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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Sub-regional Organization</td>
</tr>
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**Agenda Item 1. Opening Session**

*Welcome by Government of France*

Denis Despreaux, on behalf of the French Government, welcomed the CGIAR Executive Council (ExCo) to Montpellier and noted that it was the second time ExCo had met in France. He highlighted the importance of agricultural research in Montpellier and the fact that it had recently hosted the FAO Regional Conference, an outcome of which was stress on reinforced support to agricultural research and partnerships among various organizations. To that end, he expressed continued French cooperation and support for the CGIAR, and his hopes for the ExCo meeting to be full of fruitful discussions.

*Chairman’s Introduction*

Ian Johnson thanked Denis Despreaux for his remarks and formally opened the meeting. He also expressed thanks to Klaus Winkel for attending the meeting as a special invitee. New members and other participants were introduced. (Meeting participants are listed in Attachment 1)

*Election of Meeting Co-chair*

Ken Okaniwa (Japan) was nominated and elected meeting Co-chair.

*Adoption of the Agenda*

The draft agenda was adopted without changes.

**Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report**

*2.a Updates*

Francisco Reifschneider updated ExCo on several activities that have taken place in the CGIAR since AGM03.

*Follow-up of AGM03 decisions:*

- **ISNAR-IFPRI**: ISNAR was dissolved on March 31, 2004, and the program’s relocation to Addis Ababa, as part of IFPRI, is progressing.
- **Science Council (SC) Secretariat discussions with FAO**: SC Executive Director recruitment is proceeding after successful discussions with FAO.
- **ICRISAT Task Force (TF)**: a report was submitted to ExCo by ICRISAT management, but it is not ready for discussion as additional work is being done on it.
• CGIAR Programmatic and Structural Organizational Alignment: terms of reference (TOR) for the task forces have been drafted and potential membership contacted.

**Funding:** He highlighted the growth of the CGIAR, both in terms of funding and number of members, and pointed out the correlation between the two. He also noted that the decline in the share of contributions from the top 10 donors during 1994-2002 has been reversed as of 2002 and their share has begun to increase since. The issue of restricted funds was also highlighted, particularly the fact that the share of restricted funds has increased over the past decade, but the trend is reversing itself slightly.

**Pilot leadership and management development and training:** A needs assessment for leadership and management development is being undertaken as a pilot and includes five Centers. It is linked with the SAS-HR (Strategic Advisory Service on Human Resources) activities and will eventually be extended to all Centers. Simultaneously with the assessment, a pilot leadership and change management training program is being developed and will be conducted by the Harvard Business School during December 5-10, 2004; 30-40 participants are expected to attend. It is intended primarily for Center and System leadership, and is being extended to include participation of interested CGIAR members. Members were given an invitation to participate in the program.

**CGIAR contacts database:** The database is scheduled to be pilot tested soon. The main change to the database is that it will be accessible by all to input—with a quality control mechanism—and access contact information. It will include information on core contacts in the CGIAR, partners, and candidates for boards, panels, ad hoc working groups and task forces, etc.

**Communications:** Recent events where the CGIAR had a major presence included the Parliamentarian Network meetings in Paris in February 2004, the Uganda workshop of parliamentarians also in February 2004, and ESSD (Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development) Week at the World Bank in March 2004. Publications that have increased awareness and interest in the CGIAR include regular Chairman and Director’s letters, e-CGIAR News, partnership brochures, and website updates (>2,000 visits/day).

**AGM03 Survey:** The AGM03 survey sought views of Members on effectiveness of the stakeholder and business meetings. Overall, the survey showed an increase in the results on meetings being a valuable use of time, as well as high approval for Member and Centers’ Day, as well as the Innovation Marketplace. Other results from the survey showed that ExCo received a 75 percent positive rating on being sufficiently transparent and a high rating on ExCo’s facilitation of decision-making by the CGIAR during the AGM. Comparisons of results from the AGM03 survey and the PDK results from AGM03 business meeting were shown and the results of the two assessments were highly similar.
AGM04 and future AGMs: Planning for AGM04 in Mexico is well underway. Hernando de Soto has been invited as the Crawford Lecturer, and a Ministerial Roundtable will also be held.

Invitations had been received earlier from Malaysia and Morocco to hold a future AGM as well as inquiries from several other countries. The timing of AGM has also become an issue. He suggested that it might be prudent to move AGM from late October to early December in order to synchronize the work of the Centers, SC, ExCo, and the CGIAR. He asked the members to discuss the issue and suggested that it should be dealt with by making a recommendation to the CGIAR.

ExCo agenda: He briefly outlined ExCo’s business agenda and highlighted some of the activities that will need to be undertaken in the coming months. A timeline showing highlights of key activities was included in the documentation.

2.b. 2003 Financial Report

Juan Garafulic (CIAT Finance Director) presented the draft 2003 CGIAR Financial Report. He noted that the report is a joint effort between CIAT and the CGIAR Secretariat. For this year’s report, as part of the annual review of financial performance, a peer group of finance directors reviewed the 2003 externally audited financial statements of the Centers to assess compliance with CGIAR accounting policy and reporting guidelines, and validate the analysis underpinning the CGIAR financial report. The peer review also made a number of recommendations to promote best practice in fiduciary management and financial reporting.

Overall results for 2003 show that the CGIAR surpassed its financial targets. Member funding totaled $381 million, $23 million higher than originally forecast. Together with $17 million in Center income, contributions totaled $398 million. Against $395 million in total expenditures (5 percent above the approved target), the System ended the year with a $3 million surplus, up from an expected $6 million deficit. Overall contributions for 2003 increased 7 percent compared with $357 million in 2002.

The increase in contributions in 2003 came mainly from two Member groups: North America increased by $10.8 million (16 percent) and contributions received from Europe were higher by $13.7 million (9 percent). In addition, multi-donors and non-CGIAR members increased their contributions by $2.2 million (9 percent). These increases were partially offset by decreases from the Pacific Rim by $2 million (8 percent) and Developing Countries by $0.6 million (5 percent). Contributions from Foundations and International and Regional Organizations were stable.

The stability noted at the System level reflects a range of outcomes in the individual Centers. Contributions increased for 14 Centers, compared with nine in 2002. Only two Centers (compared with seven in 2002) saw a contraction or no change in their contributions. Operational results (expenditures matched against contributions and Center income) show that eight Centers, compared with three in 2002, ended the year
with surpluses of $0.3 million or higher. On the other hand, three Centers, compared with six in 2002, incurred a deficit. In the case of ISNAR the deficit was due to the costs of ceasing operations as an autonomous Center. The remaining five Centers either broke even or had marginal surpluses. Centers continue their efforts to address long-term financial health through full cost budgeting on restricted projects, among other financial management measures.

2003 was the first full year of implementation of Challenge Programs (CPs). About $19 million was contributed to the CPs, of which $8 million was expended, leaving a balance of $11 million for future implementation.

The 2003 results confirm the continued stability of CGIAR finances in the aggregate. As in the last several years, however, there has been significant variability among the Centers on a number of financial health indicators, suggesting a need for continued vigilance at both the Center and System levels.

