contribution to specific development outcomes?

11. Is there an effective system for internal knowledge sharing and communication?

Assurance and Financial Management:

Reviewers will address the following questions

12. Does CCAFS have an appropriate and efficient financial budgeting, management and reporting function in place?

13. Does the internal audit function of CIAT provide adequate assurance to management and the Board on CCAFS activities beyond the boundaries of CIAT?

Review process

The review will take place during the first quarter of 2013. Two evaluators will work on this assignment. The team leader will be an expert on governance and management systems and be engaged for an estimated total of 35 working days, including travel. The other evaluator is expected to cover the assurance and financial management questions (10 days).

The evaluator will work closely with CCAFS Program Director and the Coordinating Unit in Copenhagen and Cali and with CIAT Management (HQ in Cali, Colombia).

It is expected that most of the work will be done via interviews by teleconference, plus specific visits to CGIAR Centers and relevant CCAFS partners. A work plan including proposed visits will be prepared for approval during the first 5 days of work.

In terms of a comparative analysis of other CRPs (see the last question under “governance and management structure”) a comprehensive analysis is not expected. The reviewer is expected to review the appropriate documents from two other CRPs and conduct telephone interviews with 2-3 key stakeholders from those CRPs (it is expected that the other fast-tracked CRP will be covered – GRiSP – as well as one other CRP involving multiple centers, e.g. CRP5).

A detailed report will be delivered to the CIAT Board Secretary, Maria Fernanda Reyes (mfreyes@cgiar.org) by 1 May 2013, and presented to CIAT’s Board and Management at the 13 – 17 May 2013 CIAT Board meeting to be held in Nairobi, Kenya. Following this, it will be delivered and presented to the CCAFS – ISP and Management Team.
A.2. Tables and Illustrations

Figure 1: CCAFS Organizational Chart
**Figure 2: CIAT Board of Trustees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIAT Board of Trustees</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wanda Collins</strong></td>
<td>Research Management, Plant Science, Plant Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Female, USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board Chair 1 Jan 2012 - 31 Dec 2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geoffrey Hawtin</strong></td>
<td>Research Management, Genetic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, UK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice Chair 1 Jan 2012 - 31 Dec 2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Hamer</strong></td>
<td>Biotech, Private sector, Banking and Finance and Fundraising Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graham Joscelyne</strong></td>
<td>Risk and Financial Management, Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, South Africa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Audit Committee Chair 1 Jan 2011 - 31 Dec 2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruth Oniang’o</strong></td>
<td>Food science and nutrition, Gender Issues, Public Sector Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Female, Kenya)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Focal Point for 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex Officio Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruben Echeverria</strong></td>
<td>Director General, Agronomy, Agricultural Economics, Rural Development, R&amp;D Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, Uruguay)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director General, CIAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juan Camilo Restrepo</strong></td>
<td>Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, Colombia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juan Lucas Restrepo</strong></td>
<td>Executive Director of CORPOICA, Agricultural Development, Agric. Economics, Trade and Commercialization of Agricultural Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, Colombia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignacio Mantilla</strong></td>
<td>President of the National University of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male, Colombia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: CCAFS Independent Science Panel 2011 - 2013/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatima Denton</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>• PhD in political science and development studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Leader for Climate Change Adaptation in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Former senior energy planner with the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has worked with sustainable development and climate change vulnerability and adaptation, as well as food security, local governance, water, and energy poverty in the Sahel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel Dinar</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>• Professor of Environmental Economics and Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaches, conducts research and publishes on water economics, economics of climate change, strategic behavior and the environment, and regional cooperation in natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Director of Water Science and Policy Center at the Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeshi Horie</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>• Professor of crop science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Crop physiologist with a special interest in modeling crop production processes and analysis of rice-based agro-ecosystems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• President of the National Agriculture and Food Research Organization (NARO) of Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thierry Lebel</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>• Head of LTHE (Laboratoire d’étude des Transferts en Hydrologie et Environnement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Climate variability in Africa and its impact on the water cycle and water resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holger Meinke</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>• Professor of Crop and Weed Ecology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Crop science – development of technologies for climate risk assessments in the field of adaptation science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Director of the Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture (TIA) and Head of the School of Agricultural Science at the University of Tasmania (UTAS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Roswall (Chair)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>• Professor of soil ecology and expert in microbial ecology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Professor of Water in Nature and Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Former Executive Director of the International Council for Science (ICSU), Paris, France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Former President/Rector of the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Scholes</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>• Professor in the School of Animal, Plant and Environmental Sciences and Director of Postgraduate Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Soil fertility and biogeochemistry in savannas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Position and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lindiwe Majele Sibanda     | 2011-2013       | • Animal scientist.  
• Policy research and advocacy work on food security policies, agricultural productivity and climate change.  
• Coordinating food security policy research and advocacy programs in 16 African countries, all aimed at making Africa a food-secure region. |
| Ram Badan Singh             | 2011-2013       | • Plant genetics, crop improvement, plant biotechnology, policies for agriculture, farmers and agricultural research for development.  
• Is an Advisor and Distinguished Professor, IFFCO Foundation in New Delhi.                                                                                           |
| Christof Walter             | 2011-2013       | • Horticulture, agronomy, environmental sciences and economics.  
• Former Research Manager in Unilever’s Sustainable Agriculture Programme.                                                                                               |
| New appointment             |                 | • ICSU Executive Director.  
• PhD at the University of Bristol, focused on molecular photodissociation dynamics.  
• Previously at Natural Environment Research Council (NERC).  
• Helped found the Belmont Forum of international environmental research funders.  
• Has led the British National Space Centre Earth Observation activities, represented the UK environmental science community at the European Space Agency (ESA). |
| Steven Wilson               | 2013-2013       | • Natural resource management.  
• Program Director, CCAFS; former Director of Forests and Livelihoods Program, CIFOR                                                                                                                                  |
| Bruce Campbell (Program Director) | Ex officio, Ex officio, Future Earth | • Natural resource management.  
• Program Director, CCAFS; former Director of Forests and Livelihoods Program, CIFOR                                                                                                                                  |
The Independent Science Panel (ISP) of the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) is established to ensure independence of the programmatic directions of CCAFS. The ISP is accountable to, and appointed by, the CIAT Board of Trustees as the CGIAR Lead Center of CCAFS. The Lead Center has the right to review all decisions made in CCAFS in respect to potential legal, financial or reputational risks that such decisions may pose, and communicate its concerns through the appropriate channels.

