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Revised Timed Agenda

Thursday, October 28

14:30 – 16:45

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session (15 min)
   (a) Chairman’s Opening Remarks
   (b) Adoption of the Agenda

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report (30 min)
   (a) Progress Report from ExCo
       -- Discussion

Agenda Item 3. Program Matters
   (a) CGIAR Priorities and Strategies: 2005-2010 (90 min)
       -- Discussion

16:45 – 17:15  Coffee Break

17:15 – 18:45

Agenda Item 3. Program Matters (cont’d)
   (b) Report from the Science Council (30 min)
       -- Report from SC
       -- Report from SC/PIA

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation
   (a) External Program and Management Review of IRRI (60 min)
       -- Presentation by Panel Chair
       -- Comments by IRRI
       -- Comments from SC and CGIAR Secretariat
       -- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
       -- Discussion and Decision making

Special Session on CGIAR Charter

Friday, October 29

08:30 – 10:30

Agenda Item 3. Program Matters (cont’d)
   (c) Challenge Programs (90 min)
       -- Generation CP
       -- Lessons from Pilot CPs
       -- SSA CP
       -- Discussion and Decision making

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation (cont’d)
   (c) Development of Performance Measurement System (30 min)
       -- Status report by the Performance Measurement WG
       -- Discussion
10:30 – 11:00  Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30  
**Agenda Item 4. Evaluation (cont’d)**
(b) Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees *(60 min)*
   -- Outcome of discussion at the Stakeholder Meeting
   -- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
   -- Discussion and Decision making

**Agenda Item 5. Governance Matters**
(a) Task Forces on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment—SSA *(30 min)*
   -- Reports from Task Force Co-Chairs
   -- Discussion

12:30 – 13:30  Working Lunch (provided)

13:30 – 15:30  
**Agenda Item 5. Governance Matters (cont’d)**
(b) ExCo Committees *(30 min)*
   -- ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
   -- Discussion and Decision making

(c) CGIAR Nominee Process *(60 min)*
   -- Overview of Options
   -- Discussion and Decision making

**Agenda Item 6. Perspective from the Centers *(30 min)***
(a) CBC Perspectives
(b) CDC Perspectives
   -- Discussion

15:30 – 16:00  Coffee Break

16:00 – 18:00  
**Agenda Item 7. CGIAR Financing Plan for 2005 *(30 min)***
(a) Comment from the Science Council
(b) Report from the CGIAR Secretariat
(c) ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
   -- Discussion and Decision making

**Agenda Item 8. Other Business *(30 min)***
(a) Future CGIAR Meetings
   -- Discussion and Decision making
(b) Funding of System Priorities

**Agenda Item 9. Closing Session**
Main Decisions

Charter of the CGIAR System

The Charter was adopted by acclamation, and celebrated with a light reception.

Agenda Item 3(c) Challenge Programs

Generation CP

The CGIAR approved the Generation CP beyond its inception phase.

SSA CP

The CGIAR approves the SSA CP, in principle, for a 5-year period, subject to a successful assessment of its 18-month inception phase, to be initiated in the beginning of 2005. CGIAR requests FARA to:
1. Respond to the consolidated conclusions and recommendations made by the membership at AGM04 by providing ExCo every 6 months a progress report on actions taken, including the development of a logframe; and by providing the SC, 12 months after the start of the inception phase, a detailed report on the pilot sites work plan and priorities. SC will then commission an onsite review and advise the membership through ExCo on the adequacy of programs, including an assessment of a detailed plan for the additional sites, contributions to international public goods, with a focus on validity and rigor of science.
2. The program is expected to be fully funded during the inception phase.
3. Adequate flexibility should be incorporated in the expected timeframe of the inception phase.
4. FARA will indicate at the end of the inception phase the fit between the program and ongoing CGIAR Africa focused initiatives (SSA TFs, CDC Collective Action).

Agenda Item 4(a) External Program and Management Review of IRRI

The CGIAR:
1. Endorsed the EPMR.
2. Endorsed the first ExCo recommendation which reads: “IRRI should expand its activities in SSA with the proviso that it work closely with WARDA, the leading rice research institution in SSA.” This closer cooperation with WARDA should include work on upland rice in Africa.
3. Requested SC to establish an independent panel to study the situation of upland rice in Asia and IRRI’s potential contribution to solving researchable issues vis-à-vis the potential contribution of NARS or other parts of the CGIAR System.
Agenda Item 4(b) Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees

CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on Review of Partnership Committees and specifically agreed to:

**PSC**
- Continue PSC in a “market testing” mode for 2-4 years, as recommended by the Review (recommendation 8).

**CSOs**

*Short term:*
- Continuation and expansion of outreach activities already underway (Innovation Marketplace, Farmers Dialogue, Farmers Exchange), including a CSO Forum in alternate years to precede the reformatted AGM.
- Consider establishing a focal point in the CGIAR Secretariat to facilitate CSO linkages with the CGIAR.

*Longer term:*
- Develop an inventory and typology of partnerships and prepare a guide of best practices.
- Further strengthen GFAR-CGIAR linkages, specifically in relation to farmers and other CSOs.

Agenda Item 5(b) ExCo Committees

- The ExCo recommendation to abolish its two standing committees and appoint ad hoc groups when necessary was adopted.
- Members agreed to have the CGIAR Charter amended accordingly.
- ExCo should ensure that the ad hoc groups are strong (composed of members with appropriate skills and expertise).

Agenda Item 5(c) CGIAR Nominee Process

- The CGIAR-nominee process approved in March 2004 will be implemented and remain in force through the end of 2006. A review to derive lessons and recommend next steps will take place at that time.
- CBC and the CGIAR Secretariat will further develop criteria for selection of CGIAR nominees.

Agenda Item 7. CGIAR Financing Plan for 2005

- Members approved the 2005 Financing Plan, to be adjusted to include the $2.3 million approved for SSA CP in 2005.
Agenda Item 8(a) Future CGIAR Meetings

Members agreed to:

- Move AGM to the first week of December starting in 2005. The international calendar will be consulted from year to year to avoid potential conflicts.
- Hold AGM in Morocco in 2005, with thanks to the Government of Morocco for its kind offer to host the meeting.
- Change the format of AGMs, starting in 2005, to a smaller business oriented meeting in one year, alternated with an expanded meeting the following year.
- Request the CGIAR Secretariat to develop the format for AGM 2005, taking into consideration the issue of administrative burden, the views of the host country Morocco, and the comments of other Members during the discussion.

Agenda Item 8(b) Funding System Priorities

- Interested donors, with the support of the CGIAR Secretariat, should explore the possibility of developing a mechanism to allocate unrestricted funds in the context of System priorities recommended by SC. Denmark was asked to lead these initial discussions. (The support of the CGIAR Secretariat will include assistance in the mapping of the existing financial arrangements between donors and centers)
- The outcome of these initial discussions would be a proposal to ExCo for terms of reference of a task force to study and formulate a mechanism for channeling unrestricted contributions and allocating funds to support System priorities.
- The task force is expected to complete its work by and report to the Membership at AGM 2005.
Charter of the CGIAR System

CGIAR Members approved the first-ever Charter of the CGIAR System on a no-objection basis prior to AGM04. However, some Members felt that the approval should be marked by formal endorsement of the Charter at AGM and celebrated.

Introducing the Charter at AGM, CGIAR Director Francisco Reifschneider said that it is a living document which will be adjusted to reflect the decisions of the Membership that have an impact on the substance of the Charter. The Charter was drafted in a transparent process with the help of Members and had benefited greatly from editorial changes suggested by Members. The final version of the Charter was completed with the guidance of a Fine-Tuning Group consisting of Franklin Moore, Chair (USA), Afework Aklilu (AfDB), Per Pinstrup-Andersen (Science Council), and John Vercoe (representing the Centers). CGIAR Chair Ian Johnson said he wished to pay a special tribute to Ernest Corea (CGIAR Secretariat) who had done enormous work on getting the Charter organized.

The Charter was adopted by acclamation, and celebrated with a light reception.
Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

(a) Chairman’s Opening Remarks

CGIAR Chair Ian Johnson welcomed Members and formally opened the meeting. He highlighted some of the pre-AGM activities in Mexico, as well as of the Stakeholder Meeting, and expressed the hope that participants had enjoyed all these events.

The Chairman bid farewell to friends of longstanding and welcomed new friends to the CGIAR System:

Farewell:
- Seyyid Abdulai, OPEC Fund
- Adolfo Cazorla, Spain
- Ruben Echeverría, IDB (welcomed also as Executive Director, Science Council)
- Jacob Thoppil, CIDA
- Magdy Madkour, Egypt (welcomed as ADG, ICARDA)
- Dongyu Qu, China
- Klaus Winkel, Denmark
- Ron Cantrell, IRRI
- Hubert Zandstra, CIP

Welcome:
- Finn Norman Christensen, Denmark
- Marco Ferroni, IDB
- Anne Germain, CIDA
- Marcus Heinz, Austria
- Suleiman Al-Herbish, OPEC Fund
- Adel El-Safar, Syria
- Jeong-Soo Son, Korea
- Mario Gomez Perez, Spain
- Badawi El Tantawi, Egypt
- Lijian Zhang, China

The Group acknowledged the service rendered to the CGIAR by those leaving their positions and welcomed incoming individuals with a round of applause.

Mr. Lutfu Tahtacioglu, Director General, Agricultural Research, Turkey was invited to make a statement to the Group. He announced the Government of Turkey has allocated funds for membership dues and plans to join the CGIAR in 2005. He also noted the contribution the CGIAR has made to the Turkish NARS.

---

1 Please note that items in this summary are presented in order of agenda item numbering, and not according to the order of the meeting agenda above.
(b) Adoption of the Agenda

The draft agenda was adopted with one amendment:

- At the request of Denmark, an item on “Funding of System Priorities” was added under Other Business.