On compliance and accountability, he highlighted a set of guidelines Centers have agreed to in the areas of fiduciary management, financial reporting, and collaboration. These guidelines are designed to increase confidence in the System. For 2003, the peer review of Center financial statements suggested need for improvements in:

- compliance with guidelines,
- accounting,
- consistency of presentations/definitions,
- consistency of data, and
- compliance with timing.

The peer review also specifically recommended the following activities to work towards best practice:

- update fiduciary management and report guidelines to international standards,
- continue active monitoring of fiduciary benchmarks,
- utilize a peer review mechanism,
- hold an implementation workshop on new accounting guidelines.

Discussion:

- Several members commended J. Garafulic for an excellent presentation and the clear and useful information it provides on the financial health of the CGIAR System. The Chairman also noted the sacrifice CIAT made by J. Garafulic’s presence at ExCo, as the meeting was held on the same day as the CIAT Board of Trustees meeting, which he had to miss.
- It would be useful to see what the level of unrestricted funding was for each of the Centers. In addition, the issue of definition for restricted/unrestricted funding still needs to be resolved.
- Members liked the idea of the peer review mechanism and asked for more information on it and results of the pilot. The desire for this to become standard practice was also expressed.
• The collaborative effort between the Centers and CGIAR Secretariat was commended and a request made for this item to be presented in the same way at the relevant CDC meeting so that a face-to-face discussion could be held with Directors General (DGs).
• A budget breakdown in terms of CGIAR activities and outputs would be useful for clarity and as a bridge for comparison with past years.
• A request was made for Centers to be able to use contributions in the currency in which they are received because of the high transaction costs in converting currencies when they are received and sometimes again when expenditures are made.

Clarifications were made on some of the points raised in the discussion:
• The issue of definitions of restricted/unrestricted funding will be included in the 2003 Annual Report.
• The peer review mechanism was set up to look at the financial situations across Centers while the financial report was being compiled to avoid the surprise of red-flagged indicators. Part of the purpose of the review is to increase transparency and to increase/find best practices, comply with and increase fiduciary standards and highlight the importance of financial indicators. The mechanism will become a standard permanent feature to help achieve these objectives.
• Financial guidelines are updated every 3-5 years. The most recent update of the accounting guidelines moved the CGIAR from a solely U.S.-based system to an international standard which will help compare the CGIAR with other international organizations.

**Conclusion:**

*ExCo agreed to the following follow-up action:*

- The CGIAR Chairman was asked to write to Board Chairs of those Centers with red-flagged indicators requesting them to provide a plan of action to resolve the situation.

**Agenda Item 3. Science Council and Program Matters**

3.a. Report from Science Council

*Organization of SC*

Per Pinstrup-Andersen briefed members on the SC’s plan of work for the coming year. It includes continuation of all activities the CGIAR asked for advice from the SC. He noted that some activities in the interim SC (iSC) portfolio were dropped because of competing demands for SC’s time.

The SC has approached six experts to serve on SC standing panels on priorities, evaluation, and mobilizing science. The search for Executive Director of the SC Secretariat is moving ahead rapidly. Selection and appointment should be completed soon.
He stated his strong belief that the SC needs to be independent. That does not mean it must be exclusive and act in an isolated fashion. It wishes to collaborate and consult with farmers, consumers, development non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector. Nor does independence mean secrecy and lack of transparency. The SC will meet openly in a transparent manner except for sessions in which individuals for panels, etc. would be discussed.

The work program and budget distributed to ExCo is very detailed in case ExCo wanted such detail. He asked for guidance on the amount of detail the ExCo would like to have in the future. He asked for approval of the work plan and budget for two calendar years. He also commended FAO for the tremendous support it has provided SC.

He stated that the SC work plan includes three areas of priority: (1) strategic framework for assessing priorities; (2) integration of medium-term plans (MTPs) and logframes; and (3) CPs. As the CPs are covered another agenda item, he focused his briefing on the first two.

First, SC is assessing the results/outputs from agricultural research that will be needed 10-15 years from now in order to better identify priorities for the CGIAR. Following the assessment, a small number of System priorities around which the majority of CGIAR resources (around 80 percent) can be devoted would be identified for consideration by the donors, Centers and other stakeholders. The main reason to develop a small number of System priorities is to help the CGIAR research to focus on critical problems for which international agricultural research is most needed.

It is easier to track progress and measure whether progress has been achieved when such priorities are in place. One of the problems now is that there are 240+ projects and it is very difficult to know if the System has achieved its objectives.

Second, the SC plans to improve MTPs and their linkage to the logframe system to better monitor progress by the Centers. This should not be done in a way that avoids the creation of a parallel structure for evaluation. It should be a system where Centers, projects, etc. are monitored/evaluated congruently to get more bang for the buck. It should also encourage Centers to take milestones and recommendations seriously.

Discussion:
- Several members commended the SC Chair for the report and expressed support for the proposed work program and budget. However, the issue of long term sustainability of SC Secretariat financing and the need for broader burden sharing among CGIAR Members was raised as a concern. Since a general tax is not possible for many Members, it was suggested that perhaps Members could contribute to specific activities of the SC.
- One member suggested that the item in the work program on an international science conference/symposium be included as a discussion item at AGM04 to ensure it is done correctly in terms of who should participate in the conference.
• General support was expressed for the SC approach to identifying priorities in the CGIAR and linking it to performance by the Centers. However, concern was expressed about milestones set by Centers because they could be set at an artificially low level in order to show higher performance.
• A suggestion was made that more focus be placed on determining the comparative advantage of the CGIAR in the context of other organizations involved with agricultural research. Increased avenues of collaboration with other institutions should be explored in order to enhance the CGIAR’s overall impact.
• Clarification on the role of SC in evaluation of CPs was requested.
• Some members asked how the work of SC would be linked to the two task forces on alignment in the CGIAR.
• Two members suggested that the work of the CGIAR should be linked with the millennium development goals.
• One member asked if the role of SC in overall allocation of resources will be similar to what the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) used to do.
• One member would like to see how priorities can be matched to Center mandates to help guide donors, especially with unrestricted allocations to Centers.

The SC Chair responded to the concerns raised in the discussion: on individual donors supporting specific SC activities, the SC does not wish to accept funds for targeted activities, but will accept funding for general activities. As soon as funds are earmarked for specific activities or collaboration with another institution, the independence of the SC is questioned. As much as possible, the SC will analyze the information on the activities of non-CGIAR institutions. It has approached several external organizations and will continue to do. The SC will assess milestones to see first if they are reasonable and then see if they have been achieved. He noted that if Centers come to the table with milestones that are too low, the SC should recognize this and expose them as such. SC will be involved with monitoring CPs through progress reports and MTPs, and will carry out assessments on lessons learned. On the link with the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) task forces, he responded that the TFs are on the CGIAR agenda and therefore not included in the SC work plan. However, the outcome will be an integral part of and influence what is done in SC. On the role of SC in resource allocation, the SC should not have a role in allocating resources as this becomes a political exercise and would turn SC into more of a political body. He also noted his concern with understaffing in the SC Secretariat but would like to wait until an Executive Director is onboard for additional staff recruitment. He noted that Acting Executive Secretary Amir Kassam has a serious health problem and is not currently working.