The ISP has a Chair appointed by the CIAT Board, nine members, and three ex officio members (one from the CIAT Board, representing CIAT on behalf of the CGIAR, one representing the Earth System Science Partnership, ESSP and the Program Director). Ex officio members do not have voting rights. The ISP appoints one of its members as Vice-Chair.

The membership consists of internationally recognized scientists in the field of climate change and food security, as well as technical expertise drawn from civil society, development agencies and/or the private sector with a strong record of ensuring outcomes and impacts. Membership should be balanced in terms of disciplinary mix, gender and geographic diversity. The nomination process for ISP members will seek input from the ISP Chair and the ex officio members representing CGIAR and the ESSP, who will consult their constituencies.

Members are appointed for 3 years with possible reappointment for an additional period of up to 3 years to ensure a staggered rotation of members.

The ISP generally meets twice a year.

In order to ensure the independence of the programmatic directions, the responsibilities of the ISP are:

1. To set overall programmatic priorities.
2. To consider annual business plans as submitted by the Program Director and provide advice to the CIAT Board of Trustees.
3. To review proposed annual budget allocation and provide advice to the CIAT Board of Trustees.
4. To approve the activity plan and budget of each Program Participant. The Chair and Program Director will consider changes to the annual activity plans; and consult with the ISP members if needed.
5. To recommend to the Lead Center, if required, a modification of a Program Participant Grant.
6. To recommend termination of a Program Participant Agreement (PPA) if the Program Participant is in breach of its responsibilities.
7. To develop a mechanism to ensure that the emerging results from ex ante analyses are leading to strategic allocation of resources.
8. To consider an annual report as submitted by the Program Director.
9. The ISP Chair will report annually to the CIAT Board of Trustees and liaise with the Director General as needed.
10. CGIAR and ESSP ex officio members will regularly update their constituencies on CCAFS progress, and alert them to any emerging opportunities or threats that are of significance.
Figure 5: Variable Weighting for 2013 Resource Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit of activities</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of representation in CCAFS portfolio</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection of CCAFS principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: activities and reporting</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership budget</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating CCAFS</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Center synergies</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral percentage</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition of activities and deliverables</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of outcomes</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Terms of Reference for CCAFS Center Contact Points

CGIAR Climate Change Contact Points from each Center will be established to interact with the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). They will be selected by Centers.

1. Integration of CCAFS activities: Working with CCAFS Theme Leaders and Regional Program Leaders to ensure appropriate linkages between CCAFS and centre activities.

