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This document represents my first “Annual Reflections and Outlook” document as CEO of the CGIAR Consortium. Depending on reactions received this may be the first in a series. While its intended audience is comprised of CGIAR System partners, staff, and donors, it is also going to be posted on our website, as I believe that there is nothing in here that shouldn’t be shared with anyone interested in our progress. It is a personal note with some reflections on 2012 and a perspective on the priorities and program of work ahead in 2013.

Looking back on 2012
In a few years from now we may look back on 2012 as the year in which “the new CGIAR” got legs. The focus changed from designing new structures to implementing them. Without missing a beat we will now move seamlessly into evaluations of how well this fledgling organization is doing!

CGIAR Research Programs
In 2012, the full portfolio of 16 CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) was approved\(^1\). Many of the CRPs kicked-off, launched, recruited leaders, appointed advisors (including in gender research) and otherwise established themselves as up-and-running. It will clearly take a few more years before this new structure of cross-Center, system wide research and partnership programs is really felt to be the main way research and collaboration is organized and managed for the majority of scientists at the bench or in the field. Many of the researchers still think first and foremost of their group or project as their primary focus – and think of the CRP as “just another source of funding”. At the same time though, when I visited centers, scientists told me that in the past year they had worked more closely with colleagues from other Centers than in the ten years before that. That is clearly a good omen that things are changing, though still far from having demonstrated impact on the ground.

The restructuring of much of the Centers’ research into a portfolio of CRPs was a pretty massive undertaking, with repercussions for the organization of the research programs in many Centers. It is therefore understandable – justifiable even – that many of the CRPs were constructed to fit the current reality, bringing players together in a new structure and building research programs with what was largely already there at Center level. In a sense this could be considered as “constructing CRPs in the rearview mirror”, as opposed to designing new programs primarily around delivering the biggest bang for the buck.

---
\(^1\) Including conditional approval of the Dryland Systems CRP, and counting the Genebanks CRP.
While it is understandable, it does mean that this is where we have most work left to be done – shifting to a forward looking notion on what it is that will make CRPs high performing programs, delivering strong development outcomes for justifiable amounts of investment, i.e. high value for money. That is where we will focus much of our attention in 2013.

**Funding**

Given an environment in which governments almost everywhere face budget crises, and where development budgets are under pressure, it is remarkable that the financial support for CGIAR has grown so rapidly. Total funding (CGIAR Fund plus bilateral) has doubled in five years after decades of essentially flat budgets. Donors allocated close to $900M to the CGIAR’s work in 2012\(^2\). The increased funding is at least in part due to the renewed priority of food security at the top of the development agenda but also, I believe, due to a perception of the new CGIAR as a revitalized organization worthy of investment.

2012 was only the second year of operation for the CGIAR Fund. Many donors are still in the process of determining whether and how to use the Fund and its different windows. In 2011 most allocations to the Fund were placed in Window 1 (W1, unallocated) because few CRPs were approved at the time. In 2012 the allocations to Window 2 (W2, allocated to CRPs) increased from almost nothing to about $150M – while funding through Window 1 decreased. My favorite example of how this is working out in practice is the funding from the Netherlands. The Netherlands used to fund CGIAR Centers bilaterally to the tune of about $17M per year, but in 2012 it signed a 4-year contribution agreement with the CGIAR Fund to contribute $41M per year for 4 years, one-third through W1 and two-thirds through W2 for 7 CRPs. Thus, some Centers lost Dutch funding for bilateral projects – but the system as a whole gained a much larger contribution through the new structure assured for a multi-year period. Other countries, such as Australia, are shifting their contributions more gradually, but the total funding to CGIAR from Australia almost tripled over the past 5 years, and their allocation is gradually shifting to Windows 1 and 2 from a bilateral base. We are thus on track to fulfill a key objective of the reform, at the top of the agenda for the Centers, i.e. increased unrestricted funding\(^3\).

How CGIAR donors channel their funding can be directly related to the confidence they have in the new CGIAR, the Fund, the Consortium and the CRPs – but it can also be dictated by their own internal funding flows or their legal structure. USAID’s contribution, for example, is partly made through Windows 1 and 2 (its global funds), but much of USAID’s budgets are allocated through its missions, and those do not fund global programs but can fund Window 3 or bilateral projects in their mandate geographies. Other donors such as the African Development Bank cannot legally make contributions outside their mandate area and therefore cannot contribute to global programs such as CRPs through Windows 1 and 2 – but can contribute through restricted projects.