Conclusions and ExCo Decision on SC Work Program and Budget:
• ExCo approved the work program and budget submitted by SC.
• Ian Johnson noted that the World Bank will support the SC in underwriting the financing gaps during 2004 and 2005, and that the CGIAR Secretariat should develop a proposal for a new financing system with sufficient firewalls to safeguard SC’s independence.
3.b. Challenge Programs—Progress Reports and Updates

Comment from Science Council

The SC received the three CP progress reports at the same time as ExCo and has not had time to comment officially but expect to discuss them at its upcoming meeting in Aleppo, Syria. The SC Chair shared his personal comments and made clear that they do not necessarily reflect those of the SC. He proposed that the SC review the current documents and MTPs for CPs to be received in June, as it is hoped that the MTPs will give more information on science, research, milestones and substance than the current progress reports. The SC would then give its comments to the ExCo in September and a full report/commentary would be available for AGM04.

He believes the CPs are moving ahead in constructive ways but focused on a few negative aspects:

- The portion of funds spent on transactions.
- Duplication of governance and management with those of the Centers and formation of too many committees; spending too much time and money on travel, etc. There are indications that this is to be expected at the beginning and will be reduced in the future.
- Lack of a sharp focus in terms of objectives and what the CPs want to do. He has been told there is pressure from many sides on what the CPs should do. If this is the case, ExCo/CGIAR needs to help sharpen the focus to make sure CPs achieve what they set out to do.
- The amount of work brought about by competitive bidding arrangements. Competitive bidding is good for national science foundation-type organizations to add to the knowledge pool of society, but not necessarily in a sharply focused activity of the CGIAR unless clear and concise guidelines are issued first.

On the SSA CP, he has spoken to FARA (Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa) and agreed that a revised proposal will be submitted by the end of June 2004 and SC will provide commentary at the September meeting. SC will be assisted by selected African scientists during evaluation of the CP proposal.

Comment from CGIAR Secretariat

F. Reifschneider noted that ExCo would provide general oversight of CPs and believes input from SC is critical to this oversight. He highlighted areas for ExCo to pay particular attention (some of which was covered by SC Chair):

- Transaction costs need to be carefully monitored, but there are indications of decreasing costs which may be a sign that costs indeed decrease after the first year, e.g. Water & Food transaction costs were 25 percent in the first year and are projected at 9 percent in the second.
- Coordinators of CPs recognize the complexity of governance and would like to streamline but retain broad-based governance agreed to when CPs were established.
• The question of whether the CPs are really time-bound or not.
• In relation to Generation CP, is it appropriate to have a call for proposals during the inception phase, especially given the expectations that are raised when a public call for proposals is issued. Perhaps it should be more carefully discussed by the CP proponents.

Some of the positive aspects include:
• The CPs have brought innovation to the System.
• CPs have attracted additional resources to the System (e.g., Gates Foundation, Dutch, French, and UK governments; and signs of additional resources from USAID).
• Openness and ability to attract additional partnerships has been good for the System.
• The CPs are very young and are pilots to experiment and benefit from. Going forward, the CGIAR must undertake a careful analysis and make adjustments as necessary and then determine what to do going forward, e.g. strengthen, expand, retract.

Discussion:
• ExCo Program Committee (PC) expressed concern about: (1) the arrangement of involving Center staff in CPs, (2) the need to clarify the role of stakeholders and to highlight participation of NARS (National Agricultural Research Systems) more clearly, and (3) the Generation CP does not mention winter wheat varieties in highland areas.
• The CP concept is good, however implementation is flawed and funding not adequate as core funds are being diverted to CPs. CPs were entered into with the goal to attract new funds and not impinge on core funds, which has happened.
• Governance at Centers involved with CPs is problematic because the Center Boards are not able to have a final say because of complicated governance structures. The fiduciary oversight of boards has been lost.
• CPs were originally expected to be time bound and focused and not go on forever. However, it appears that CPs have a life of their own separate from Centers. High transaction costs are a natural result and ExCo should think carefully about the future of CPs.
• Expectations of CPs have been raised to very high levels and therefore achievements must increase. The SC should play a central role of reorientation of CPs so they achieve stated objectives.
• Avoidance or minimization of duplication is very important. Governance must include freedom and flexibility but the model for governance needs to be decentralized and harmonized at the Center level. Reduction in overhead cost must include not only monetary costs but the costs in time from various stakeholder institutions for monitoring, etc. which is certainly very high.
• Donors and Members need to give CPs a chance to succeed, so they can understand how CPs are going to evolve.
• It was suggested that another model exists, in the U.S. National Science Foundation Bio-complexity grant program, which is similar and much larger and
would provide invaluable lessons. The focus should be on lessons learned and how the CPs mesh with other System activities. Scaling-up also needs to be considered, not in terms of whether but how. A key factor of success is how to scale up and reach intended clients. When considering partnership programs such as the CPs, one should keep in mind that the process is as important as the outcome.

- We need to be more explicit about where the System is in the CP process. ExCo made a decision to suspend the process because there was no strategic framework for going forward and a strong need to learn from experience. The following were proposed as the next steps: (1) SC and CGIAR Secretariat should review CP progress and synthesize lessons learned; (2) the SC should complete the strategic framework and analyze the role of the CPs; (3) the CGIAR should decide at AGM05 whether the process should be opened again.

- A member asked if there was ever a decision made on finance issues for CPs, particularly the minimum amount of funding needed to continue and if there is a sunset clause to retire a CP if it is determined there is not enough interest to attract funds and continue.

F. Reifsneider clarified that responsibilities of roles on CPs had been spelt out at the beginning of the CP process. It is similar to what happens in external program and management reviews (EPMRs): the SC is responsible for program evaluation and the System Office for the evaluation of the governance and management. There is currently no sunset clause, but a synthesis of experience, or lessons leaned on science, governance and finance could be brought to AGM04 as suggested. He also clarified that the CGIAR decision on Generation CP was approved in July 2003 for a one-year inception phase, during which proponents would respond to issues raised by ExCo. Because of this decision, concern was raised about launching a competitive grants scheme before the inception phase is completed. Perhaps the inception phase should be extended (until September) and ExCo could send a clear message to the CP on its concern about issuing a call for proposals.

P. Pinstrup-Andersen agreed that it is not fair to initiate CPs without assurance of adequate funding. He agreed with the suggestion to wait until AGM05 to take serious decisions going forward. He noted that it is difficult to request the SC not to look at governance/management and finance of CPs. It doesn’t mean the SC can do all evaluation on its own, but that it needs to work jointly with the System Office to undertake such an evaluation.

**Conclusions and points to convey to pilot CPs:**

- There was consensus on the importance of promoting the three pilot CPs and expectations are very high. The pilot CPs should be given time to learn from experience, make appropriate adjustments, and be monitored.

- Concerns were expressed in terms of the development and implementation of the CPs. These included duplication with Center activities, diverting core resources, high transaction costs, governance, and need for time-bound activities. On Generation CP, concern was expressed on the need for more focus and resources,
including focus on winter wheat production in highland areas. On Water and Food, the appropriateness of competitive bidding arrangements was raised and more information requested.