2. Coordination with other CGIAR Centers: Engage to ensure effective cross-Center collaboration on CCAFS.

3. Work plan and budget development:
   a. Participate in CCAFS annual planning meeting and in ex ante priority setting exercises and work with Centre scientists and financial staff to develop the Centre’s activity plan and budget for the following year.
   b. Coordinate among scientists in the Centre to share communications from CCAFS and organize and ensure timely delivery of Centre inputs to CCAFS.

4. Implementation: Be the link for CCAFS to the Center and its responsibility to carry out CCAFS-related activities as per the Annual Activity Plan, including facilitating or encouraging cross-centre collaboration where suggested or opportune and moving from outputs to outcomes and impact.

5. Annual technical support: Coordinate with Centre scientists to ensure timely delivery of Center annual technical report for CCAFS.

6. Scientific progress: Participate in at least one meeting per year of the CGIAR Climate Change Contact Points to undertake shared critical review of scientific progress and identify emerging opportunities for policy impact and research coordination, bringing in and sharing the perspectives of Centre scientists and ensuring that meeting outcomes are shared with Centre scientists and other relevant stakeholders.

7. Data sharing, publications and communications: Ensure appropriate data sharing, communications, dissemination and branding of Centre/CCAFS activities, publications, and results in line with the provisions in the Program Participant Agreement (PPA).

8. Centre management: Liaising with the Center on management and administrative issues as appropriate.

9. Integration with other CGIAR Research Programs: Assist, where feasible, with helping CCAFS link with other CGIAR Research Programs.
Figure 7a and 7b: 2011-2014 Budget

**Figure 7a: 2011 – 2014 budget per source of funding**

- 2011: $40,564 (W1 & W2), $21,374 (W3 & Bilateral)
- 2012: $46,687 (W1 & W2), $51,373 (W3 & Bilateral)
- 2013: $42,762 (W1 & W2), $37,314 (W3 & Bilateral)
- 2014 (Est.): $41,080 (W1 & W2), $34,900 (W3 & Bilateral)

As CCAFS funding drops from W1 and W2, there is greater reliance on W3 and bilateral fundraising by Centers.

**Figure 7b: 2011 – 2014 budget per category**

- 2011: $42,425 (Centers), $4,546 (Theme and Regional Program Leaders), $14,967 (Coordination and Mgmt)
- 2012: $46,687 (Centers), $5,554 (Theme and Regional Program Leaders), $17,605 (Coordination and Mgmt)
- 2013: $42,762 (Centers), $4,744 (Theme and Regional Program Leaders), $13,908 (Coordination and Mgmt)
- 2014 (Est.): $41,080 (Centers), $4,673 (Theme and Regional Program Leaders), $14,247 (Coordination and Mgmt)
Figure 8: Governance and Management Comparison of CCAFS with other CRPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Governance and Oversight</th>
<th>GRISP CRP3.3</th>
<th>Water, Land and Ecosystems CRP 5</th>
<th>CCAFS CRP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participating Centers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 Centers (+ CPWF, FAO)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Center</td>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>IWMI</td>
<td>CIAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP Governance</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Independent Science Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 ex officio</td>
<td>9 ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 DGs ex officio</td>
<td>2 ex officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Seven external experts</td>
<td>Eight independent members (including FAO-1 and GFAR-1)</td>
<td>Nine independent experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five board members from principal centers (IRRI-2, AfricaRice-2, CIAT-1)</td>
<td>Three CGIAR members (ILRI-1, IWMI-2)</td>
<td>Ex officio: Partner (Future Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex officio: DGs – IRRI, AfricaRice,</td>
<td>Ex officio: Program Director DG - IWMI</td>
<td>CIAT board program director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Chair: an external expert</td>
<td>Chair: an independent member</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected by OC members</td>
<td>Selected by ISP members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>3 yrs x 2</td>
<td>3 yrs x 2 (initially – Chair to consider if/how to stagger terms)</td>
<td>3 yrs x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members appointed by CIAT board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center board members report to respective center boards</td>
<td>IWMI Board</td>
<td>CIAT board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>1 x year</td>
<td>2 x year</td>
<td>2 x year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional meeting optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRISP CRP3.3</th>
<th>Water, Land and Ecosystems CRP 5</th>
<th>CCAFS CRP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Management</strong></td>
<td>Program Director: Bas Bouman</td>
<td>Interim Program Director: Andrew Noble</td>
<td>Program Director: Bruce Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant management tasks the responsibility of IRRI, AfricaRice, CIAT</td>
<td>Seven person Operations Team including Program Director</td>
<td>Six person coordinating unit + Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Mobilization in Program/Program Director’s ToR</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Evaluation, Resource Allocation</strong></td>
<td>Program Planning and Management Team</td>
<td>Management Committee</td>
<td>Program Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition</strong></td>
<td>Program Director DDGs IRRI, AfricaRice Research Area Director, CIAT Partners: CIRAD, JIRCAS, IRD</td>
<td>Program Director, SRP Leaders, Working Group Leaders (These members are from IWMI, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFPRI, ICRAF, Bioversity, CIAT)</td>
<td>Program Director, Research Theme Leaders, Regional Program Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center/Partner positions in planning, evaluation, resource allocation</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the Program Plan projected increases in W1 and W2 funding over time, the actual funding has been dropped, resulting in projected funding in 2014 from W1 and W2 that is less than half the original amount.
A.3. Resources and Interviews