The Chairman noted that the CGIAR Charter has been approved on a no-objection basis, and some members have suggested a special session at the end of the day so that the Charter could be formally endorsed at AGM, and the adoption of the Charter could be celebrated.

The Digivote technology was introduced to members. It allows members to assess various aspects of each agenda item electronically when discussion of that item has concluded. A brief demonstration the technology followed. (Complete results are available in Attachment 3)

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report

(a) Progress Report from ExCo

CGIAR Director Francisco Reifschneider updated members on Executive Council (ExCo) activities and developments in the CGIAR since AGM03. A recap of major activities since AGM03 include:

- Transfer of ISNAR as a program to IFPRI. He noted the smooth transition that took place and acknowledged the tremendous efforts of individuals at IFPRI and ISNAR and the professional manner in which the transfer was executed.
- Task Forces (TFs) on programmatic and structural/organization alignment in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) have been established. Work has begun and is ongoing.
- The CGIAR Charter has been finalized and endorsed without objection. He commended the feedback from Members that was received in development of the Charter.

He noted the increase in funding and the increase in number of members in the CGIAR. For 2004 total funding is estimated at $428 million, with 63 Members. He thanked Members for their support.

He highlighted the activities of ExCo during the past year, including ongoing and completed activities in program matters, evaluation, and governance and finance. He reminded members that rotation of some ExCo members is expected at the end of the calendar year. He said that a chart showing constituencies that are expected to rotate is available and requested members to discuss rotation within the constituent groups and notify the CGIAR Secretariat of any decisions reached.

On a final note, he stated that ExCo is working to increase the efficiency, efficacy, and transparency of its work.
Compensation Study Steering Committee Chair, Philippe Vialatte, was invited to brief members on the study. He gave a brief history of the study, and noted that Phase I is completed and Phase II is currently underway. The entire study is targeted for completion by the end of 2005. As agreed by ExCo, the report will be made available to Members after completion of the study. He welcomed the lead consultant of the study, Sandra Lawrence, to give a more detailed briefing.

She noted that 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

A brief overview of the activities and results of Phase I was presented. Phase II is currently underway and will compare compensation levels to the market with comparator organizations, particularly those engaged in agricultural research, in both private and public sectors worldwide. The target completion date for Phase II is early 2005. Phase III is scheduled for completion by mid-2005, and as noted previously, the entire study is targeted for completion by the end of 2005.

She noted that to maintain privacy of individuals it is recommended there be no disclosure of individual data. However, base salary ranges, benefits policies, etc. should be disclosed and updated periodically. She concluded by thanking Centers for their support during the exercise.

The Chairman noted that this is a rare instance when information has not been distributed publicly since the study is not complete and asked Members to exercise discretion with the information.

**Discussion:**

- The CGIAR should begin to think about what to do with the results of the study once completed. The need for discretion and privacy is understandable but transparency is essential and commitment to such a policy should be explicit.
- One member asked why the study was undertaken and what the plan is once it is completed.
- Members discussed various aspects of the presentation and results of the study so far.

F. Reifschneider clarified that the study was undertaken because of limited information on compensation packages and the potential problems it could raise including on transparency. Some ExCo members had also asked that such a study be undertaken. Therefore, information was collected to gain knowledge and assess what the current situation is. As the results show, there is a possibility for increased alignment standards
and establishment of guidelines and more coherent human resource (HR) policies across the System. Because of the sensitive nature of the information, balancing the need for privacy of individuals with the need to be transparent is important as the study moves forward.

**Agenda Item 3. Program Matters**

**(a) CGIAR Priorities and Strategies: 2005-2010**

Science Council (SC) Chair Per Pinstrup-Andersen made a formal presentation on this item during the Stakeholders Meeting. The presentation was followed by a rich discussion during a parallel session. He noted that he looks forward to members’ comments and is also asking for an endorsement of the process used to identify priorities for research.

He said that the vision of the SC was for 80-90 percent of CGIAR funds to be spent on the agreed priority research areas, after a period of transition. To maintain flexibility and encourage innovation, 10-20 percent of resources would be left undedicated to specific System priorities. Donors could allocate funds based on the priorities without further earmark, which would help Centers to secure funding in a more efficient manner. This will enhance public goods research and make a difference in the lives of poor people.

He pointed out that the study of priorities was inherited from the interim SC and enhanced by looking at the whole portfolio of activities that has the greatest amount of impact. Therefore, it is important to get agreement from all stakeholders. He noted that 10 areas have been identified as priority and are quite broad and contain sub-areas which will be studied in greater detail in January and February during planning meetings (one for each of the areas). He emphasized that this is the right time for the exercise, because the CGIAR is in a position of strength that enables it to focus on its research strengths.

Denis Despreaux, co-chair of the parallel session “Dialogue on CGIAR Priorities and Strategies” noted some of the issues raised during the session (see report from parallel session in Attachment 1).

**Discussion:**

- Members commended the SC for its work and noted that it is important to devise a mechanism to align the research agenda of Centers with System priorities.
- It is difficult to identify and rank priorities and care should be taken not to get locked into a static system; priorities are dynamic and they change. Therefore, flexibility should be built into the system to respond to changing needs.
- It is important to conduct the priority setting process from a position of strength and to proceed in a transparent manner. Regional and sub-regional priorities should also be examined. The priorities should be forward looking, demanded by end users, and achievable with as little duplication as possible from other organizations. The exercise will help move the CGIAR to a true “system” and
will be helpful when negotiating budget lines for the CGIAR System rather than for 15 individual centers.

- The identified themes are very broad and it would be useful to identify deliverables for each theme. Concern was expressed that the number of priorities has increased from 5 to 10, but there has been no discussion of what is no longer a priority for the System.
- Research is about knowledge and technologies; therefore, it is important to define themes in terms of deliverables and how they will impact on the outcomes that are being sought. To this end, at what stage will key partners be identified in the process and how will this impact delivery of outcomes?
- We should keep in mind ‘what is’ rather than ‘what ought to be’ in going forward in terms of resource allocation. Is it too much to expect that 80 percent of resources will be allocated to the priorities during a transition period? How does SC propose the CGIAR use the additional 10-20 percent of funds that are not allocated to priority areas?
- A set of priorities should really have some bite, rather than just be a wish-list. They should eventually be ranked to have an impact. This means that there is a need to determine what gets left out; but also what projects that are not currently undertaken but should be. At some point, a group of partners needs to be identified; a strategy must be implemented with a full partnership, and not just by a group of Centers.
- For the long term, CGIAR Centers should not focus on activities of NARS, but on activities that they do best, e.g. provide global public goods. It is also paramount to help NARS build capacity to fully take up their own responsibilities.
- A desire for a closer link to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in order to increase focus on interdisciplinary issues was expressed by several members.
- Non-research activities of the CGIAR should also be included, e.g. systems for sustainable development, delivery systems, rural development, etc.
- Several members pointed out the need for more detailed focus on cross cutting issues such as health, including HIV/AIDS, post-conflict rehabilitation, gender, biodiversity, water management, inclusion of high value crops, focus on regional goals and consultation with regional fora (in addition to GFAR), and conservation of resources.

P. Pinstrup-Andersen responded that Members’ comments have been noted and will be taken into account as the exercise proceeds. He thanked Members for their remarks and made clarifications. He noted that the 10-20 percent margin of resources would be reserved specifically to respond to crises and/or changing needs of the System. However, when dealing with research, it is also important to remember areas of focus can not be changed rapidly. The CGIAR focus is on the long term and needs to have long term goals, and to use Medium-term Plans (MTPs) and logframes to establish realistic milestones to monitor progress. One of the current problems in the System is that there are too many projects which focus on the short term. These projects are undertaken primarily because money is available and Centers feel the need to get the money.
He agreed on the importance of agriculture and health and also noted the importance of agricultural research to countries that have experienced conflict. It is not entirely clear whether help in this area should be to failed states or to those undergoing conflict. In any case, it would probably fall into the 20 percent margin area because it is usually a more short term activity. Gender issues will be a focus of the exercise. Milestones will be linked with the performance measurement system being developed and the outcome of research and impact will also be linked. Every effort will be made to avoid overlap with other activities. SC will make rankings within each priority area, but not among the areas. SC believes the 10 priority areas are correct and it is difficult to see how any of the areas could be dropped. The issue is what to do within each area. The links to MDGs are important and he agreed that is should be made more explicit.

The exercise focuses on priorities for the CGIAR and its partners and does not attempt to set global priorities. It is important to remember that 96 percent of agricultural research is done outside of the CGIAR and it would be presumptuous to attempt to set such global priorities. The SC looks forward to working with GFAR for planning at the regional level and realizes that it will be an iterative process.

SC hopes to complete its work by the end of April 2005. The CGIAR is expected to consider the SC recommendations, through ExCo, most likely at AGM05. However, in case the final approval of priorities is delayed to AGM05, SC would like to suggest that Center MTPs submitted in 2005 be in line with the recommended System priorities.

Conclusion:
- SC is off to a very good start on identifying System priorities.
- Members endorsed the process that was laid out for moving forward.
- Financing of the priorities will be dealt with in an item under Other Business.
- When the final report is received it would be submitted to Members for comment and subsequently a timeline for approval will be established.
- In setting priorities, “what not to do” is as important as “what to do.”
- As the process moves forward, it is important to keep an eye on global public goods research and distinguish between research and development agendas.