\(^2\) As much of the 2012 allocations came late in the year, CRPs could not absorb and expend all these funds in time and about $60M will be carried forward to 2013, thus 2012 expenditures are likely to be around $850M.

\(^3\) In the new CGIAR, core funding is Window 1 and 2 - which is not identical to “unrestricted” in the old system, but has many of its attributes in terms of enabling the flexible programming of upstream research.
Some donors though can legally make contributions through Windows 1 and 2, but choose not to do so because they don’t (yet) have enough confidence in the new CGIAR. My former colleagues at the Gates Foundation for example, told me that the outcomes of the CRPs would have to become much clearer, as would the reporting, before Gates would invest directly in CRPs through Window 2. Until that time, they feel they can “get a better deal” through bilateral grants. While there is nothing wrong with such bilateral grants – and I think they will remain a valuable part of the overall system – I also do believe that this is a direct challenge to the new CGIAR. Our CRPs should have clear and compelling outcomes, with clear value propositions and reporting that demonstrate good value for money, such that critical investors who can shop around, choose to invest in CRPs through Windows 1 and 2.

**Funding Uncertainty**

CGIAR has always been a funny system in that its budgets are based in part on projections of past contributions rather than signed agreements. In other words, the unrestricted component of Center budgets in the past, and the Windows 1 and 2 contributions today, are based in essence on assuming that donors will allocate in 2013 what they allocated in 2012. Of course that is not always the case, and if the allocation decision is made late in the year then that can cause pretty severe discomfort. While this has been a feature of the CGIAR finance system for decades, the uncertainty increases when many donors are in the middle of changing their allocations, as was the case in 2012.

When all budgets are growing, uncertainty is less of a problem, but in 2012 donors started to allocate serious amounts of money through Window 2 to specific CRPs, and less money remained for the general pot through Window 1. That meant that there were perceived winners and losers. Some CRPs, such as Roots, Tubers and Bananas received much more money than they had expected at the beginning of the year (and could not spend it all). Other CRPs received less Window 2 funds and with a declining Window 1 pool that meant that their combined W1-2 allocations were reduced. Six CRPs were in this category in 2012. Because many donor decisions were made late in the year, however, it would not have been fair to implement budget cuts at that point and the CGIAR Consortium therefore allocated additional Window 1 funding to these CRPs to meet their 2012 expenditures and prevent “losses”.

For 2013 the Consortium has proposed, and the Fund Council has accepted, to implement on a temporary basis a new funding mechanism that will “guarantee” at least 90% of the 2012 expenditures through Window 1 and 2. In other words, some programs may experience a budget “cut”, but no larger than 10% - and the remainder of the budget is guaranteed early in the year, so it can be spent (contracts can be executed with partners, etc.) with confidence. This is expected to significantly reduce the funding uncertainty as experienced in 2012. Over the next several years the intent is to move to a performance-based funding system based on development outcomes, replacing the current compromise.

---

4 In response, the CGIAR Consortium implemented a policy change, mid-way through 2012, to partially decouple Windows 1 and 2, recognizing the allocation decisions made by Window 2 donors.
Priorities and Performance

The CGIAR Funders Forum approved the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) in 2011, but commented that it would like to see clearer metrics to assess the results of the work of CGIAR and mechanisms to set priorities and allocate resources. In response, during 2012 the Consortium prepared an SRF Action Plan, which laid out plans for a new system of performance management for CGIAR based on the achievement of intermediate development outcomes (IDO) at both the overall system level and the program level. This SRF Action Plan was approved by the Funders Forum in November 2012 and will be implemented in 2013. This also provides a major opportunity to align the priorities of the CGIAR Consortium with that of our partners, such as the CAADP national investment plans drawn up by many African countries.