- Positive aspects of CPs included: CPs bring people together from Centers and stakeholders into one program, have succeeded in raising additional funding, putting various elements together in one program, private sector participation possible in very result oriented way.
- ExCo welcomed the proposal from the SC Chair to submit a monitoring report in September after review of the CP progress reports and MTPs.
- ExCo also requested the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to work together to synthesize lessons learned so far on CP science, finance and governance for presentation at AGM04.
- A decision on the future of the CP process should wait until at least AGM05.

**ExCo Decision on Generation CP:**
- The one-year inception phase for Generation CP, approved in July 2003, is extended until September 2004. ExCo would not recommend the CP to make any financial commitments beyond September 2004, when ExCo will assess the inception phase and recommend next steps.

**Agenda Item 4. Governance Matters**

**4.a. Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees**

Review Panel Chair Keith Bezanson presented an overview of the final report of the team. The review team was formed in June 2003 to explore two basic questions: (1) How successful have the Committees been in achieving their mission? and (2) Are there alternative ways in which the CGIAR could achieve the Committees’ mission more efficiently?

He noted that the creation of the Private Sector (PSC) and NGO (NGOC) Committees was the result of the Lucerne Ministerial meeting in February 1995, which concluded that the CGIAR should strengthen its partnerships with key stakeholders, such as the NGO and private sector communities.

*Private Sector Committee*

During the PSC’s initial years there was enthusiasm shared by the Committee and the CGIAR to moving the agendas forward. This was followed by disappointment because of what the PSC considered non-responsiveness of the CGIAR System. The PSC expressed frustration that the CGIAR functions as a ‘black box’ where there is a one-way flow into it, with no response coming out. By the early 2000s meetings had become less frequent. In January 2003, with new membership, a new program was launched with time bound projects in the areas of alliance building, policy dialogue (specifically biotechnology), and communications, which appears promising in terms of achieving concrete results.
A survey conducted by the Panel shows that PSC members consider the Committee’s main strength to be having a mechanism to carry on a dialogue with the CGIAR for mutual awareness and benefit. However, the main weaknesses they see are inadequate links with Centers. Past PSC members evaluate the Committee as only 30 percent effective because they believe the CGIAR is only 30 percent effective and there is need for the CGIAR to figure out what it wants from the Committee.

**NGO Committee**

Similar to the PSC, there was a lot of enthusiasm when the NGOC was created in 1995. There was a large reservoir of NGO goodwill for the System and general support for mainstreaming NGOs into the System. However, there was resistance in some quarters of the System to working with NGOs. The NGOC produced a paper in 1997 on biotechnology stating that the CGIAR commitment to biotechnology could alienate much of the NGO community, followed by a paper on intellectual property rights (IPR) emphasizing farmers’ rights and protection of indigenous and traditional knowledge. This was soon followed by a rise in advocacy on the part of the Committee. By 2000 there was a formal expression of disappointment that its recommendations were not being acted on at the System level. The NGOC announced a freeze of its relationship with the CGIAR in October 2002 at the AGM.

From the NGOC perspective, on the plus side members welcomed a place at the table and saw some gains in moving the CGIAR agenda to focus on poverty reduction, and mainstreaming NRM and ecological research, and improved communications. On the negative side, they concluded the CGIAR is unable or unwilling to make changes necessary to act as a force for poverty reduction, felt the dialogue had proved meaningless and the process had become a means to co-opt NGOs. Bezanson noted that the NGO community is deeply divided and some advocate closure of the CGIAR, but others privately deplore the breakdown in communications and the unilateral freeze.

**Other Issues**

There is a divergent set of views from the many actors in the System: DGs, Board Chairs, donors, co-sponsors, NARS, etc. Few doubt the importance of linkages represented by the committees, but the experience of both committees is part of a larger systemic problem. There is agreement that new mechanisms are needed to make such linkages effective, but it is unclear what these are. Some believe, especially in terms of the NGOC, that the system is broken. On the relationship with NGOC, all agreed there are serious problems with the engagement that can not be rectified by a few adjustments, rather there is a need for reinvention and innovation. There are divergent views on whether the January 2003 PSC program will produce a concrete, functional base for collaboration.
There is also a strong view that the CGIAR should make a clearer distinction between shareholders and stakeholders. Stakeholders such as NGOC and PSC should not take part in CGIAR decision making.

Other possible lessons from the CGIAR experience with NGOC and PSC include:
- Partnerships come in many forms; know what you want before entering into one.
- Partnerships can be cost-ineffective—to many approaches as ends in themselves.
- Agreements should be time bound with sunset clauses.
- Agree on clear milestones, evaluation criteria, and formal exit strategies ex ante.
- Issues of asymmetry and cultural differences should be resolved beforehand.

**Discussion:**
- The PSC Chair noted that the report has been circulated to PSC members and the PSC will provide a formal reply after it has had an opportunity for discussion. She noted that the PSC remains enthusiastic about collaboration with the CGIAR and welcomes clarity on what is expected from the committee.
- The concept of civil society needs to be seen as much larger than only NGOs and the private sector, but also include other groups such as farmers, indigenous peoples, etc. Globally, there has been a paradigm shift in thinking about civil society, from the initial focus in the early 1990s only on NGOs and private sector institutions to a much more comprehensive view that exists today. The review has failed to capture this shift.
- The central question is whether partnership committees are the best way to engage with civil society. The CGIAR cannot afford to not have such a relationship. However, whether the relationship should exist through the partnership committees or another mechanism, it is imperative to maintain such an engagement.
- The PSC should have a chance to proceed with its current program.
- A relationship and engagement with NGOs was seen as important and should somehow be resurrected. However, the freeze of relationship with NGOC was a unilateral decision and the CGIAR should not beg to continue the partnership.
- Partnerships with both NGOs and the private sector have been successful at the Center level, because they were undertaken with clear agreements with groups that have a common agenda—political with advocacy groups.
- GFAR has a lot of experience with civil society partnerships and could play a role in closing the gap between civil society and the CGIAR.
- The CGIAR Charter should express clearly the CGIAR’s desire to partner with all civil society organizations (CSOs), along the lines suggested in the report.

**ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR:**

*ExCo adopted the following two-pronged approach as a way forward:*

1. The CGIAR Secretariat should draft a clear statement on the necessity for CGIAR engagement with all components of civil society to be incorporated into the CGIAR Charter. The statement would be sent to ExCo for endorsement before going to the CGIAR for final approval. The Charter would recognize that a range
of partnerships are essential for success, and highlight the widespread collaboration at the Center level, missing at the System level.

2. Regarding the recommendations of the review:
   - **On PSC**, adopt recommendation 8, “market testing” for 2-4 years.
   - **On NGOC**, send message on desire to re-establish dialogue. At the same time, strengthen ongoing initiatives with CSOs, such as innovation marketplace, SC initiatives, e-consultation on CGIAR-CSO linkage as pre-AGM activity, etc.
   - **Develop an inventory of partnerships, study lessons learned and prepare a guide of best practices at the Center and System levels.**
   - **Draw from recommendation 3 to focus on the kinds of partnerships desired, costs, benefits, governance implications, and rules of engagement.**

*ExCo also welcomed a proposal from GFAR to work to facilitate dialogue between CSOs and the CGIAR.*

4.b. **Report from the Centers**

**CBC**

Uzo Mokwunye shared with the ExCo the main Committee of Board Chairs (CBC) activities since AGM03. He noted that the primary responsibility of CBC is to:
   - Demonstrate initiative in responding to CGIAR opportunities and challenges that are common to Centers;
   - Contribute to the development of CGIAR policy;
   - Encourage and develop effective leadership by Center Boards; and
   - Provide oversight of coordination between Centers.