(b) Report from the Science Council

Report from SC

P. Pinstrup-Andersen noted that the CGIAR was building a strong Science Council with outstanding membership. He outlined SC activities and explained the implementation of its work program. He referred to the establishment of the SC’s four standing panels and announced that SC members as well as external members had been identified to serve on them. The SC inherited a strong Secretariat which was strengthened with the selection of a new Executive Director, Ruben Echeverria. SC is committed to operating in a fully transparent and open manner, and meetings are open to observers from the CGIAR. Closed sessions are held only for housekeeping matters and are primarily limited to discussions of individuals under consideration for panel memberships.
SC’s mandate is to focus on science in terms of priorities and relevance, quality, impact, mobilization (to collaborate in the 96 percent of agricultural research conducted outside the System) and to increase value. To that end, SC is focusing on helping the System develop a more cohesive and effective approach to its work, so that it can have a greater impact on reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition. There are five elements to this approach: (1) to identify a set of clear System priorities and objectives; (2) to improve monitoring and evaluation, a process in which the SC Secretariat and CGIAR Secretariat were collaborating on a joint paper; (3) to integrate performance measurement in MTPs and logframes; (4) to strengthen MTPs and logframes by setting realistic goals and monitoring progress towards their achievement; and (5) to encourage regional programmatic alignment, starting with the ongoing effort of the CGIAR Task Forces on SSA.

He highlighted some of the recent actions taken by SC, including:
- MTP reviews: final commentaries were sent to each Center/CP inviting each to prepare a short response. In the past, commentaries were often ignored, but now Centers/CPs are given an opportunity to respond, which allows for a dialogue.
- CPs: periodic reviews undertaken, joint paper with CGIAR Secretariat on lessons learned from pilot CPs.
- System Priorities exercise.
- External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs): together with the CGIAR Secretariat, currently working on IFPRI and CIMMYT and the Systemwide Program (SWP) on Slash and Burn. To avoid any real or perceived conflict of interest on the IFPRI EPMR, he noted that he has recused himself from SC discussions on this matter. EPMRs are planned for CIFOR, ICRAF, and WorldFish in 2005; CIFOR and ICRAF will have at least one joint member. EPMRs for IWMI and ICARDA are planned for 2006.
- Impact Assessment: to be reported by Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) Chair Hans Gregersen.
- Other: studies on food safety and ethics.

Report from SC/SPIA

SPIA Chair Hans Gregersen reported on activities of the panel since AGM03. He noted that the mandate for SPIA remains the same, and includes four strategic objectives:
1. Improving impact assessment relevance;
2. Expanding impact assessment coverage;
3. Improving the quality of impact assessments; and
4. Facilitating the dissemination and use of results.

SPIA projects have been designed to address each of the above objectives.

He presented highlights from the ongoing SPIA activities, details of which are available in the report submitted to AGM04.
He acknowledged the contribution of Ruben Echeverria who retired from SPIA to assumed duties as Executive Director of the SC Secretariat, and expressed thanks to Tim Kelley and Sirkka Immonen in the SC Secretariat for their support of SPIA, and to SC members for input on program matters. He noted that SPIA welcomes additional input on all aspects of its program from Members and other stakeholders.

**Discussion:**
- Members were appreciative of the efforts of SC and excited about it future work. Concern was expressed that it has a heavy work load.
- A member asked whether biosafety issues—which are of Systemwide concern—would be addressed by the individual Centers.
- Members also expressed concern about whether SC will look at large emerging scientific technology issues, such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs), nanotechnology, etc. How will positions be reached and how will policies and/or decisions be implemented across the System?
- On impact studies, it was noted that there seems to be slow progress on NRM.
- Easy-to-digest information on impact is greatly desired.
- It would be useful to see a clearer and more direct link between results of SPIA studies and the System priorities exercise, and with the performance measurement system.
- The SPIA survey on training is crucial for quality of NARS training programs in SSA.

The SC and SPIA Chairs addressed some of the concerns and issues raised and thanked Members for their comments and suggestions. The SPIA Chair suggested that members might consult the new impact web site (http://impact.cgiar.org/).

**Conclusions:**
- *The Chairman concluded that SC has a very heavy work agenda. Some of the large scientific issues raised by Members may be better dealt with in a newly designed AGM format that will be discussed in a later agenda item. He suggested, as well, that the Membership should discuss and adopt a CGIAR publications policy.*

**(c) Challenge Programs**

The Chairman introduced the three sub-items and suggested the Generation CP be discussed first and then combine the final two items into one discussion. Members agreed to this arrangement.

*Generation CP*

F. Reifschneider gave a brief background on the item and noted ExCo has recommended approval of the CP beyond the inception phase.
**Discussion:**

- The CP proponents were congratulated for the amount of inter-Center collaboration they had created, and for including beneficiaries in the planning process. It was noted that a planning meeting will be held with USDA and it is hoped that similar meetings will be held with European and other regional organizations.
- CPs are time bound and output related; concern was expressed that this CP will go on for a long time.
- Support was expressed for the SC and ExCo recommendations to approve the CP beyond its inception phase.

**Decision:**

- *The CGIAR approved the Generation CP beyond its inception phase.*

*Lessons from Pilot CPs*

**Science**

P. Pinstrup-Andersen briefed members on the science and programmatic aspects of the lessons learned on pilot CPs.

He noted that all three CPs focus on international public goods research on important issues. It is clear that CPs need to set very sharp priorities before they proceed, particularly before competitive grant proposals are invited.

CPs should have very clearly defined boundaries: thematic and time bound. They should focus sharply on the generation of international public goods and research results should be tied to deadlines.

CPs have helped open the CGIAR to new partners and made their participation easier. However, partnerships should be pursued for the purpose of doing research and not as a goal in itself.

Recommendations in science/programmatic matters include:

- Pilot CPs should continue and be evaluated after five years of operation, including the Generation CP. The CPs may continue after this period, but an evaluation by an external panel should take place.
- New CPs should be developed in the context of new System priorities. SC sees no conflict with the current three CPs, as they are well within the foreseeable System priorities.
- CPs should be time bound (although an extension could be provided, depending on the circumstances).
- Particular attention should be paid to the public goods research nature of CPs.
Governance and Finance

F. Reifschneider briefed members on the governance and finance aspects of the lessons learned on pilot CPs.

He noted that it is appropriate to maintain flexibility so each CP can achieve what it sets out to achieve. At the same time, a set of governance parameters should spell out key questions of governance, including legal and administrative matters.

On whether CPs are generating new funds for the System, it is clear that the pilot CPs have generated new funding from traditional and completely new sources. One of the objectives of CPs was to help open up the System. Competitive grants are doing this by bringing in new research suppliers. Future reviews will help gauge the level of participation of non-CGIAR research centers.

Transaction costs are unavoidable when developing and implementing CPs. They seem to decrease with time, but will have to be examined by an external review in five years. Good oversight is necessary to control transaction costs.

Recommendations in governance and finance matters include:

- Prescribing a single model of governance is not wise. Governance flexibility must be retained, but a set of governance principles should be developed.
- The linkage of CP and Center governance bodies should be clarified to avoid legal and oversight problems. Lines of accountability should be more clearly defined.
- Good oversight is required to properly monitor transaction costs.

SSA CP

Before presenting an overview of the SSA CP, FARA (Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa) Executive Secretary Monty Jones was honored by acclamation for receiving the 2004 World Food Prize.

M. Jones noted that the CP is a product of a range of stakeholders including sub-regional organizations (SROs) in Africa, comprising 45 countries and other stakeholders from advanced research institutions in the North and contributions from all 15 CGIAR Centers.

He noted that the CP comprises two components: 1) integration among multiple stakeholders and across disciplines, and 2) research for development on a broader systems dynamic (to address the complexity of farming systems in Africa and to link agricultural research for development to markets and policies with a view to increasing agricultural productivity and profitability in the region).

The overall CP themes are:

- Development of functional agricultural markets
- Intensification of smallholder farming systems
• Sustainable management of natural resources
• Development of enabling policies

Phase 1 of the CP will cover three learning sites across SSA in east, west-central, and southern Africa.

He noted that the SSA CP represents an opportunity to generate innovative, high quality science. The CP:
1. Draws upon the best available science, technology and insights;
2. Uses a participatory approach likely to identify problems calling for new science;
3. Analyzes linkages between economics, social science and policy; and
4. Analyzes how to implement institutional change.

He presented a brief overview of program management issues, including planning and implementation and noted that a review will take place after 12 months to satisfy the CGIAR that the CP is moving ahead satisfactorily, and employing science worthy of the CGIAR.

P. Pinstrup-Andersen summarized SC’s comments on the SSA CP. The CP presents a new paradigm for agricultural research for development and should be funded and supported as an experiment for doing this kind of research. One drawback is that the proposed research themes do not reflect specific priorities with logframes because of the nature of the approach. SC agrees with an initial phase of 18 months in which priorities for research will be identified. It is understood that this will be based on a diagnosis in the regions to determine priorities. A potential problem is that it could become location specific and not generate international public goods. However, the CP proposal is very innovative and deserves support. He concluded that the SC agrees with the ExCo recommendation on the CP.

F. Reifschneider presented ExCo’s recommendations on the SSA CP. He noted that the financing plan for 2005 is $2.3 million and contributions to FARA to date have been received through ILRI. The CGIAR Secretariat has been in discussion with FARA on strengthening its fiduciary standards so it will be able to handle these matters on its own in the future.