The backbone or foundation of this new system is the set of IDOs— which in turn link to an impact pathway and associated Theory of Change. The Consortium’s vision, as laid out in the SRF Action Plan, is to develop a system based on geographically explicit IDOs, carefully negotiated with development partners, and with funding linked to delivery of outcomes, i.e. paying for performance, in 2013. The new system can be piloted with volunteer CRPs in 2014 – and implemented system-wide for the next round of CRP contracts (for which proposals will be developed in 2014). I was very pleased that this vision was endorsed by the Funders Forum in Punta Del Este, and we have worked hard with the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) and the Science Leaders to design processes to make this happen in 2013.

I am very much looking forward to the day when I can write an annual overview such as this and describe CGIAR’s accomplishments for the year with reference to an agreed set of system level performance metrics, reporting on progress for the overall CRP portfolio in a manner that clearly demonstrates value for money for the total investment in the system. It will take a few years – but that is definitely the pot of gold at the end of our rainbow!

Partnerships

One of the promises of the re-designed “new” CGIAR was also that it would open up the system for partners. The Centers and CRPs generally take pride in their partnerships – and it is clear that some CRPs have established strong global partnerships with critical partners both in upstream research and downstream delivery. At the same time, though, the feedback provided by partners is often quite different– with some partners very critical of the dominant role of CGIAR Centers in the governance and management of the CRPs, or critical of the limited budgets allocated to partners.

As a result the Consortium decided to commission a stakeholder perception survey, to establish a baseline of the opinions of our partners and develop a plan of action to achieve progress from there. GlobeScan was contracted to carry out this survey and a questionnaire was developed with the help of an advisory group from the Centers, CRPs and GFAR. The questionnaire was sent out to about four thousand stakeholders in December and was completed by about a thousand of them in early January. We are looking forward to releasing a report in March 2013.

---

5 Intermediate Development Outcomes
In 2012 CGIAR co-sponsored the second GCARD, the global Conference on Agriculture Research for development, in Punta del Este where over 1,000 people on site and remotely came together as representatives of a wide range of organizations across the spectrum from farmers to upstream research to explore the practical implications of partnership and pathways to impact around the themes addressed by the new CRPs, helping CRP leaders shape their programs to meet the needs and expectations of partners. This has led to a range of new commitments concerning partnership, capacity development and foresight in CGIAR, as I blogged after the event.

Also in 2012 a number of CGIAR partners approached the Consortium to discuss possible partnership agreements with the CGIAR Consortium as a whole, in order to have a single agreement covering all Centers and CRPs rather than bilateral agreements with Centers. We expect the development of such partnership deals to become a significant portfolio of work for the Consortium Office in 2013.

One high priority partnership for CGIAR is the alignment of our CRP priorities with those of the CAADP national investment programs of African countries. This partnership has developed quite positively in 2012 through several regional workshops, the development of a spatial mapping tool by a team at IFPRI, and a second conference of all partners in Dublin last October. I expect that CAADP-CGIAR partnerships at the national level with individual CRPs can be an excellent opportunity to promote the adoption of innovations developed through the CRPs, i.e. to achieve development outcomes in close collaboration with our partners.

Progress on many other fronts
The above pages reflected on some of the top priorities for the new CGIAR. Of course much more has happened – and I lack space to do justice to the many things that could be listed here. But I’d like to mention a handful of other issues briefly:

- **IA Principles.** The Fund Council and Consortium Board approved CGIAR Intellectual Asset Principles in early 2012, which are designed to promote more open access to CGIAR research and technologies. These are now being developed into a detailed Open Access Policy and Guidelines, and have established the development of an annual CGIAR Intellectual Asset report.

- **Gender Research.** Most of the CRPs developed gender research strategies during 2012 and the Gender and Agriculture Network developed research themes that it expects can be prioritized across CRPs. The Consortium is proposing to support and accelerate the mainstreaming of gender research, and the development of gender research capacity, in the CRPs through dedicated Window 1 funding of $5M for 3 years. The proposal will be submitted to the FC for its approval shortly. Overall we think significant progress was made in 2012 on this front, and I expect to see our gender focus much more integrated into all we do.

- **OCS.** A major project for the “back office” functions of the new CGIAR is the One Corporate System (OCS), an integrated finance, project management and HR system that 9 Centers and the Consortium Office have agreed to implement in the first wave. The system was essentially developed in 2012 and training has started to roll it out among the first group of Centers. We believe this will be a critical element to much more effective and efficient financial and project management and reporting across Centers.
• **Consortium.** The CGIAR Consortium formally achieved international organization status in March 2012 through a treaty that has now been signed by France, Hungary, Denmark, Benin and Uruguay. The Consortium Office continued to develop in its second year in Montpellier, recruiting not only a CEO but three more directors, completing the leadership team, and maturing in many of its functions.