Most of the activities of CBC since AGM03 have been guided by these functional roles. For example, in order to encourage and develop effective leadership by Center Boards, the CBC organized an orientation program for Board members in London in early May 2004. CBC was assisted by the Institute of Directors (IOD) and received financial and other support from the CGIAR Secretariat.

CBC is excited about the new SC, and looks forward to its active involvement in the CGIAR. CBC has also provided input to development of the CGIAR Compensation Study that led to a modified TORs, and actively participated with the Working Group on Performance Measurement (WGPM) and has set up a small working group to help develop indicators on governance.

**CDC**

Kanayo Nwanze briefed ExCo on the activities of the CDC since AGM03. He noted that he would not cover CDC views on items on the ExCo agenda as CBC and CDC would make joint statement on these separately (e.g., on CPs and on the draft CGIAR Charter). Highlights of CDC activities:
- A Future Harvest Alliance Executive Officer was recruited to assist CDC and CBC improve the effectiveness of their operations. (Incumbent: Meryl Williams).
- The Africa 2020 Conference was a major success for the CGIAR. It was notable that Presidents of three African countries attended.
- Centers have a close engagement with NEPAD in several areas, including the management of the NEPAD Bioscience Facility by ILRI.
- CDC has set up task forces on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and alignment of Center outputs with these goals. ICRAF will host a Technical Support Center for the MDGs.
- CDC has interacted with the Co-chairs of the two CGIAR task forces on programmatic and structural alignment. CDC has set up working groups to address the alignment question and interact with the CGIAR task forces.
- Regarding the Open University initiative, four DGs have agreed to work with Joachim von Braun to move the concept closet to implementation.
- Finally, CDC supports the reform process in the CGIAR and works closely with the CGIAR Chairman and the Director to make the System more effective and efficient.

ExCo thanked the Chairs of CBC and CDC for their reports.

4.c. CGIAR Compensation Study

Philippe Vialatte, Steering Committee Chair of the study, reported that the committee held its first meeting on April 30, 2004 in Brussels. The study is delicate because of the need to maintain confidentiality of data at the individual level. He encouraged full and active participation from Members and Centers.

Sandra Lawrence gave an overview of activities and results of Phase I of the study to date. The study entails four phases:
- Phase I: Review of Compensation structures and mechanisms for ensuring transparency of internationally recruited staff (IRS)
- Phase II: Comparison of CGIAR compensation packages for IRS with the market
- Phase III: Review of CGIAR compensation structures for nationally recruited staff (NRS)
- Phase IV: Integrated results report

The targeted completion date for the study is end of 2005.

ExCo discussed the presentation and results of Phase I and agreed with the Steering Committee recommendation that, in the interest of confidentiality, results should not be posted on the CGIAR website until completion of Phase II.

Conclusion:
- Copies of the presentation will be provided upon request to CGIAR Members, including members of ExCo.
4.d Working Group on Performance Measurement

The Co-chairs of the WGPM were not able to attend the ExCo meeting; therefore, WG members P. Pinstrup-Andersen and Selçuk Özgediz briefed ExCo about the progress made by the WG. The WG plans to develop the indicator set during the rest of 2004 and pilot test it in early 2005, using 2004 data.

Discussion:
- Several members voiced support for performance measurement as important to the long term health of the CGIAR.
- One member expressed concern that the indicators being developed will be confused as guidance for allocating funds.
- Another member noted that it is important not to confuse performance measurement with priority setting. Performance measurement is a measurement of what was agreed to be done.
- A member asked how an independent validation of information from the Centers will be carried out. It was suggested that a simple set of indicators be included on how well Centers implement external review recommendations. It was noted that ExCo Finance Committee (FC) discussed that Center follow-up to external reviews did not always match the recommendations.
- It was suggested that measurement of Centers’ performance should be complemented with the financial performance of the investor(s) supporting the Centers.
- The indicators will not only be a tool for donors, but will become an important tool for the Centers as well.

4.e. CGIAR Charter

F. Reifschneider introduced the item and noted that it is not for decision but for discussion in order to move towards a final draft. He thanked ExCo for their comments as well as those received from CGIAR Members and other stakeholders, and noted that they have been taken into consideration and incorporated into the draft. It will go through another iteration and eventually contribute to a final draft that will be submitted to the CGIAR for approval.

Discussion:
- CBC and CDC voiced strong concerns about the organization of the charter document. The CBC has formed a team to suggest changes. CBC requested ExCo to create a small sub-committee that can sort through the different views. This is the first time principles and procedures are being codified in the CGIAR and it needs to be done right.
- The relationship between ExCo/PC and SC is not clear in terms of the role of each body. It is assumed that the section on Partnership Committees will be re-drafted after the review process is completed.
- The CGIAR Director clarified that all comments received on the Charter are publicly available on the CGIAR website. He agreed that a small drafting
committee should be constituted (four members) that would work with the Secretariat to fine-tune the document. He proposed the committee should include one member from SC, one from the Centers, and two from the membership (one from the North and one from the South).

**ExCo Recommendations:**

- ExCo agreed to establish a drafting committee to fine-tune the April 23, 2004 draft of the CGIAR Charter. The committee will consist of four members (one from SC, one from the Centers, and two from the membership—one each from North and South), supported by the CGIAR Secretariat. The Secretariat will consult with the above groups and propose a slate of names and timetable to the ExCo for its approval.

**4.f. Selecting CGIAR-nominees on Center Boards**

Following a recommendation from ExCo, a new process for selecting CGIAR nominees was approved by the CGIAR in March 2004. S. Özgediz gave an overview of the procedural guidelines for implementation that have been developed and noted that ExCo was asked to identify an efficient mechanism through which it will fulfill its own responsibilities in the process. It was suggested that ExCo could fulfill its role through ExCo/FC.

U. Mokwunye noted CBC’s participation in the process but CBC believes the implementation guidelines are too complex and would slow down appointment of CGIAR nominees required by Centers. He asked ExCo to allow IFPRI to fill CGIAR nominee slots on its board as required by its by-laws now, rather than waiting until the start of the new process. He suggested that the CGIAR Secretariat and CBC should be given more time to fine-tune and revise the implementation guidelines.

**Discussion:**

- The current implementation process takes nearly a year to complete; it should be speeded up and guidelines revised to reflect this.
- The approved process states that ExCo is invited to add up to an additional three names for consideration and would be assisted by the System Office. In other words, the CGIAR Secretariat would not be identifying additional candidates, but ExCo would identify and be supported by the Secretariat.
- CBC welcomes ExCo to work with Boards in the process but notes that Boards retain the final appointment of new members.
- If there is to be a CGIAR nominee process, then CGIAR Members must retain the right to nominate and have a say in appointment of the nominees.
- The problem in the past has been lack of a useful database to choose candidates that have been nominated by CGIAR. If a useful database exists, it would speed the whole process up.
ExCo Conclusions and Decisions:
- ExCo agreed to waive the use of the new CGIAR-nominee appointment process to fill current vacancies on the IFPRI Board.
- ExCo requested the CGIAR Secretariat and CBC to improve the implementation process.