The review included the review and analysis of program and financial documents; interviews with key personnel at CIAT, CCAFS and the Consortium, and members of the CIAT board and ISP, and responses to questionnaires. The reviewers also relied on their knowledge of best practices in nonprofit governance, management and finance.

**Review of key documents included, but not limited to:**

- Budgets for years 2011, 2012 and 2013
- CIAT Audited Financial Statements for 2011 and 2012
- CCAFS Financial Reports to Consortium for 2011 and 2012
- CCAFS Program Plan
- CCAFS Business Plan, 2012
- CCAFS Consolidated Logframe of Activities, 2013-2015
- Activity plans
- Center annual reports to CCAFS (examples)
- CCAFS Program Management Committee Minutes
- PMC proposal to add additional regions
- Proposed performance indicators for CCAFS management function
- CCAFS Knowledge Sharing for Internal Communications document
- Monthly bulletin to stakeholders from Program Director
- Documentation of center conflicts/resolutions
- CGIAR Financial Guidelines
- CGIAR Audit Charter
- ISP Meeting minutes
- CIAT Board of Trustees Meeting minutes
- Center Contact Points, 2012 meeting minutes, 2013 survey
- Means for allocating funds to Centers
- External Auditor presentation to CIAT Audit Committee – 2012 Audit
- Minutes – Meetings between CIAT DDG Corp Services and CCAFS Mgt
- CCAFS Risk Catalogue
- Joint Agreement – Consortium and Fund Council
- Consortium Performance Agreement – Consortium and Fund Council
- Program Implementation Agreement – Consortium and CIAT
- Program Participant Agreements – CIAT and participating Centers
- CRP5: Water, Land and Ecosystems Program Plan
- GRiSP Program Plan

**Interviews were conducted with the following:**

**CCAFS**
- Bruce Campbell, CCAFS Program Director
- Pramod Aggarwal, South Asia Region
• Osana Bonilla, CCAFS Theme Science Officer
• Andrew Jarvis, Theme 1
• James Hansen, Theme 2
• Ana Loboguerrera, Latin America Region
• Clare Stirling, CIMMYT Contact Point
• Vladimir Smakhtin, IWMI Contact Point
• Torben Timmerman, CCAFS Head of Program Coordination and Communications
• Phil Thornton, Theme 4
• Gloria Cecilia Rengifo, CCAFS Senior Manager of Finance, Contracts and Liaison
• Reiner Wassman, IRRI Contact Point
• Robert Zougmore, West Africa Region

Independent Science Panel
• Thomas Rosswall, chair
• Takeshi Horie
• Holger Meinke
• Lindiwe Majele Sibanda
• Ram Badan Singh

CIAT
• Ruben Echeverria, CIAT Director General
• Albin Hubscher, Deputy Director General, Corporate Services
• Andres Pacheco, Contracts Assistant
• Fernando Osorio, Financial Coordinator
• Vicky Ramirez, Contracts Coordinator
• Maria Fernanda Reyes, Board Secretary
• Julian Rivera, Financial Assistant
• Jose Rodriguez, Head of Finance
• Nathan Russell, Corporate Communications
• Joe Tohme, Agrobiodiversity Research Director
• Andre Zandstra, Resource Mobilization Officer

CIAT Board of Trustees
• Wanda Collins, chair
• Geoffrey Hawtin
• John Hamer
• Graham Joscelyne, chair, Audit Committee