With that let me end my 2012 retrospective with the note that for me personally the high notes of my first half year as CEO were the visits to nine CGIAR Centers. It was inspirational to see so many Centers in such a short time, experience the vitality of the Centers (many of them in the middle of rapid growth), learn from the scientists, check out the labs and genebanks, debate the pros and cons of the Reform with the management teams, and answer staff questions in town hall meetings.

**Looking forward to 2013**
In my opinion the new year is already starting well, with visits to ILRI and ICRAF in Addis and Nairobi in mid-January, and WorldFish, CIFOR and ICRISAT shortly after that. In early February I will have visited 14 of the 15 Centers with an 8 month period before starting all over again on the second round.

If 2011 and 2012 were primarily characterized by building out the structures designed during the CGIAR Reform process – particularly development and approval process of the SRF and CRP portfolio – then 2013 will be characterized by fine-tuning the machine and make sure it runs effectively. Key words in 2013 will be Performance, Partnerships, and Accountability:

• **Performance:** further development of the theories of change, impact pathways and intermediate development outcomes both at system level and CRP level – enabling a solid system of performance management and priority setting.

• **Partnership:** Better alignment of CGIAR priorities with relevant priorities of partners and ensuring that we have effective partnerships to deliver impact.

• **Accountability:** reviewing the governance of the CGIAR system to ensure that accountabilities and authorities are matching and risks are managed effectively.

Let me give you an overview of key projects, processes and events in 2013 from the perspective of the CGIAR Consortium, with emphasis on the first half of the year.

---

6 All except ICARDA.
7 With CIAT in March.
**Performance and priority setting processes at system and CRP level**

Key steps to the successful development of a performance management system for the CGIAR Consortium are the priority setting exercises at system and CRP level that we kicked off late in 2012. These processes have been developed through consultation with two committees of science leaders chaired by Karen Brooks and Patrick Dugan, working closely with Luis Solórzano in the Consortium Office (who is the project leader for both processes). Memos describing both processes were shared in December and can be found [here](#). Key milestones in the process will be:

- March 24, Joint ISPC- Consortium workshop on IDOs at system and CRP level, CIAT, in Cali, Colombia.
- April 10-11, CRP on Policies and Institutions-led Conference on Foresight in Dublin at which ex-ante impact assessment of CRP technologies and mapping of CRP activities will be discussed.
- April 23, Joint Fund Council – Consortium day on system level theory of change, impact pathway and IDOs, New Delhi, India.
- May-July, 3 workshops in Montpellier in which groups of CRPs will negotiate their IDOs with key stakeholders (Consortium, donors, ISPC, partners).

The key products from the exercises will be:

- An ISPC white paper on SLO-linkages and impact pathways at system level.
- A report on CRP-level IDOs for the CRP portfolio, outlining the theory of change, impact pathway and IDOs for all CRPs.
- The 2013 SRF Management Update that will describe the proposed metrics for system and CRP level IDOs, the system for priority setting and resource allocation and the proposed performance management system.

I expect that engaging in these exercises will be an opportunity for all CRPs and their partners and stakeholders to develop agreement on a shared set of concepts and ideas, improved and coherent theories of change and impact pathways, and concrete, geographically explicit IDOs that can then form the basis for future performance contracts. My hope is that the performance management system that will be developed for the CGIAR Consortium’s future use – intending to link IDOs to funding – can be piloted with several CRPs in 2014. That will enable us to further develop our thinking, and test early experience, as well as discuss implications of this new way of doing business – that may involve, for example, incentives for out-performance – with all concerned. If all goes as intended that would enable us to set the scene for the next round of CRP proposals, using both the newly developed sets of IDOs and the new performance management system.