ExCo recommendations to CGIAR on SSA CP:
• SSA regional needs are high; therefore, there is a clear sense of urgency.
• ExCo supports the innovation embodied in the CP, but recognizes the risks involved.
• There is a need for the SSA CP to demonstrate added value by contributing to efficient utilization of CGIAR resources with clear linkages to other CGIAR activities (e.g., CGIAR task forces on SSA, CP lessons learned, CDC Collective Action Framework, Systemwide Program (SWP)—African Highlands).
• ExCo recommends to the CGIAR approval of the SSA CP for an 18 month inception phase incorporating the following three steps:
  1. AGM04 discussion to thoroughly enrich SC and ExCo-raised issues.
2. **FARA will be requested to respond to the consolidated AGM04 conclusions and recommendations by providing ExCo, every 6 months, a progress report on actions taken to address CGIAR conclusions and recommendations and by providing the SC, 12 months after the start of the inception phase, a detailed report on the pilot sites work plan and priorities. SC will then commission an on-site review and advise ExCo on adequacy of progress made by FARA.**

3. **ExCo makes a recommendation to the membership on whether or not to continue the SSA CP beyond the inception phase at the end of the 18 month period.**

**Discussion:**

- Members expressed strong support for the SSA CP and noted that it is an important initiative in light of SSA being the only region where food security remains a major challenge and productivity is declining, in spite of the giant strides in global science and technology.
- Governance and management structures of the CP require further clarification to improve accountability. Concern was expressed about the complexity of the system, which would be difficult to sustain.
- It is not enough that CGIAR is supportive of the CP; there must be buy-in from national and regional partners. It is important to establish mechanisms with appropriate SROs and NARS to ensure adequate program capacity. Widespread input requires proper delineation of tasks to avoid duplication of efforts, promote cooperation and assure integrated implementation among the various partners.
- The CP has potential for high gains, but it is important to recognize the high risks associated with it as well. It would therefore be useful if FARA put together a detailed logframe (or similar tool) for the CP. There needs to be objective criteria to assess the CP as it moves forward.
- Support was expressed for the CP’s strong linkages to markets, but there needs to be more discussion on how getting to markets will be addressed, due to the lack of infrastructure in SSA.
- The CP should seek greater participation from non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private sector, and smallholders in the region.
- It is important to look at the CP in terms of how it fits in with the entire African picture and how it will generate added value, including global public goods.
- New CPs should be developed in the context of the new System priorities. CPs should not be seen as an instrument of last resort, but should be used when it is the most appropriate instrument to achieve CGIAR objectives.
- The issue of governance in CPs remains unresolved, i.e. the role of Center boards in oversight. It is also a major challenge of the SSA CP, since unlike other CPs, the lead institution is not a CGIAR Center, but the secretariat of a non-CGIAR institution.
- Many members expressed agreement with the ExCo recommendation of approval for an initial phase of 18 months; however, several members proposed that the CP should be approved for a five-year period to send a strong signal of CGIAR support to SSA. It would highlight the urgency of Africa and raise its profile to
help receive the attention it deserves and more likely assure continuation of the program. There is a risk for slippage if approved for only 18 months. The CP has already attracted several donors and resources to finance Phase 1 and expectations in the donor community have been raised.

- Other Members countered that the CP must be held to rigorous scientific standards and therefore should not be rushed. Many details still need to be worked out and it will take 12-18 months to do this; approval for the 5-year period should not be done until this is completed. Transaction costs are a concern, and the inception phase will assure donors that they are worth it. It is also important to wait for the outcome of the Task Forces on SSA to get a better idea of how the CP will fit in with overall program and structure of activities in SSA.

- One member floated the idea of approving the CP on a timeframe that is more flexible between the 18 months recommended by ExCo and for the full 5 year period.

P. Pinstrup-Anderson noted that SC is aware of the urgency of agricultural research in SSA and of the interest of Members. However, it is important to get the CP right from a science perspective; the CGIAR can not afford to fail in this endeavor. If the CP is approved for a 5 year program and after 2 years we learn that it isn’t right, it would be difficult to start another program. Therefore, SC recommends an initial diagnostic phase of 18 months to give FARA a chance to complete the specifics of the proposal. Such detail is necessary in order to recommend continuation. He strongly urged Members not to approve the CP for 5 years and instead approve the inception phase.

**Decision:**

In light of the discussion, the Chairman presented a modified proposal to Members for their consideration, which was agreed:

*The CGIAR approves the SSA CP, in principle, for a 5-year period, subject to a successful assessment of its 18-month inception phase, to be initiated in the beginning of 2005. CGIAR requests FARA to:*

1. Respond to the consolidated conclusions and recommendations made by the membership at AGM04 by providing ExCo every 6 months a progress report on actions taken, including the development of a logframe; and by providing the SC, 12 months after the start of the inception phase, a detailed report on the pilot sites work plan and priorities. SC will then commission an onsite review and advise the membership through ExCo on the adequacy of programs, including an assessment of a detailed plan for the additional sites, contributions to international public goods, with a focus on validity and rigor of science.

2. The program is expected to be fully funded during the inception phase.

3. Adequate flexibility should be incorporated in the expected timeframe of the inception phase.

4. FARA will indicate at the end of the inception phase the fit between the program and ongoing CGIAR Africa focused initiatives (SSA TFs, CDC Collective Action).
M. Jones responded to some of the technical comments raised during the discussion.

**Agenda Item 4. Evaluation**

**(a) External Program and Management Review of IRRI**

The EPMR report was available to CGIAR Members in advance of AGM04. The full text of the report may be accessed at http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/agm04/agm04_irri_epmr.pdf. The Chair noted that the report was discussed fully by ExCo at its meeting in September 2004.

EPMR Panel Chair Richard Flavell summarized the findings of the EPMR. The review was favorable, in sum, but made some suggestions for enhanced achievement and impact. The panel acknowledged that IRRI occupies a very small slice of overall rice research worldwide, but emphasized that it is a powerful slice. IRRI should inspire and harness the world rice research community, leveraging it for the poor and link interdisciplinary sciences to tackle complex issues in rice production systems. IRRI would need to continue to work in close collaboration with NARS.

The panel felt that IRRI’s board should be more active in strategic planning and monitoring progress of the Center, and adopt more comprehensive investment guidelines. The panel recommended that attaining sustainable yield increases in favorable and unfavorable environments should become the two flagship challenges of IRRI’s research.

IRRI Board Chair Keijiro Otsuka thanked the panel for the collegial manner in which it undertook the review, and said that the Center planned to implement the panel’s recommendations in 2005. He offered some clarifications on some of the issues raised in the report. The issues included research on upland rice, the Center’s social science capacity, collaboration with WARDA, and the emphasis on research for sustainable yield increases in favorable and unfavorable environments.

SC Chair P. Pinstrup-Andersen stated that SC agreed with all 10 recommendations and concluded that the small amount spent on upland rice would be better spent on lowland rainfed rice systems. He noted that ExCo overrode this recommendation and suggested IRRI continue to work on upland rice in coordination with WARDA.

F. Reifschneider noted that the comment in the EPMR stating that CP funding has taken funding away from Centers is not based in fact and should have been analyzed more carefully.

ExCo submitted the following recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo expressed general agreement with the EPMR and recommends approval of the EPMR recommendations by the CGIAR.*

- *Two additional ExCo recommendations for consideration and approval by the CGIAR are:*
IRRI should expand its activities in SSA with the proviso that it work closely with WARDA, the leading rice research institution in SSA.

IRRI should not abandon research on upland rice, instead it should work with WARDA on a joint activity on this subject.

- Panels conducting external reviews should refrain from making judgmental comments that are not evidence-based.

**Discussion:**

Members commended the EPMR panel and management of IRRI and expressed general agreement and support for the EPMR recommendations, including the additional ExCo recommendations. In the course of a lively discussion, two issues emerged as central to Members’ concerns:

- The relative merits of IRRI’s involvement with research on upland and lowland rice, and
- The need for collaboration between IRRI and WARDA.

**Decision:**

**The CGIAR:**

1. Endorsed the EPMR.
2. Endorsed the first ExCo recommendation which reads: “IRRI should expand its activities in SSA with the proviso that it work closely with WARDA, the leading rice research institution in SSA.” This closer cooperation with WARDA should include work on upland rice in Africa.
3. Requested SC to establish an independent panel to study the situation of upland rice in Asia and IRRI’s potential contribution to solving researchable issues vis-à-vis the potential contribution of NARS or other parts of the CGIAR System.

**(b) Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees**

A review of CGIAR Partnership Committees conducted by an external panel chaired by Keith Bezanson was discussed at the May 2004 meeting of ExCo. The report which was distributed in advance of AGM may be accessed at [http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco6/exco6_review_cgiar_part_comm.pdf](http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco6/exco6_review_cgiar_part_comm.pdf).

Following its discussion, ExCo submitted the following recommendation 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 (Private Sector Committee), adopt recommendation 8, “market testing” for 2-4 years.
• On NGOC (Non-governmental Organizations Committee), 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.

At AGM, F. Reifschneider noted that one of the two committees reviewed, the PSC, had provided a response to the review. The CGIAR approached and requested NGOC Co-chair, Patrick Mulvaney to address the Group but Mulvaney responded that he had resigned. A statement was also released which said that the NGOC was not the best way to bring NGO views to the table. Reifschneider said that a proposal to be presented during the discussion on timing of future AGMs will suggest a way to increase interactions with CSOs.

Ruth Haug and Mohamed Roozitalab, Co-chairs of the parallel session on “CGIAR Partnership Committees: Next Steps,” held during the Stakeholder Meeting, presented a summary of the discussion (see report in Attachment 2). Participants in the session agreed with the ExCo recommendation on PSC, but felt that future CSO interaction with the CGIAR should allow for farmers to be represented separately from NGOs. Identification of a focal point for CSOs in the CGIAR Secretariat was also suggested. M. Roozitalab noted that GFAR recently met with NGOs, and that GFAR could serve as a conduit for increased interaction between NGOs and the CGIAR. He said that several NGOs had supported this approach.

PSC Chair Usha Barwale noted that the PSC had issued a response to the review. It agrees with the ExCo recommendation of an examination on how PSC fits in and the value of the partnership and agrees that if it doesn’t add value it shouldn’t exist. She also requested there be a more formal mechanism for PSC inputs and views to be conveyed to the CGIAR. She noted with satisfaction that PSC was working together with CDC on a program of staff and knowledge exchange between the Centers and private sector. There was an expectation the program would start in 2005. Additional areas of joint work are also being explored.

Discussion:

Members agreed with ExCo’s recommendation, and emphasized the need to maintain effective partnerships with CSOs including NGOs, farmers, and the private sector. The strong case made by farmers for a direct relationship between farmers organizations and
the CGIAR was acknowledged. The report on UN (United Nations) civil society linkages commissioned by Secretary General Kofi Annan was suggested as a reference for possible options for consideration by the CGIAR.