4.g. GRPC Work Plan and Budget

F. Reifschneider introduced the item and noted that the work plan is for comment and the budget is for approval by ExCo.

Discussion:
- The SC would be pleased to co-host the workshop proposed in the plan. SC is also interested in topics such as ethics in agricultural research and could work with GRPC on these.
- Members welcomed the planned workshop prior to AGM which would provide a basis for discussion of genetically modified organism (GMO) issues at AGM04. The PSC Chair indicated that PSC would also be interested in co-organizing the workshop

ExCo Decision:
- ExCo approved the GRPC work plan and budget.

Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Programmatic and Structural Alignment

5.a. Task Forces on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment

F. Reifschneider clarified that the TORs of the task forces (TF) are for endorsement by ExCo and approval by the CGIAR, and membership of the TFs are for approval by ExCo.

P. Pinstrup-Andersen (TF1 Co-chair) recently met with Co-chairs of the Task Forces. It was decided the TFs will meet on May 26-27, 2004 in Germany to discuss ways to move forward. TF2 Co-chairs Jochen de Haas and Moise Mensah have met with the resource persons and have developed a draft work plan.

The membership of both TFs proposed by the respective Co-chairs was displayed and ExCo was asked for its approval before moving on to discussion of the TORs. ExCo approved the membership of both TF1 and 2.

Discussion:
- Concern was expressed that the TORs are too general, focused mainly on process matters and do not include the substance of the review. Because of the importance of the exercise, it would be useful to be more specific so that one could measure progress. The Co-chairs noted that this would be clarified when the work plans are completed.
• An analysis of CGIAR work in relation to NARS is not as explicit in the TOR as it should be, including needs of the future.
• The relationship between the TFs and Centers isn’t clear. Without such a dialogue, it is difficult to thoroughly complete the exercise.
• How does the work of the ICRISAT TF and the SC strategic framework fit into this exercise? Focusing exclusively on Africa in isolation is not good from a strategic point of view.
• FARA undertook a similar exercise; the TFs should see if its vision still has validity, which clearly spelled out a roadmap for a way forward for Africa.
• Form should follow function. TF2’s work should be driven by what TF1 concludes.
• In 1998-99 the Centers engaged in an intensive dialogue with sub-regional organizations (SROs) during the FARA exercise and did many of the things suggested by members, which resulted in a clear vision for Africa. Both TFs should assess what achievements were realized and what worked and didn’t work. The Centers are eager to move the current exercise forward as quickly as possible.
• Any decision on alignment in Africa will affect the rest of the System. This needs to be taken into account when making recommendations.
• This might be the last best chance for the CGIAR to reinvent itself and move into a 21st century which is very different from when the CGIAR was created. Decisions going forward face short-term roadblocks that could paralyze the System’s efforts to make the fundamental long term changes that may be necessary to adapt to current realities. Roadblocks include differences in institutional cultures between Centers considering merger, political issues regarding host country agreements, and the financial costs of institutional transformation. TF2 on Structural/Organization Alignment should conduct a zero-based planning exercise in which it would begin by considering a world in which CGIAR Centers didn’t exist, and then consider how, where and to what types of institutions $400 million of donor support would be allocated for the most cost-effective international public goods research. Rather than be constrained in its planning by the short term roadblocks and thus consider only marginal changes, the CGIAR should look 10-15 years ahead in developing the new vision and structure. Knowing where it wants to go, it can then develop a work plan to address the short term problems to get there.
• The TFs should sequence activities so that programmatic recommendations of TF1 precede structural recommendations of TF2.

J. de Haas thanked members for their contributions and suggestions. He noted that it is indeed important to look at other regions besides Africa and that actions there will affect the rest of the System, but the process must proceed step by step and start somewhere. He looks forward to receiving input from Centers.

P. Pinstrup-Andersen agreed that input from Centers is important, but they should not serve directly on the TFs. The exercise would be linked with the SC priorities and strategic framework exercise. Sequencing the work of both TFs is a problem because both will need to collect information at the same time. The plan is to sequence
recommendations and interact so that structural recommendations do follow programmatic recommendations. Interaction with CSOs is not clear at this time, because hundreds exist, but TF1 would definitely like to meet with farmers’ organizations and others. Linkage with the ICRISAT TF is not clear at this time since the ICRISAT Board has asked for additional work to be carried out.

**ExCo Conclusions and Recommendations:**
- Membership of TF1 and TF2 was approved.
- ExCo endorsed the TORs which will be submitted to the CGIAR for approval on a no-objection basis. The TFs should brief ExCo on their detailed plan of work, which should take into account ExCo’s input.

### 5.b. ISNAR-IFPRI Transition

Joachim von Braun updated ExCo on the transition and progress made by IFPRI regarding the ISNAR program.

An invitation has been received from the Government of Ethiopia to locate the ISNAR program in Addis Ababa, and a cooperation agreement has been signed with ILRI for it to be housed on its campus in Addis Ababa. The ISNAR program encompasses three new research and capacity strengthening aspects:

1. Agricultural science policy research;
2. Institutional change for innovation systems; and
3. Organizational and management of agricultural research (and a training unit).

On management aspects of ISNAR, he noted that the ISNAR program is now a division of IFPRI based in Addis Ababa. A Program Advisory Committee has been established and new staff recruitment is in process, including a director. Contacts with partners have also been initiated and an inception report was issued to donors. He noted that ISNAR remains highly relevant to agricultural growth and poverty reduction in developing countries.

**Discussion:**
- Two members noted that they are looking forward to interaction between IFPRI and NARS and regional fora. They asked when this interaction can be expected to take place.
- A member noted that ISNAR has ceased operations as an independent entity, but a management structure still exists. How will reporting on ongoing projects be handled?
- A member inquired as to whether all the costs of the transition had been absorbed.
- Since the decision to close ISNAR was made at AGM03, a member asked why it has taken so long to hire a new director.

J. von Braun responded that IFPRI has only had legal mandate to undertake interactions with regional organizations (ROs), SROs, and regional fora since April 5, 2004, after ISNAR ceased to operate as a legal entity, and few staff to carry out such activities. The
program is currently focusing on scaling up capacity before promising delivery of services. On accounting and end of project reports on items not transferred to IFPRI, he noted that the office of the interim ISNAR DG would be able to respond. If in doubt, inquiries should be addressed to IFPRI. Closing costs were lower than originally expected (about $4.5 million vs. $4.9 million). Only after it was clear that IFPRI would take over the program and that money was available were serious applications received for a director. He noted that the ISNAR program will be a valuable addition to the ILRI campus in Addis Ababa and it is a joint program in the making.

The Co-chair thanked J. von Braun for his informative presentation.

**Agenda Item 6. Evaluation**

**6.a. Follow-up to External Reviews**

The ExCo Finance and Program Committees reported on its discussions of follow-up to EPMRs from IITA, IPGRI and ICRISAT.