**Partnerships**

The priority setting exercises described above also offer a major opportunity to align the emerging CGIAR priorities with those of our partners. This refers to the countries where we aim to have impact, e.g. aligning CRP IDOs with priorities expressed in CAADP national investment plans, and also to alignment with the development partners that invest in our work as well as in the development projects that aim to promote or support the adoption of the innovations developed by CGIAR.
We are designing the priority setting exercises specifically to invite and enable such alignment with our partners.

As noted above, in 2012 the first requests came in to the Consortium for system-wide collaboration agreements through the Consortium and this list is quickly growing. Luis Solórzano in the CEO’s office will be the point person to develop such agreements. We are currently working on the following partnership agreements:

- African Union, intended to facilitate and support CAADP-CGIAR alignment through the Dublin process, to be signed in Addis on January 15th.
- FAO, prepared by new FAO Director General Graziano da Silva and Consortium Board Chair Pérez del Castillo to enhance FAO-CGIAR-collaboration, scheduled to be signed in February.
- French partners (CIRAD, INRA, IRD, Agropolis Foundation) expected to be signed early March. Of these, the CIRAD MoU is most advanced as CIRAD is a key partner of CGIAR with many of its staff actively engaged in CRPs and located in CGIAR Centers – and CIRAD would like to have an umbrella agreement with the CGIAR System through the Consortium. The Agropolis Foundation funds French-international collaboration and capacity building and already works with several CGIAR Centers and we have drafted a collaboration agreement to extend this to all of the CGIAR system.
- National Science Foundation of China already funds a number of CGIAR Centers and would like to expand to the system through a Memorandum of Understanding with the Consortium. This is scheduled to be signed during or around the 30-year China-CGIAR celebration, June 5-6, Beijing.
- New EMBRAPA President Mauricio Lopez will visit the Consortium in Montpellier 8 or 9 March and we will discuss improved CGIAR-EMBRAPA collaboration – probably followed by a workshop to develop the partnership in Brazil later in the year.
- The Consortium Office is having early conversations with the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis at the University of California Santa Barbara (NCEAS), The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and The Natural Capital Project at Stanford University (NatCap) to develop a formal agreement to advance collaborative research on Natural Resource Management with the CGIAR CRPs. The NCEAS, TNC and WCS have recently created a research consortium called “Nature Lab” to operate a global center of excellence focused on knowledge generation to sustain nature and human well-being.

It is clear that there is an active interest on the part of our partners to develop improved collaborative relationships with CGIAR at the system level. We welcome that but have to see how we can develop such relationships in a real and meaningful way that supports the work of the CRPs and the Centers as we have no interest in just signing agreements that do not lead to significant follow-up action.
Governance and Accountability

The issue of governance in the CGIAR became a high priority in 2012 and will be a major focus in 2013. At the end of 2012, the Center Board Chairs and Directors General held a very successful retreat to reflect on governance in CGIAR as a whole and discuss the implications of the Reform and the new structures that have been set up. One question that has been debated at length over the past several years is whether the Centers, the members of the CGIAR Consortium, are accountable to the Consortium Board, or the Consortium Board and Office are accountable to the Centers. In practice the answer is that both are true. In outline, for their work on CGIAR Research Programs the Centers are accountable through the Consortium Board to the Fund Council\(^8\), but for Consortium Office work on shared services the accountability is to the Centers.

The Fund Council and Consortium are jointly commissioning a governance review of the new CGIAR system in 2013. This governance review aims at reviewing and assessing the governance structures, processes and controls in place across CGIAR as well as their operation over the last few years, in order to determine whether the design set up during the reform is working out as intended or whether improvements are necessary. In particular, the review will identify potential gaps and/or mismatches between accountability and authority throughout the system, and recommend solutions to address them. The report of the governance review is expected in June, with discussion of its implications expected in the second half of the year.

Ahead of the main phase of the governance review, the Fund Council and Consortium commissioned three consultants in December 2012 to do a preparatory phase review that will scope and direct the main phase. The preparatory phase report will be available in February.

The new CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) is also scheduled to carry out an external review of the CRPs governance and management arrangements in 2013.