**Decision:**
CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on Review of Partnership Committees and specifically agreed to:

**PSC**
- Continue PSC in a “market testing” mode for 2-4 years, as recommended by the Review (recommendation 8).

**CSOs**
*Short term:*
- Continuation and expansion of outreach activities already underway (Innovation Marketplace, Farmers Dialogue, Farmers Exchange), including a CSO Forum in alternate years to precede the reformatted AGM.
- Consider establishing a focal point in the CGIAR Secretariat to facilitate CSO linkages with the CGIAR.

*Longer term:*
- Develop an inventory and typology of partnerships and prepare a guide of best practices.
- Further strengthen GFAR-CGIAR linkages, specifically in relation to farmers and other CSOs.

(c) Development of Performance Measurement System

Kevin Cleaver, Co chair of the Working Group on Performance Measurement (WGPM) briefly introduced the item, and said that Professor Susan Cozzens, consultant to the WG, from the Georgia Institute of Technology, would make a more detailed presentation.

S. Cozzens explained that performance measurement is an ongoing process of gathering information on important dimensions of performance and complements other evaluative mechanisms such as EPMRs. The purpose in the CGIAR is to aid in decision making and performance management, accountability, benchmarking and resource allocation.

The WG has adopted eight performance elements, and has drafted a recommended set of indicators for each. The eight performance elements are:

**Results:** 1) outputs, 2) outcomes, 3) impacts, 4) stakeholder perceptions

**Potential to Perform:** 5) quality of research staff, 6) quality and relevance of programs, 7) institutional health, and 8) financial health

Next steps include fine-tuning of the list of indicators, development of a data gathering mechanism, and approval by ExCo in early 2005. Data collection (of 2004 data) for pilot
testing the system will begin in April 2005. Full implementation would begin in 2006 using 2005 data.

WG Co-chair Luis Arango noted that after approval of the system, it is hoped that it will be the only system used to measure performance to reduce duplication. Some Centers are concerned that this will be used as a ranking system. He emphasized that this is not the case.

**Conclusion:**
- The Chair noted that this item was for information only and Members will be updated as the system is further developed. He informed Members that S. Cozzens would be available to discuss any issues during the coffee breaks.

**Agenda Item 5. Governance Matters**

**(a) Task Forces on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment—SSA**

Jochen de Haas, Co-chair of the TF on Structural/Organizational Alignment provided an update on activities of the TFs on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment in SSA on behalf of the four Co-chairs.

He noted that a team of consultants has conducted field visits, consultations and surveys in SSA. The initial findings center on CGIAR’s achievements in the region and concerns of stakeholders. Some of the achievements that were highlighted include generation and dissemination of appropriate technologies, jointly addressing research challenges with partners, a good record of national capacity building and human resource development, linking NARS and Center activities, and helping NARS connect to global networks. Major concerns were in the areas of competition and interaction among the Centers, lack of a cohesive CGIAR strategy, too much time and resources spent on project development and fund raising, and the relationship between NARS and Centers moving from one of partnership to competition.

These findings have led to a set of guiding principles suggested by the study team for realignment of the CGIAR in SSA:
- Strengthening NARS institutions;
- Broadening of the CGIAR mandate and research agenda;
- Joint priority setting, program development and implementation;
- Mechanisms for integration and coordination of CGIAR activities; and
- Sustained funding.

The study team will submit its report to the TFs at the end of November 2004. The TFs will then hold a series of meetings to draft its own report. It is tentatively scheduled to be submitted to ExCo in or before April 2005.
Discussion:

- Members congratulated the TFs for their efforts to date and look forward to the recommendations of the TFs and the efficiencies they may bring to the System.
- Other discussions such as the CDC collective action framework that aim toward working as a single System were welcomed as well.
- The TFs should seek input from stakeholders so that any resulting reforms capture national strengths and assure synergy to tackle more effectively regional problems within the framework of regional action.
- The TFs should look into the funding problems of NARS in SSA, and particularly if funding for NARS is decreasing vis-à-vis funding for Centers.
- Some Members were concerned that the TFs are not focusing on key issues such as forestry, fisheries, water, HIV/AIDS and biotechnology research. It was clarified that these areas will not be neglected.

Conclusion:

- The Chair noted that comments by Members will be taken into account by the TFs as their work moves forward.

(b) ExCo Committees

The Chair introduced the item and noted the ExCo recommendation that the ExCo Program (ExCo/PC) and ExCo Finance (ExCo/FC) Committees, should be abolished. ExCo could establish *ad hoc* groups, when necessary, to study specific issues.

ExCo/PC Chair Marina Puccioni noted that the ExCo/PC was useful as long as SC was not in place. Moreover, there was considerable duplication because matters discussed by the committee were discussed again by ExCo. Consequently, ExCo/PC felt it was best to abolish the committee. SC should handle program matters, but ExCo could set up *ad hoc* groups when required.

ExCo/FC Chair Kevin Cleaver noted a similar experience with the ExCo/FC, namely all issues discussed by the committee were discussed a second time by ExCo. The committee had good deliberations, but there was little value added to justify the time and effort. As suggested, *ad hoc* groups are better suited to handle such issues when necessary.

Discussion:

- General support was expressed for the recommendation in the interest of efficiency.
- One Member dissented from ExCo’s recommendation. Because only one and a half days are spent at AGM on decision making and at two ExCo meetings per year, smaller groups (of experts) should look more closely into issues that warrant such scrutiny in order to expand [and not lessen] shareholders’ role in governance. *Ad hoc* groups could undertake this work, but they should be more permanent in nature. Although ExCo/PC may have outlived its usefulness because of SC, the ExCo/FC had more explicit terms of reference. Scrutiny is
also required in the area of management and governance, on issues of Center governance, and how emerging partnerships may fit in with CGIAR governance.

- While some Members were sympathetic to this view, there was greater support for the idea of time-bound *ad hoc* groups.
- Several Members felt that ExCo should decide how it wants to organize itself. However, establishment of the committees was a CGIAR decision so abolishing them would also require a decision by Members.
- A decision to abolish the committees would also mean the Charter would have to be amended.

**Decision:**

- *The ExCo recommendation to abolish its two standing committees and appoint *ad hoc* groups when necessary was adopted.*
- *Members agreed to have the CGIAR Charter amended accordingly.*
- *ExCo should ensure that the *ad hoc* groups are strong (composed of members with appropriate skills and expertise).*

**c) CGIAR Nominee Process**

The Chair introduced item and noted that a new process was endorsed by ExCo and approved by the CGIAR in March 2004. However, reservations were expressed by some ExCo members at its September 2004 meeting, and ExCo recommended that it be included as an item for discussion at AGM04.

F. Reifschneider briefed Members of the process over the past two plus years that led to approval of the new process. The issues raised by ExCo were:

1. What should be the selection criteria for CGIAR nominees? What set of skills and perspectives should CGIAR nominees bring to a Board?
2. How should the CGIAR nominees be identified? In particular what role, if any, should the Boards play in identification of CGIAR nominees? Should the nominees have a representational role on the Board (representing the CGIAR)? How would this affect the liabilities/responsibility of Boards?
3. What protocols would guide the inputting and access to the database so as to protect the privacy of nominees?

As a way forward, he suggested that the agreed process be implemented for a two-year period, after which a review would take place to derive lessons and recommend next steps. This would allow time for adjustments to be made to allay concerns of those who expressed reservations. The process endorsed by ExCo and approved by CGIAR would be implemented and remain in place until the end of 2006. The issue would be taken up again by Members at that time.

Selection criteria for CGIAR nominees would be further developed by CBC and the CGIAR Secretariat.
Discussion:

- The CGIAR Secretariat and CBC worked hard on the approved process and it should be allowed to move ahead for two years and conduct a review at that time.
- All names submitted for each vacancy should be selected from the new CGIAR database.
- In reality, there will only be one type of board member; CGIAR nominees will only bring a perspective to the board. To that end, it is necessary to establish criteria that can be used to determine the qualifications of individuals to perform the required board functions.

Decision

- The CGIAR-nominee process approved in March 2004 will be implemented and remain in force through the end of 2006. A review to derive lessons and recommend next steps will take place at that time.
- CBC and the CGIAR Secretariat will further develop criteria for selection of CGIAR nominees.

Agenda Item 6. Perspective from the Centers

(a) CBC Perspectives

CBC Chair Uzo Mokwunye stated that CBC welcomes the Centers’ initiative to enhance collective action. CBC firmly believes that this effort will add value to and complement the work of the TFs on SSA.

He noted that CBC has embarked on a set of activities that will enhance the performance of Center Boards to meet expectations of CGIAR Members. It has agreed to commission an external review of board performance and Center governance, and that terms of reference for this review will be prepared, together with the CGIAR Secretariat. To better understand the expectations of Members, he requested Members to cooperate with the consultants that will be contracted to undertake the study. He informed Members that CBC will conduct a second round of board orientation courses at the close of AGM04. The courses have been amended as a result of feedback received after the pilot course held in May 2004. Additional orientation programs are planned for 2005.

Finally, CBC continues to demonstrate initiative by contributing to the performance measurement system by participating in the WG and it wholeheartedly endorsed the elements identified by the WG. It will work to ensure that a viable and useful system is adopted for all components of the CGIAR System. He concluded by reiterating CBC’s commitment to the reform process, and stressed CBC’s dedication to the goals and mission of the CGIAR.

(b) CDC Perspectives

CDC Chair Kanayo Nwanze stated that CDC and the Centers wish to thank the CGIAR Co-sponsors, Members and partners for their support throughout 2004. He noted the
System has passed the $400 million mark, which is indicative of the strong support and expectations placed on the System. He also thanked the Government of Mexico for hosting AGM04 and CIMMYT for hosting the CDC meetings prior to AGM.

On behalf of the Centers, he congratulated the SC on the development of the System priorities and noted the Centers are committed to being fully engaged in the exercise. CDC has had active engagement with the SC Chair and provided feedback on the current set of System priorities. He stated that CDC believes the priorities should be strongly linked with development themes of poverty reduction, economic growth, equity, sustainability, human health, and security. He noted other CDC suggestions for further development of the priorities.