CGIAR
• Frank Rijsberman, CEO, CGIAR Consortium
• Adam Avni, Senior Internal Auditor, CGIAR
• Blanshard Marke, Director of Internal Audit, CGIAR
• Peter Gardiner  Executive Director  CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council
• Sirkka Immonen, CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council
• Rachel Sauvinet Bedouin, Head, Independent Evaluation Arrangement

Meetings Observed/Attended
• PMC, February 19
• Center Contact Point meeting, March 17/18

Questionnaires were answered by the following:
• Allison Poulos, CRP Process Manager, Bioversity
• Ch Sridhar, Project Finance & MIS Manager, ICRISAT
• Nadeesha Rajapaksha, Project Officer, IWMI
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MAUREEN K. ROBINSON
8217 HAMILTON SPRING COURT
BETHESDA, MD 20817
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Independent consultant

Practice focuses on nonprofit governance, management, planning, organizational development and evaluation. Clients include foundations, cultural organizations, educational institutions, social service organizations, and research institutes.

Director of Education
BoardSource (1990 - 1998)
(formerly the National Center for Nonprofit Boards)

Designed and managed the education and public programs of BoardSource, the national nonprofit organization dedicated to strengthening the effectiveness of nonprofit boards of directors.

As BoardSource's founding director of education, created the strategy and framework for a national program that addressed the governance needs of nonprofit organizations. Developed a consulting service that provided tailored training and facilitation annually to more than 100 nonprofits in the U.S. and abroad, a comprehensive board information library and referral service, an annual leadership conference, distance learning programs and comprehensive governance training programs for consultants and nonprofit technical assistance providers.

Special Assistant, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Museums
Smithsonian Institution (1987 - 1990)

Organized and conducted the searches for executive level positions in the Smithsonian Institution, including director of the Museum of the American Indian, director of the National Museum of American Art, director of the Freer and Sackler Galleries, deputy director for program at the National Museum of Natural History, and director of the Archives of American Art. Supervised and conducted management studies of selected Smithsonian programs within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Museums.
**Financial Consultant**
Merrill Lynch (1985 - 1987)

Developed long-range financial plans and managed the financial assets of individuals, nonprofit organizations, and small businesses.

**Director, Legislative Program**
American Association of Museums (1979 - 1985)

Founded and directed first legislative advocacy program for museums at the AAM, the leading national organization representing the nation's 5,000 museums. Monitored appropriations for arts, education and science-related federal programs, and legislation and regulation relating to nonprofit tax issues. Prepared testimony for Congressional hearings, created grass-roots network within museum community for lobbying purposes and communication systems that enabled rapid and well-informed responses to legislative and regulatory issues.

**Associate Editor of Publications**
American Association of Museums (1975 - 1979)

Wrote and edited monthly newsletter for members, and edited *Museum News*, the AAM's journal.

**Publications**

- The Chief Executive’s Role in Developing the Nonprofit Board, Booklet 2 in the NCNB Governance Series, National Center for Nonprofit Boards
- Developing the Nonprofit Board: Strategies for Educating and Motivating Board Members, National Center for Nonprofit Boards
- Gifts of Appreciated Property, American Association of Museums

Regular contributor to nonprofit trade publications on nonprofit leadership

**Education**

- B.A., The George Washington University, 1974
- New York University, 1970 -1973

(2013)
BRIAN P. FLOOD  
C: (443) 838-6352  email: floodbp@comcast.net  
www.linkedin.com/in/floodb

FINANCE & OPERATIONS SENIOR EXECUTIVE  
CFO / COO / CPA

FINANCE & ACCOUNTING / BOARD COMMUNICATIONS / OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT  
MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS / TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION / STRATEGIC PLANNING & BUDGETING

Comprehensive finance and operations management expertise, with leadership success in both high growth and turnaround environments, including a division of a publicly-traded international company, a private company startup, and a non-profit trade association and foundation, after starting career with Big-4 public accounting firm.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

CFO CHESAPEAKE, WASHINGTON, DC  MAY 2012 – CURRENT

Providing interim and part-time CFO services to nonprofit organizations in the Washington DC Metro region.

The German Marshall Fund of the United States – Interim CFO  July 2012 – Nov 201

• Manage accounting staff during year-end audit process, to ensure timely report submission to external auditors, and well-coordinated interaction and responses with audit team.
• Oversee all finance and accounting functions during transition period until new CFO hired.
• Initiate planning for new budget to be presented at October 2012 Board of Directors’ meeting.

TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, DC  APR 2009 – APR 2012

Leading nonprofit trade association for the technology industry, and its associated charitable foundation.