Financing Plan 2013

We are finalizing the 2013 Financing Plan (FP13) that will be sent to the Fund Council (FC) for approval in late January. Key changes in FP13 over FP12 will be:

- the way the separate use of Windows 1 and 2 funding are balanced, ensuring both that additional allocations by a donor to a specific CRP do indeed result in additional funding becoming available to that CRP, and in a stabilized allocation of funding to CRPs, avoiding large funding swings from year to year (with a maximum reduction in funding of 10% over 2012 expenditures (as estimated by Centers in late 2012), and a maximum allocation limited by the FC approved total budget); and
- a guarantee of combined Window 1 and Window 2 funding of at least 90% of 2012 expenditures, provided early in the year, so CRPs can proceed with commitments to their partners with confidence.

---

\(^8\) The Consortium Board has fiduciary responsibility to the Fund Council for Window 1 and 2 funds received from the Fund and programmatic responsibility for the CRPs as a whole, regardless of funding source.
The funding approach for 2013 is a temporary stepping stone towards a performance-based funding system as described above. The overall Window 1 plus Window 2 funding expected to be available to the whole portfolio of CRPs as allocated in the draft FP is 20% higher than 2012 expenditures, with some CRPs forecasted to have very large increases while other CRPs may see cuts (limited to 10%).

**Reporting earlier in the year**

A key performance goal for the Consortium Office in 2013 is to complete and submit all reporting earlier in the year for which we have agreed to a target date of May 31, 2013. This includes the following reports:

- CRP 2012 annual reports (reviewed and revised for final submission);
- CRP portfolio report final version for submission;
- CGIAR 2012 Financial Report (based on Centers’ audited financial statements); and
- CGIAR 2012 Annual report published.

As part of the reporting work, the Consortium and Fund Council have formed working groups to negotiate harmonized reporting guidelines and templates for the CRPs that are acceptable to all donors. This is one of the promises of the Reform and quite important to both the Centers and CRPs as well as to donors. Many donors have quite strict requirements on reporting, but those requirements vary widely and so harmonization among donors is not easy. We are counting on having two processes contributing to a position that is hopefully going to be acceptable to the largest number of donors, minimizing multiple reporting formats: 1) the CRPs will move to IDO based performance indicators as the basis for progress reporting; and 2) donor harmonization or reporting requirements.

Recognizing that this is in fact a very complex undertaking, and that reporting on the IDOs (to be developed in 2013, and used for the first time in 2014) will take several years until the new performance management system is operational, the reporting guidelines and templates that will be used to report over 2012 are an interim stepping stone toward a monitoring and evaluation system that is fully aligned with IDO based performance indicators.

**Strategy development for Knowledge Management, Communication and ICT**

Piers Bocock, who joined the Consortium Office in late October 2012 as the new Director of Knowledge Management and Communication, is working with communities of practice from across the Centers and CRPs on the development of Consortium level strategies for: (1) Communication; (2) Knowledge Management and (3) ICT. He expects to have versions available to discuss with the Consortium Board at its meeting in June in Montpellier. His charge is to help systematize and improve coordination and leadership for these three disciplines, in partnership with a more scaled up Shared Services team.
**OCS**
The One Corporate System (OCS) is an inter Center initiative focused on identifying and implementing a common integrated enterprise resource planning (ERP) system to support Project, Financial and Human Resource information management. Participation is voluntary, and 9 Centers (CIP, IRRI, WorldFish (WF), ICRAF, IRRI, AfricaRice, Bioversity, CIAT, and ICARDA) together with the Consortium Office (CO) have committed to implementing the new system. By participating in OCS Centers expect to achieve a substantial reduction in the investment cost of adopting a new system and to benefit from an ease of information exchange and consolidation that results from use of common codes and information structures. In 2013 the OCS will be rolled out to the group of participating Centers.

**Shared Services**
At their December meeting in Washington, the Corporate Services Executives further discussed and endorsed an offer from the Consortium Office to re-invigorate the process to explore how services can be shared among Centers by establishing a one-year budget in the Consortium for leading the efforts, after which time the enterprise should become self-sustaining financially, i.e. able to provide services on full-cost-recovery basis.

Enrica Porcari will start a process to develop an actionable roadmap on the basis of inputs from the Centers, working with an initial group of Centers representatives from CIFOR, IRRI, ICRAF, CIP, WorldFish, and IWMI who volunteered during the meeting to help develop a preliminary roadmap. In addition the Consortium Office would welcome the participation of any other Centers who wish to work with this initial working group.