He commended SC for its thoroughness in reviewing the MTPs and the constructive feedback, and for the Systemwide view it has taken. The Centers will take account of the comments in its program on collective action. They will also forward a collective response to SC on their suggestions for collaboration in the System.

He highlighted the progress made by Centers on collective action. CBC and CDC have endorsed the establishment of an Alliance of Future Harvest Centers to further enhance the collective action of the Centers. CDC will next transform itself into the Executive of the Alliance. He reiterated that the Future Harvest Alliance Office does not intend to duplicate or compete with the CGIAR Secretariat, but to complement and strengthen the System Office (SO). It will be an instrument to help Centers act in a more collective fashion. CDC has approached IFAD about the possibility of hosting the office; further discussions will take place at a later date. He noted that the Centers work on collective action corresponds with the guiding principles of the SSA TFs.

He noted that a dialogue between CDC and PSC in 2004 has led to two proposed areas of work: 1) a program of staff and knowledge exchange between Centers and the private sector, and 2) collaboration to enhance delivery systems for products produced by the Centers. A third activity is also being planned to study public-private partnerships for corporate social responsibility which will be further discussed in early 2005. He thanked PSC Chair Usha Barwale Zehr for her leadership of the PSC and for bringing PSC and CDC closer together. He also thanked Selcuk Ozgediz for his support in helping to build the relationship between the Centers and private sector.

In closing, he thanked colleagues for their support during his tenure as CDC Chair and for the support from Meryl Williams, the first executive of the new Alliance Office. He also noted the good working relationship with F. Reifschneider and his colleagues in the CGIAR Secretariat.

Discussion:

- Members expressed appreciation for the reports.
- Kanayo Nwanze was commended for his tenure as CDC Chair and the Systemwide view he brought to the table.
• A decision on location of the Alliance Office will take time and the CGIAR will be informed on any new developments.

Conclusion:
• The Chair thanked CBC and CDC Chairs for their presentations.

Agenda Item 7. CGIAR Financing Plan for 2005

F. Reifschneider introduced the item and noted that ExCo recommended approval of the 2005 Financing Plans.

(a) Comment from the Science Council

SC Member Ken Fischer presented comments from SC. He commended Centers on the preparation of the financing plans and MTPs and the short amount of time in which they were prepared. SC believes strongly that good science and quality begins with good planning. All SC members read the Center and CP MTPs and offered detailed comments on all. The responses received from Centers and CPs are attached to the SC commentaries.

Overall, the MTPs are in line with CGIAR goals and the overall planning indicates high quality of science. This was the first time the MTPs were used for all Center programs and CPs. System programs remain variable and there is not always a clear link to Center programs. SC will work with Centers to establish such linkages. SC is concerned that some projects and activities at the local level are not integrated in a way that will provide global public goods. In the future, SC will seek greater clarity on integration of plans. SC also noted the large number of partnerships and these are encouraged, but they need to be purposeful and provide added value through synergies. He cautioned against a proliferation of partnerships for their own sake, which can lead to large transaction costs without added benefit.

(b) Report from the CGIAR Secretariat

Senior Finance Officer Shey Tata of the CGIAR Secretariat presented a summary of the 2005 Financing Plan. He acknowledged the collaborative effort of the ILRI finance team in preparing the report.

The financing plan for 2005 is for a proposed research agenda of US$464 million, which includes the CPs. With the approval of the SSA CP, the total 2005 research agenda would increase by $2.3 million, for an overall total of $466 million. He noted that investment requirements of CPs are projected to increase to approximately US$48 million by 2007. The 2005 plans are to be financed by $459 million in donor grants, and $7 million from Center income/reserves.

The planned aggregate investment for all programs in 2005 is nearly $64 million (16 percent) over the actual 2003 level. Fourteen Centers propose an increased budget over
2003 and one a decrease. Investment by region also shows a slight shift, with relative
shares increasing for Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA) and SSA and
decreasing for Asia and Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) regions.

Discussion:

- Support was expressed for approval of the 2005 Financing Plan.
- One member cautioned that the increased level of funding should not be taken as a
given, in light of the fact that exchange rates inflate the dollar value of contributions and it may go the other way and reduce the overall funding picture in the future. Explanation was given that in 2003, gains associated with the exchange rate represented approximately $9 million.

Decision:

- Members approved the 2005 Financing Plan, to be adjusted to include the $2.3 million approved for SSA CP in 2005.

Agenda Item 8. Other Business

(a) Future CGIAR Meetings

The Chair noted that AGM04 has been a very successful meeting and has attracted about 1000 participants. This was due to a number of factors, including additional Members and partner’s relationships, and holding AGM in a location closer to research sites. As a result, the meeting put the CGIAR Secretariat under an enormous strain. As was noted previously, timing of AGM also has become an issue for the ExCo, SC and CGIAR Secretariat.

F. Reifschneider highlighted three points in relation to timing, location, and format.

Timing: ExCo has recommended an adjustment to the timing of AGMs to give SC enough time to review MTPs and prepare documents for submission to ExCo. ExCo also needs time to perform its functions, which feeds into preparation of AGM documentation by the CGIAR Secretariat. Two options were discussed with the SC Chair, and input was received from several Members. There was an option to hold the meeting during the first week of December or the second week of January. Either option would allow enough time for SC and ExCo to complete its work, and conflicts with other international meetings would be avoided. Based on feedback, the first week of December appears to be the preferred option.

Location: Malaysia and Morocco have offered to host AGM in the past. Morocco has again indicated it would be delighted to host the 2005 meeting.

Format: It is proposed to alternate the format of AGM from year to year. Starting in 2005, AGM would be a more business oriented meeting, consisting of a Member-Centers’ Day, followed by an expanded two-day business meeting. This would be followed in 2006 by an expanded AGM that, as an example, could include:
• CGIAR Forum (expansion of Stakeholder meeting—open to all):
  o Science Forum (1 day)
  o CSO forum (1 day)
• Member-Centers’ Day (1 day)
• National Day—field visits (1 day)
• Crawford Lecture
• Business meeting

The format would be altered from year to year. Such arrangements would enhance the quality of AGMs, optimize time allocation, reduce cost of AGMs, improve science and CSO linkages, and increase time for Center-Member and Member-Member interactions. The new arrangements may increase perception of unwillingness to interact with stakeholders, especially CSOs; but with proactive engagement strategies—some of which were discussed in an earlier item—these issues can be tackled effectively.

**Discussion:**

- The first week of December would be more suitable than the second week of January. However, the timing should be checked year to year with the international calendar.
- Broad support and agreement was expressed to hold AGM 2005 in Morocco.
- Members were in favor of the new format in terms of reducing the workload of the CGIAR Secretariat, but were concerned that there would be no CSO interaction planned for 2005 in light of the current situation. It was also suggested that a biennial CSO forum should be regionally focused rather than globally.

**Decision:**

Members agreed to:

- **Move AGM to the first week of December starting in 2005.** The international calendar will be consulted from year to year to avoid potential conflicts.
- **Hold AGM in Morocco in 2005,** with thanks to the Government of Morocco for its kind offer to host the meeting.
- **Change the format of AGMs,** starting in 2005, to a shorter, more business oriented meeting in one year, which could be alternated with an expanded meeting the following year, in a way to ensure that the innovative forms of programming which have been introduced in recent years are continued, but do not place an excessive administrative burden on the CGIAR Secretariat.
- **Request the CGIAR Secretariat to develop the format for AGM 2005,** taking into consideration the issue of administrative burden, the views of the host country Morocco, and the comments of other Members during the discussion.

**(b) Funding of System Priorities**

This item was added to the agenda at the request of Denmark which submitted the following framework for discussion:
• The establishment of the new System priorities for the CGIAR by the SC will make it necessary to create a mechanism to support the funding of the recommended priorities.
• With this in mind, Denmark proposes that interested donors decide to establish a task force to examine the possibilities and conditions for creating a mechanism/ procedure that allows for the system to be matched by sufficient core funding.
• The task force will look into the possibilities and conditions for allocating contributions to the new System priorities as unrestricted core funding. It could further consider models to assure that contributions to individual research projects will support System priorities.
• We therefore propose that interested donors, with the support of the CGIAR Secretariat, examine the possibilities to support the System priorities recommended by the SC.
• The outcome of these deliberations will be a proposal to ExCo (or CGIAR) to formulate terms of reference for a task force including all relevant stakeholders to study and formulate a mechanism for channeling unrestricted contributions and allocating funds to the System priorities of the SC. The task force will report to the AGM.

Introducing the subject, the Danish representative pointed out that the suggested mechanism is not meant to restrict collaboration between individual donors and Centers, but rather as a supplementary mechanism to support priorities based on SC’s recommendations.

Discussion:
• Several members expressed support for the proposal and offered to participate on the task force.
• A distinction should be made between donor and investor. Most developing countries are investors (in that they expect a return on the investment) and funding is mostly restricted, whereas donors are more able to give unrestricted funds. It was noted that the word ‘member’ more accurately reflects those who give contributions to the CGIAR.
• The task force should include representatives from SC, CBC, and CDC (or the Future Harvest Alliance Office).
• It is important to keep in mind that some bilateral funding is subject to various rules governing funding and Centers have been successful at procuring such funds.
• Unrestricted resources are often allocated where restricted resources are not; such nuances need to be examined. In reality, there is no such thing as purely unrestricted funds as donors will always have impose some sort of restriction—even those donors committed to unrestricted funding. For example, a donor may choose not to allocate funds to a bankrupt Center, even if its projects contribute to System priorities. However, such a mechanism could be very important as there are many donors that would use such a mechanism.
The CGIAR Chair said that the Danish suggestion, as well as the discussion of the issues raised, were important and helpful. He suggested that funding should be considered as a System package while, however, taking note of donor autonomy. He added that the Danish proposal, if acted on, would require donor discipline.