*ExCo/FC*

The committee appreciated receiving feedback from Centers on EPMR recommendations, but it did not always find the information adequate or complete.

IITA: the feedback was not as complete as it should have been; there should be more rigorous follow-up to some of the recommendations.

IPGRI: the committee noted that there was an inadequate response on recommendation (6) to hire a senior social scientist. Lack of social science input has undermined other work in the Center.

ICRISAT: The committee understands that the ICRISAT TF is doing additional work which will address issues highlighted in the external management review (EMR) and external program review (EPR).

*ExCo/PC*

The committee felt it was not in a position to critically assess follow-up to the reviews with the information provided. The reports were too much of a summary and did not adequately explain actions taken by the Centers. More detailed information and analysis are needed to present a clearer picture. Follow-up documents should first be examined by the SC and CGIAR Secretariat and their comments presented to ExCo. A concern was also raised about the late date at which documents were received.

**Discussion:**

- Several members agreed that it would be best if this information is sent to the SC and CGIAR Secretariat for analysis and comment before it is submitted to ExCo.
• A member asked how ExCo deals with non-compliance with CGIAR-agreed EPMR recommendations. Another member noted that there may be two situations: one where the Center has a good reason for not implementing a recommendation, such as a major restructuring that makes the original recommendation inapplicable. The second is when it is agreed that a recommendation should be implemented and the Center does not comply.
• The Centers are concerned about how far forward progress should be reviewed by ExCo as follow-up to EPMRs because this is also a responsibility of the boards.
• It was noted that follow-up reports are requested yearly, but in some cases recommendations may be rendered moot (where Center management changes occur following the EPMR, for example).
• Follow-up to EPMRs were originally requested because in the past some Centers ignored EPMR recommendations and ExCo wanted to monitor the follow-up. If ExCo is going to continue to play this role, it needs to determine exactly what it is going to do in cases of non-compliance. ExCo members should give thought to this and forward ideas to the CGIAR Secretariat.
• Currently there is no mechanism to address non-compliance. Perhaps as a first step, ExCo could send a letter to the Board Chair asking for further clarification. When recommendations are repeatedly ignored, some kind of mechanism for sanction should be developed.

ExCo Conclusions and Recommendations:
• ExCo adopted the reports of ExCo/FC and ExCo/PC on follow-up to the EPMRs.
• ExCo requested the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to do detailed work on follow-up to EPMRS and present ExCo with their analysis and recommendations.
• ExCo members were requested to submit suggestions to the CGIAR Secretariat for actions that should be taken in response to non-compliance.

Agenda Item 7. Planning ExCo Business

Role of ExCo Committees

F. Reifschneider introduced the item based on comments received that have questioned the need for and role of the ExCo committees. He reminded members that the committees were established by the CGIAR and therefore ExCo can not make a decision on the existence of the committees, but can always make recommendations to the CGIAR.

ExCo Committee Membership

The ExCo committee members are due to rotate this year following completion of their two-year term.

Members agreed to discuss the above two items before moving on to other ExCo-related items.
**Discussion:**

- The role and responsibility of the ExCo/PC is unclear and appears to overlap with that of the SC. There seems to be little added value, and if this is the case, there is no need for the committee. ExCo/PC members have agreed that, as presently organized, the committee does not add value.
- The ExCo/PC seems to be a clone of the former Oversight Committee, but with less responsibility.
- ExCo/PC adds to bureaucracy. Centers report to SC, which reports to ExCo/PC, which reports to ExCo, which reports to the CGIAR. Now that the SC is in place, there is no need for ExCo/PC.
- Establishment of ExCo eliminated the need for the former Oversight and Finance Committees. The full Group could not carry out the kind of dialogue ExCo is now able to. Therefore, the need for the committees is not clear and the time spent on committee meetings could be better spent on meeting of the full ExCo.
- Some ExCo committee discussions are redundant as the same subjects are discussed in meetings of the entire ExCo. Items such as CPs and EPMRs should be assigned to a smaller group of ExCo which reports to the full ExCo and not discussed in full again, or discussed only by the full ExCo. Duplication does not add value.
- In regards to ExCo/FC, members felt its role was different as there is no similar body carrying out these functions. It deals with more substantive matters and adds value. In addition, it could take on more responsibility on governance matters and operate more like the former Oversight Committee.
- Rotation of the ExCo/FC should be synchronized with that of ExCo.
- Agendas and meeting documents should be available well in advance of meetings and a reporting mechanism to ExCo established in order to avoid duplication.

**ExCo Conclusions and Recommendations:**

- There is not a clear need for the ExCo/PC, but ExCo should determine how it would address issues that are programmatic in nature without a PC. One option would be using ad hoc committees on matters that require small group attention before ExCo discussions.
- ExCo/FC should continue, perhaps as a “Governance and Finance Committee” of ExCo, with an expanded mandate.
- ExCo members are invited to suggest alternative organizational modalities to improve the performance of ExCo.
- The CGIAR Secretariat should develop a proposal on ExCo organization and send to ExCo for discussion then to the CGIAR for approval. A decision can be made virtually and does not have to wait for the AGM or another face to face meeting.
- Rotation of committee membership should be synchronized with that of full ExCo.
**ExCo Business Agenda**

Copies of the ExCo business agenda timetable were made available to members for information.

**Deadlines for Comments on ExCo Action Items**

Based on discussions in previous ExCo meetings, members had decided two weeks would be sufficient to respond to requests for comment on action items. In some cases there have been minor delays in response from members, which has not presented a problem, but in other cases considerable delays in response have slowed decision making. Therefore, ExCo was asked if it wishes to maintain, increase or decrease the two week response time period.

**Discussion:**

- Two weeks is sufficient for regular items of business, but more substantive policy matters should be given more time.
- Members were also concerned that documents for meetings should be made available far enough in advance for them to be addressed sufficiently during meetings. This should be conveyed to all System units that provide documentation for ExCo.
- One member expressed concern about the inability of some members to download documents sent electronically.
- F. Reifschneider clarified that hard copies of documents have always been sent if requested by a member. ExCo rules of procedure state that documents be made available one week prior to meetings, but in practice they are usually sent two weeks in advance.

**Conclusion:**

- *ExCo agreed to maintain the two week response time period.*

**Future Meetings**

If necessary, the next ExCo meeting will be held September 13-14, 2004. The venue has not yet been selected. Although the dates may clash with other commitments of some members, timing of the meeting was coordinated with the September SC meeting in order for the SC Chair to report to ExCo.

F. Reifschneider noted that in order to alleviate the significant time pressures created by holding an SC, ExCo and CGIAR meetings in September-October, one solution would be to move the dates of the AGM to the beginning of December. This would allow for more flexibility for Center MTPs, and SC and ExCo meetings. If agreed, the new timing would start in 2005.
**Discussion:**

- Several members pointed to conflicts with other meetings scheduled for early December, including winter parliamentary sessions held in many Asia-Pacific countries, public holidays, end of year activities such as the closing of accounts at the Centers, and other meetings/conferences, etc.
- There was general agreement on the need to move AGM to a later date as the current calendar affects the quality of work leading up to AGM.