Chief Financial Officer / Senior Vice President, Affinity Programs  SEP 2009 – APR 2012

Oversee all financial functions, in addition to operating P&L responsibility, for non-profit organization, and reporting results on a monthly basis to the Board of Directors and executive staff.

• **Slashed monthly operating expenses by 25%** over a three-year period, from time following merger of two leading technology associations, through April 2012.
• **Implemented new, cloud-based accounting software** (Intacct) that reduced headcount, generated more timely management reports (from 25 days to 10 days closing), and integrated with new CRM system (Salesforce.com).
• **Enhanced Board of Director communication** with meaningful reports to the Executive Committee, Finance Committee and Audit Committee, resulting in better understanding of financial performance and more timely guidance on strategic decisions.
• **Instituted incentive compensation program tied to financial performance**, rewarding bottom line contribution and resulting in focus on key programs and retention of top performers.
- **Reinvigorated financial conference, increasing attendance by 20%** after 5 consecutive years of decline, by recruiting strong internal team, restructuring pricing for attendees, enhancing marketing campaign and partnering with NASDAQ.

**Consultant (Hudson Financial Solutions)**  
**APR 2009 – SEP 2009**

- **Developed and executed financial model** to translate organization strategy to business plan and operating budget.

**THE MACANTUILE GROUP, ARNOLD, MD**  
**OCT 2008 – APR 2009**
*Consulting firm focused on improving business strategy and financial performance, and evaluating acquisition opportunities.*

**President**

- Founded and operated consulting firm to offer finance, accounting and operational expertise to businesses on a project basis.
- **Evaluated acquisition opportunities** for private equity group, with focus on logistics industry.
- **Facilitated smooth audit for non-profit organization**, by updating accounting records and preparing financial statements.

**CHESAPEAKE LOGISTICS, ELKRIDGE, MD**  
**NOV 1997 – OCT 2008**
*Regional provider of third party logistics services (3PL) in the mid-Atlantic region.*

**Chief Operating Officer/Chief Financial Officer**

- Founded and grew organization from small startup consulting firm to top regional provider of logistics services in the mid-Atlantic region, with responsibility for all areas of business: strategic plan, human resources, technology implementation, marketing, sales, operations management, finance, pricing and accounting.
- **Achieved a 30% average annual growth** rate with heavy consumer goods retail delivery services for companies including Pier 1 Imports, Sony, Serta, LG, Home Depot, Panasonic, JC Penney, Lowe’s and others.
- **Implemented new technology, operational processes and KPI’s** that enabled firm to be one of first companies to institute a two-hour window for home delivery services, achieving over 98% on-time delivery, tops in Pier 1’s national rankings.
- **Awarded regional winner of business plan competition** “Pitching Across America”, with voting by venture capitalists nationwide, organized by FundingPost.com.

**TNT LOGISTICS, LINTHICUM, MD/TAMPA, FL**  
**NOV 1992 – NOV 1997**
*US Division of $6 billion international transportation and logistics conglomerate.*

**Chief Financial Officer**

- Part of startup team to build 3PL services in the United States for Australian-based transportation company.
- **Built a $50M business within three years** with 8-person management team that developed strategic plan, created budget, prepared and presented proposals, and operated just-in-time parts delivery programs for Mazda, Ford and Chrysler automotive assembly plants in the United States.
Implemented processes and procedures, and oversaw all financial, accounting and human resource functions, including cash management, financial analysis and reporting, accounts receivable and payable, payroll, benefits and risk management.

Led project teams to implement Balanced Scorecard to evaluate performance, coordinate alliances with regional warehouse service providers, and create in-house transportation brokerage capabilities.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

RYDER SYSTEM, INC., MIAMI, FL
JUL 1987 – NOV 1992
Controller for $150M product line, acquisition analyses, financial modeling, business planning, pricing models.

BEATRICE COMPANIES, INC., CHICAGO, IL
FEB 1983 – JUL 1987
SEC reporting during leveraged buyout by KKR, financial statements, acquisition due diligence, LIFO inventory valuation.

ERNST & YOUNG, CHICAGO, IL
JUL 1979 – FEB 1983
Managed audit engagements for private, public, nonprofit and government organizations.

EDUCATION & CREDENTIALS

Master of Business Administration, Finance and Marketing – University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Bachelor of Business Administration, Accounting – University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN
Certified Public Accountant – State of Illinois
American Institute of CPAs
Maryland Association of CPAs