**Decision:**
- **Interested donors, with the support of the CGIAR Secretariat, should explore the possibility of developing a mechanism to allocate unrestricted funds in the context of System priorities recommended by SC. Denmark was asked to lead these initial discussions. (The support of the CGIAR Secretariat will include assistance in the mapping of the existing financial arrangements between donors and centers)**
- **The outcome of these initial discussions would be a proposal to ExCo for terms of reference of a task force to study and formulate a mechanism for channeling unrestricted contributions and allocating funds to support System priorities.**
- **The task force is expected to complete its work by and report to the Membership at AGM 2005.**

**Agenda Item 9. Closing Session**

A Digivote assessment on CGIAR business conducted between AGMs and on AGM04 was held. The Chair noted that input from Members on ways for ExCo to increase the transparency of its work and on providing adequate information for decision making is welcome and important to better serving the Group.

The Chair introduced the two Directors General (DG) who will be leaving their posts and opened the floor to give them an opportunity to make statements.

CIP DG, Hubert Zandstra, stated that he was privileged to have played several roles in the CGIAR and thanked his family for their support throughout his career. He also thanked the donors and Center staff at both IRRI and CIP for their support, as well as colleagues in various NARS, and fellow DGs. He is pleased to leave CIP in a strong and financially sound position. His overriding message as he leaves the CGIAR System was for the CGIAR to keep science and technology as its guide and as a source to improve the lives of the poor.

IRRI DG, Ron Cantrell, said he felt blessed by the opportunity to work at both CIMMYT and IRRI. He noted both Centers’ commitment to strengthening NARS and using science and technology for the greater good. He thanked colleagues in the System for the opportunity to serve and looks forward to future interactions with them.

**Conclusion**

In concluding remarks, the Chair said that he was inspired by the quality of the work displayed at AGM by the Centers and their contribution of bringing science to the poor. He thanked them for their tremendous efforts over the years.
He thanked the Government of Mexico for hosting AGM, particularly Minister Javier Usabiaga, Victor Villalobos, and SAGARPA staff. In addition, he thanked CIMMYT DG Masa Iwanaga and his colleagues, as well as the team from IMMS and Feroza Vatcha and her team in the CGIAR Secretariat for their efforts in making AGM04 a success.

He noted that AGM04 saw the best of what the CGIAR stands for with the presence of some of the founders. It is exciting that agriculture is back on the international development map, evidenced by the fact the System has surpassed the $400 million mark. He thanked Members for their support in making the CGIAR a top quality science based institution that positively impacts the poor of the world.

The Chair sensed a spirit of optimist among Members and noted that close to $470 million is projected for next year, and even greater levels in the years ahead. He pointed out that the CGIAR needs to think about its relations to national systems and civil society, and particularly about how it could ensure that the results of research actually go into development.

He considered AGM04 a tremendous success in terms of the dialogue with NGOs, CSOs, donors, investors, etc. and highlighted the importance these partnerships play in the success of the CGIAR. He concluded by thanking Members for their attendance and participation, and wished everyone a safe trip home. He gavelled the meeting to a close.
Stakeholder Meeting Parallel Session A. Dialogue on CGIAR Priorities and Strategies

Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues.

Convener: Per Pinstrup-Andersen (SC Chair)
Recording Secretary: Ruben Echeverria
Co-Chairs: Clayton Campanhola (Brazil) and Denis Despreaux (France)
Panelists: Philippe Viallate (EC), Romano Kiome (Kenya), Luis Arango-Nieto (Colombia), William Dar (Incoming CDC Chair), Michael Gale (SC).

General comments

- General support for the Science Council’s Priorities initiative.
- Good to see competitiveness issues back in the research agenda, particularly re NARS agenda.
- Improve the link of the proposed priorities with grand themes (MDGs), using current development language. Improve link of SP with climate change.
- Ensure that systems research is accommodated within or across the essentially disciplinary, present SPs.
- Need much more research to address rural development issues, including a strong environmental sustainability agenda.
- Explain that the CGIAR is not moving upstream but it is focusing on the middle ground, between the more basic fundamental science and the more applied end of the spectrum.
- Explain how a regional program for LAC can be assembled from the current list of priorities; as well as other geographic and thematic research programs (utilizing the 10 proposed SPs as elements).
- SP10 is a key research area, explain better what the CG will do. It should not be just training, look at what NARS are already doing and promote the idea that some NARS can strengthen other NARS.
- Utilize existing post-harvest research frameworks if the CGIAR is to move into that research area.
- Specify the transition period from current to proposed new system.
- Will it be possible for donors to fund SPs or system-wide projects directly once the priorities are established? Can SC be involved in the allocation process without losing independence.

On partnerships

- This priority exercise could be useful to develop more effective partnerships with NARS, integrate them into the global research agenda, understanding their increased research capacity.
• Explain the need to focus CGIAR priorities on regional demands and need better partnerships to make international and national research more efficient.
• When starting new areas (e.g. fruits and horticulture) there will be a need to specify partnerships with new players.

On the need to focus on a smaller set of well defined priorities

• There is a general consensus that there is “mission creep” at the CGIAR, and too many research items, some of which are essentially small research contracts, that do not add up to a small cohesive set of system priorities.
• There is not enough expertise at the CGIAR to cover everything that is being proposed.
• The CGIAR is part of a research community, needs to evolve and to be able to focus on fewer key global research issues, limit number of priorities to a core list, particularly by looking at what NARS are already doing well. 400 U$M is too small to cover all challenges ahead, so need to concentrate on shorter list of items to make a difference.

On the addition of possible new SPs or sub-priorities.

• Agriculture and human health.
• Post-conflict rehabilitation (a sub-priority perhaps).
• More soil fertility research issues (inorganic fertilizer).
• Seeds systems and crop/tree/livestock systems.
• More animal products and organic food research items on SP6.
• More research on marginal lands.
• Communication and knowledge management.
• Innovation systems and learning.

On the process to define sub-priorities during consultations

• Include experts, specially those coming from NARS
• Check overlaps, define sub-priorities and rank research areas
• Will proposed consultations be enough to set research priorities? Define the criteria and indicators to rank sub-priorities.
• Use the following criteria to prioritize: MDG connection, chance of success, comparative advantage of CG, partnerships.
• How could we be more systematic if workshops will be organized by SP area?
• Keep being inclusive in the next steps when sharpening sub-priority areas, and utilize an ex-ante evaluation framework to define them.
• Keep the effort in the near future by preparing a rolling document, improving over time
Stakeholder Parallel Session B. CGIAR Partnership Committees: Next Steps

Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues

Co-Chairs: Ruth Haug (Norway) and Mohammad Roozitalab (GFAR)
Recording Secretary: Sarwat Hussain (CGIAR Secretariat)

In April 2004, the independent external review commissioned by CGIAR Executive Council (ExCo) completed its report. The findings of the review were discussed by ExCo, and ExCo has provided recommendations to the CGIAR on actions to be taken. This parallel session sought additional comments from CGIAR stakeholders on the review of both Private Sector (PSC) and Non-Governmental Organizations Committees (NGOC), the outcome of which is intended to serve as an input to the discussion at the business meeting to chart next steps.

Over 27 CGIAR stakeholders attended the parallel session. In opening remarks, Mohammad Roozitalab, GFAR, noted that public-private partnerships (taken to include civil society) are necessary to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. He outlined GFAR’s strategy and outreach to three distinct stakeholders: farmers’ organizations, non-governmental organizations, and private sector.

Ruth Haug, Norway, gave an overview of the genesis of CGIAR’s partnership committees (PSC and NGOC), noting that both committees had faced problems because roles and expectations had not been well defined. She summarized the nine main recommendations of the external review report and gave an overview of the recently-concluded United Nations’ report on civil society.

Usha Barwale-Zehr presented discussants’ remarks on behalf of CGIAR Private Sector Committee. She noted that PSC is developing a plan of action in key areas of activities (Staff Exchange Program, Challenge Programs, and CEO dialogue) and reiterated PSC’s role and commitment to bringing broader private sector perspectives to the CGIAR so as to serve better serve the needs of the farmer community. She stressed that PSC provides a platform for dialogue.

Monica Kapiriri, Vice Chair, GFAR presented discussants’ remarks. She reported on the GFAR-sponsored meetings held in Mexico, noting that GFAR’s role as a stakeholder platform could help in facilitating the process of initiating dialogue between NGOs and the CGIAR. The role of GFAR-NGO facilitation group is to facilitate meaningful linkages between actors, facilitate transfer of useful technologies, providing feedback, linking field experience into decision-making processes and policy, facilitating joint learning, documentation, and sharing of experiences. The current facilitating group will continue until 2006 with a specific mandate to produce democratically nominated representatives from the regions. The group resolved to facilitate mobilization of NGOs.
into the GFAR structure: from NARS, sub-regional fora to regional, to global. The facilitating group will nominate an individual to provide a link from the mobilization process to the CGIAR for information and participation in on-going activities. The group will also develop mechanisms for NGO involvement with individual CGIAR Centers.

Summary of discussion

Comments from the floor focused on new mechanisms necessary to facilitate effective and fruitful dialogue between civil society organizations (CSOs) and CGIAR, including the recommendation to CGIAR to set up a Farmers’ Committee, the possibility of including a farmer in the PSC, maintaining the distinction between NGOs and farmers, importance of field level linkages, need for precise terms-of-reference, clear rules of engagement and responsibilities, need to focus on governance, expanding the role of CSOs as Members of CGIAR Center Boards of Trustees (BOTs), placement of farmers on BOTs, and ensuring wider geographic coverage (e.g. North Africa) in discussions of CGIAR-CSO linkages.