**ExCo Conclusions:**

- *ExCo agreed that AGM should be moved to a later date during the year. The CGIAR Secretariat will consult with the CGIAR to determine what dates would be best and make a proposal to the membership.*

**Agenda Item 8. Other Business**

**8.a. Global Open Agriculture and Food University**

J. von Braun gave a presentation to ExCo on progress in the establishment of a Global Open Agriculture and Food University. He noted that this is a CGIAR initiative that will address capacity challenges in agricultural development and moving research to action.

He outlined the conceptual framework, budget, next steps and timeline of the initiative. He noted that it is not a traditional degree granting university, but will seek to spread knowledge through an open source institution where everyone can participate who wants to participate. The open university concept is an initiative of the CGIAR but not confined to the CGIAR; rather it seeks to build capacity and scale up with existing and new partners. Many universities from Europe and North America have expressed interest, but the objective is for the initiative to be driven from the South, which will seek to find appropriate partners from the North.

A meeting will be held in Washington on August 25-26, 2004, with potential investors and partners. It will be an open meeting and the agenda will soon be shared.

**Discussion:**

- Members thanked J. von Braun for an informative presentation and noted that it is an important issue for many CGIAR Members. One member asked whether the non-degree granting stance of the CGIAR approach could change 3-5 years down the road.
- It was suggested that the approach should go beyond the traditional agricultural and food agenda, and include topics such as research management.
- Input should be requested from the private sector on curriculum development.
- The open university could enhance the potential for job creation as a result of increased capacity in Africa.

J. von Braun thanked members for the thoughtful exchange of ideas and comments. They will be shared with colleagues who have worked on the project.
Agenda Item 9. Closing Session

Co-chair K. Okaniwa thanked the Government of France, INIBAP and Agropolis on behalf of the ExCo for their hospitality and support. He also thanked members and other participants for their attendance and contributions to the meeting. Participants gave a special round of applause to K. Okaniwa for his skillful chairmanship of the Tuesday portion of the meeting.
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ExCo Member Feedback on ExCo 6

2. CGIAR Status Report

2. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
<td>Avg 6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree)</td>
<td>Div 10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly)</td>
<td>S.D. 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
<td>Avg 5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree)</td>
<td>Div 12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly)</td>
<td>S.D. 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
<td>Avg 6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree)</td>
<td>Div 6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly)</td>
<td>S.D. 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
<td>Avg 5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree)</td>
<td>Div 12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly)</td>
<td>S.D. 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
<td>Avg 6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree)</td>
<td>Div 10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly)</td>
<td>S.D. 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
<td>Avg 5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree)</td>
<td>Div 12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly)</td>
<td>S.D. 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Report from Science Council

3.1 Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.b. Challenge Programs—Progress Reports and Updates

### Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.a. Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees

4.a. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

- Agree Strongly: 6.0
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 3.0
- Disagree Strongly: 2.0

4.a. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

- Agree Strongly: 5.07
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 2.08
- Disagree Strongly: 2.78

4.a. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

- Agree Strongly: 5.57
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 2.74
- Disagree Strongly: 2.42

Participation:
- 4. a. 15
- 4. a. 11
- 4. a. 14
4.b. Report from the Centers

4.b. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

- **Agree Strongly**
  - Avg: 5.44
  - S.D.: 3.06
  - Part: 16

- **Neither Agree Nor Disagree**
  - Qty: 4

- **Disagree Strongly**

4.b. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

- **Agree Strongly**
  - Avg: 4.27
  - S.D.: 5.22
  - Part: 11

- **Neither Agree Nor Disagree**
  - Qty: 4

- **Disagree Strongly**

4.b. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

- **Agree Strongly**
  - Avg: 5.67
  - S.D.: 3.88
  - Part: 12

- **Neither Agree Nor Disagree**
  - Qty: 4

- **Disagree Strongly**

4.c. CGIAR Compensation Study

4.c Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.c ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.c Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.d. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 3.6
Div: 34.33
S.D: 3.4
Part: 15

4.d. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 3.44
Div: 33.74
S.D: 3.33
Part: 16

4.d. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 5.0
Div: 47.88
S.D: 4.77
Part: 14
4.e. CGIAR Charter

**4.e. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.e. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.e. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>31.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.f. Selecting CGIAR-nominees on Center Boards

4.f. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.f. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.f. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.g. GRPC Work Plan and Budget

4.g. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.g. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.g. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.a. Task Forces on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment

**5.a. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.**

```
| Agree Strongly | 7 |
| Agree Not Strongly | 4 |
| Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 1 |
| Disagree Strongly | 0 |
```

- **Avg:** 0.5
- **S.D.:** 0.64
- **Part:** 12

**5.a. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.**

```
| Agree Strongly | 7 |
| Agree Not Strongly | 4 |
| Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 1 |
| Disagree Strongly | 0 |
```

- **Avg:** 5.69
- **S.D.:** 0.73
- **Part:** 13

**5.a. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.**

```
| Agree Strongly | 7 |
| Agree Not Strongly | 4 |
| Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 1 |
| Disagree Strongly | 0 |
```

- **Avg:** 5.21
- **S.D.:** 2.03
- **Part:** 14
5.b. ISNAR-IFPRI Transition

5.b. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

| Agree Strongly | 7 |
| Agree Nor Disagree | 4 |
| Disagree Strongly | 1 |

- **Avg**: 5.46
- **S.D.**: 2.6
- **Part**: 13

5.b. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

| Agree Strongly | 7 |
| Agree Nor Disagree | 4 |
| Disagree Strongly | 1 |

- **Avg**: 5.62
- **S.D.**: 1.76
- **Part**: 13

5.b. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

| Agree Strongly | 7 |
| Agree Nor Disagree | 4 |
| Disagree Strongly | 1 |

- **Avg**: 6.0
- **S.D.**: 2.15
- **Part**: 14
6.a. Follow-up to External Reviews

6.a. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

- Agree Strongly: 7 votes, Avg 6.0, S.D. 1.45, Part 12
- Agree: 4 votes, Avg 14.41
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 1 vote
- Disagree Strongly: 1 vote

6.a. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

- Agree Strongly: 7 votes, Avg 5.08, S.D. 2.91, Part 13
- Agree: 4 votes, Avg 29.08
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 1 vote
- Disagree Strongly: 1 vote

6.a. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

- Agree Strongly: 7 votes, Avg 6.18, S.D. 2.36, Part 11
- Agree: 4 votes, Avg 23.3
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 1 vote
- Disagree Strongly: 1 vote
### 7. Planning ExCo Business

#### Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.a. Global Open Agriculture and Food University

8.a. Time allocated to this agenda item was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.a. ExCo adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.a. Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ExCo 6 Feedback

### ExCo Overall, the ExCo meeting was a productive use of my time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ExCo Time available for the ExCo meeting allowed for an appropriate level of discussion and debate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ExCo The documentation provided enabled me to discuss and decide matters adequately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ExCo Overall, the decision making process at the ExCo meeting was effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ExCo I would be comfortable if documents for ExCo were provided 1 week before the ExCo meeting instead the 2 weeks as provided now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ExCo The 2 weeks provided to ExCo for virtual decisionmaking and feedback provides me sufficient time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>