Outcomes

In summarizing the discussion, Co-Chairs noted that the meeting was fruitful and offered meaningful ways in which the CGIAR could move forward in strengthening linkages with CSOs including the private sector. There was recognition that quick solutions are needed and GFAR can assist in building up this constituency. There was uniform recognition that CSOs are needed both at the system/policy and Center levels. Principal outcomes include:

- Clear wish for separate a Farmers’ Committee at CGIAR system level to be established
- Continuation and expansion of outreach activities already underway (Innovation Marketplace, Farmers Dialogue, Farmers Exchange) including a CSOs Forum to precede the Annual General Meeting
- On Private Sector Committee adopt the recommendation of “marketing testing” for 2-4 years
- Consider establishing a focal point in CGIAR System Office to facilitate CGIAR-CSO-Farmers-Private Sector linkages and provision of budget for this activity
- Interim arrangement for CSO representation at system level until 2006 when the NGOs have finalized their assessment
- Ensure precise terms-of-reference, clear rules of engagement, and responsibilities for partnership at System and Center levels
- Support for an inventory of lessons learned and best practices both at System and Center levels
CGIAR Feedback on AGM 2004

**Stakeholder Meeting Assessment:**

**The Stakeholder meeting was a productive use of my time.**

7. Agree strongly
6. 
5. 
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3. 
2. 
1. Disagree strongly

**Graph:**

- Agree strongly: 2
- Agree: 6
- Neither agree nor disagree: 5
- Disagree: 6
- Disagree strongly: 11
- Total: 44

**Average:** 4.48
**Standard Deviation:** 1.17
**Number:** 44

---

**Stakeholder Meeting Assessment:**

**The Stakeholder meeting session I enjoyed the most (i.e., the most productive use of my time) was:**

1. CGIAR Awards
2. Centers’ Forum
3. Strategic Directions in CGIAR Research for Development
4. Parallel Sessions
5. Innovation Marketplace
6. Farmers’ Dialogue
7. Ministerial Roundtable

**Graph:**

- CGIAR Awards: 2
- Centers’ Forum: 5
- Strategic Directions: 24
- Parallel Sessions: 7
- Innovation Marketplace: 3
- Farmers’ Dialogue: 2
- Ministerial Roundtable: 1

**Average:** 3.39
**Standard Deviation:** 1.32
**Number:** 44

---

1 The question on time allocated to each item was modified from Agenda Item 3.c. for increased clarity.
2 ExCo members were excluded from ExCo related questions in the assessments on ‘Business Between AGMs’ and ‘Business Meeting AGM04.’
Stakeholder Meeting Assessment:
The Stakeholder meeting session I enjoyed second most (i.e., the second most productive use of my time) was:

1. CGIAR Awards
2. Centers’ Forum
3. Strategic Directions in CGIAR Research for Development
4. Parallel Sessions
5. Innovation Marketplace
6. Farmers’ Dialogue
7. Ministerial Roundtable

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report:
Time allocated to this information item was sufficient.

1. Disagree strongly
2. Neither agree nor disagree
3. Agree strongly
4. Disagree strongly
5.
6.
Agenda Item 2. CGIAR Status Report:

**CGIAR adequately discussed this information item.**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(avg = 5.45, SD = 1.42, N = 51.00)

Agenda Item 3.a. CGIAR Priorities and Strategies: 2005-2010:

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

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(avg = 5.72, SD = 1.81, N = 50.00)
Agenda Item 3.a. CGIAR Priorities and Strategies: 2005-2010:

CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly
Agenda Item 3.b. Report from the Science Council:

Time allocated to this information item was sufficient.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

Avg. = 5.66
SD = 1.35
N = 44.00

Agenda Item 3.b. Report from the Science Council:

CGIAR adequately discussed this information item.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

Avg. = 5.45
SD = 1.51
N = 44.00
**Agenda Item 3.c. Challenge Programs:**

Time allocated to this agenda item was:

7. Highly excessive
6.
5.
4. Just about right
3.
2.
1. Highly insufficient

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.91  
SD = 1.14  
N = 46.00

**Agenda Item 3.c. Challenge Programs:**

CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 5.83  
SD = 1.24  
N = 47.00
Agenda Item 3.c. Challenge Programs:

Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Agree strongly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 6.34  
SD = 0.85  
N = 44.00

Agenda Item 4.a. External Program and Management Review of IRRI:

Time allocated to this agenda item was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Highly insufficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Just about right</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Highly excessive</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.51  
SD = 2.02  
N = 45.00
**Agenda Item 4.a.** External Program and Management Review of IRRI:

**CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Avg. = 4.58  SD = 2.34  N = 38.00*

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

**Agenda Item 4.a.**

**Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Avg. = 5.07  SD = 2.26  N = 41.00*
Agenda Item 4.b. Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees:

**Time allocated to this agenda item was:**

7. Highly excessive
6.
5.
4. Just about right
3.
2.
1. Highly insufficient

![Graph showing time allocation distribution]

 Avg. = 4.57  
SD = 1.38  
N = 42.00

---

Agenda Item 4.b. Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees:

**CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.**

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

![Graph showing agreement distribution]

 Avg. = 5.22  
SD = 1.52  
N = 45.00
Agenda Item 4.b. Review of CGIAR Partnership Committees:

Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 6.02
SD = 0.96
N = 47.00

Agenda Item 4.c. Development of Performance Measurement System:

Time allocated to this agenda item was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Highly insufficient</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Just about right</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Highly excessive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.38
SD = 1.39
N = 34.00
Agenda Item 4.c. Development of Performance Measurement System:

CGIAR adequately discussed this information item.

Avg. = 5.27  
SD = 1.60  
N = 33.00

1. Disagree strongly  
2.  
3.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
5.  
6.  
7. Agree strongly

Agenda Item 5.a. TFs on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment—SSA:

Time allocated to this agenda item was:

Avg. = 4.39  
SD = 1.17  
N = 44.00

1. Highly insufficient  
2.  
3.  
4. Just about right  
5.  
6.  
7. Highly excessive
Agenda Item 5.a. TFs on Programmatic and Structural/Organizational Alignment—SSA: 
CGIAR adequately discussed this information item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.84  
SD = 1.61  
N = 44.00

Agenda Item 5.b. ExCo Committees: 
Time allocated to this agenda item was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly excessive</th>
<th>Just about right</th>
<th>Highly insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.68  
SD = 1.20  
N = 44.00
**Agenda Item 5.b. ExCo Committees:**

**CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Agree strongly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg. = 6.07**  
**SD = 0.84**  
**N = 44.00**

---

**Agenda Item 5.b. ExCo Committees:**

**Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Agree strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg. = 6.50**  
**SD = 0.75**  
**N = 44.00**
Agenda Item 5.c. CGIAR Nominee Process:

Time allocated to this agenda item was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.10  
SD = 0.87  
N = 42.00

7. Highly excessive  
6.  
5.  
4. Just about right  
3.  
2.  
1. Highly insufficient

Agenda Item 5.c. CGIAR Nominee Process:

CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 5.09  
SD = 1.81  
N = 43.00

7. Agree strongly  
6.  
5.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
3.  
2.  
1. Disagree strongly
Agenda Item 5.c. CGIAR Nominee Process:
Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

7. Agree strongly  
6.  
5.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
3.  
2.  
1. Disagree strongly

Agenda Item 6. Perspective from Centers: 
Time allocated to this agenda item was:

7. Highly excessive  
6.  
5.  
4. Just about right  
3.  
2.  
1. Highly insufficient
Agenda Item 6. Perspective from Centers: CGIAR adequately discussed this information item.

Avg. = 5.67  
SD = 1.16  
N = 43.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Item 7. CGIAR Financing Plan for 2005: Time allocated to this agenda item was:

Avg. = 4.43  
SD = 1.03  
N = 47.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly excessive</th>
<th>Just about right</th>
<th>Highly insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Highly insufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item 7. CGIAR Financing Plan for 2005:

CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 5.40  
SD = 1.47  
N = 45.00

7. Agree strongly  
6.  
5.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
3.  
2.  
1. Disagree strongly

Agenda Item 7. CGIAR Financing Plan for 2005:

Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 6.37  
SD = 1.03  
N = 46.00

7. Agree strongly  
6.  
5.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
3.  
2.  
1. Disagree strongly
**Agenda Item 8.a. Future CGIAR Meetings:**

**Time allocated to this agenda item was:**

- Avg. = 4.22
- SD = 1.07
- N = 41.00

7. Highly excessive
6.
5.
4. Just about right
3.
2.
1. Highly insufficient

**CGIAR adequately discussed all substantive issues regarding this agenda item.**

- Avg. = 5.31
- SD = 1.58
- N = 42.00

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly
Agenda Item 8.a. Future CGIAR Meetings:

Outcome as summarized accurately reflects discussion.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

Avg. = 5.83
SD = 0.92
N = 42.00

Business Between AGMs:

Decision making by the CGIAR between AGMs was facilitated by ExCo.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

Avg. = 5.63
SD = 1.07
N = 24.00
Business Between AGMs:

ExCo’s conduct of business is transparent to CGIAR Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.96  
SD = 1.77  
N = 24.00

Business Between AGMs:

ExCo provided adequate oversight of the implementation of CGIAR decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagree strongly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 4.96  
SD = 1.22  
N = 25.00
Decision making by the CGIAR at AGM04 was facilitated by ExCo’s guidance and recommendations.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly

The AGM04 documentation provided (in electronic and printed formats) enabled me to discuss and decide CGIAR matters adequately.

7. Agree strongly
6.
5.
4. Neither agree nor disagree
3.
2.
1. Disagree strongly
Business Meeting AGM04 Assessment:

The decision making process during the Business Meeting was effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 5.68  
SD = 1.27  
N = 40.00

7. Agree strongly  
6.  
5.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
3.  
2.  
1. Disagree strongly

---

Business Meeting AGM04 Assessment:

The Business Meeting was a productive use of my time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. = 5.75  
SD = 0.86  
N = 40.00

7. Agree strongly  
6.  
5.  
4. Neither agree nor disagree  
3.  
2.  
1. Disagree strongly