We see the setting up of a Shared Services function across the Consortium as a means to provide a strategic and focused approach to identifying and implementing activities that benefit from cross-CRP, cross-Center synergies. The overall objective of Shared Services is to help make the CGIAR Consortium a more efficient and effective organization.

In the drafting of the roadmap we will ensure it includes a governance structure, principles, prioritization options, and an actionable way forward. The shared services will have to be demand-led, the participation voluntary, and its performance guided by principles of transparency and accountability to the Consortium Members, i.e. the Centers.

As an initial set of priority areas to explore further, the following were identified at the CSE meeting:

1- OCS is a project that must not fail. We will identify areas – such as training, implementation and support - where a shared services approach can be most effective.

2- Regional Support Arrangement – for which initial proposals have already been developed by ILRI-ICRAF. This support model nicely dovetails with the OCS training and technical and users support provisions.

3- Procurement and Leveraged Buying: Software, training, publications.
4- Shared ICT: Application / Database Development & Maintenance, application hosting, storage, field support.


**Capacity Building/Strengthening**

A committee chaired by Marco Wopereis, AfricaRice DDG-Research, is working closely with capacity building experts from the Centers/CRPs together with the Consortium Office to formulate and propose a CRP/Center-wide capacity strengthening ‘strategy’ that will allow us to collaborate more effectively and efficiently in achieving CGIAR system level outcomes. The group has been looking at the history of CGIAR collaboration in capacity strengthening and the current capacity strengthening activities and needs under the CRPs and Centers. In early February this group will complete a memo suggesting concrete steps and activities to advance a CGIAR system level capacity strengthening effort.

In 2013 we expect to go through a process similar to that for gender research in 2012 to clarify both what the role and strategy of CGIAR is at Consortium level and to develop CRP level strategies.

**Resource Mobilization**

Resource Mobilization is a shared responsibility of many actors in the CGIAR system. The Fund Office (FO) maintains the day-to-day relationships with the current and potential contributors through the CGIAR Fund and is also charged by the Fund Council Chair with the development of a resource mobilization strategy for the CGIAR Fund. In my role as Consortium CEO, I work closely with the FO and am the primary liaison between the Fund and the member Centers, supporting resource mobilization on behalf of the system. In addition, CGIAR Centers and CRPs will remain responsible for their own bilateral fundraising as well as supporting the fundraising activities of the FO and Consortium Office (CO).

During the first half year in my new role there was little time left over to devote to resource mobilization due to a limited staffing of the CO and many immediate priorities to visit centers, recruit CO staff, develop the office’s workplan, and the SRF Action Plan – but this should change during 2013, with increasing priority devoted to resource mobilization.

**CO**

While the Consortium Office leadership team is complete now, we have a number of vacancies for other staff members and will be actively recruiting. Specifically:

- Two Senior Science Officers (internationally recruited), one focused on biotechnology, plant breeding and genetic resources and the other focused on policy, economics and monitoring – working with the Chief Science Officer, Anne-Marie Izac.
- A Legal Officer (one-year consultancy) to support the work of the Consortium’s General Counsel, Elise Perset.
• A Communication Manager (nationally recruited) working with the Director Knowledge Management and Communication, Piers Bocock.
• Two rotating (seconded) junior professional positions, which we are positioning as opportunities for national staff from the Centers to gain international experience and exposure for a period of a year, one for a Finance Assistant and one for a Communication Fellow / writer.

The Consortium’s new HQ building will be constructed in 2013, with ground expected to be broken in February, the first stone ceremony expected early March, and the building ready to move in early in 2014. We also expect ratification of our HQ agreement with the French government in the first half of the year, which would mean the Consortium then detaches from Bioversity and will have to set up its own systems and policies (currently we are using Bioversity’s system as our host organization).

**In summary: 2013 Outlook**

To conclude, I believe 2013 is the year in which we will make a major step forward in the development of a performance management system for the CGIAR – which will over time quite radically change the way we do business. The new system intends to pay for performance and reward out-performance, based on a solid understanding of the development outcomes of our work. In the new system I envision that the research programs will be contracted to deliver outcomes and demonstrate value for money – in a system that fully recognizes that research is in fact a risky business – with uncertain outcomes.

2013 should also be a year in which we make it very clear to our partners that we mean business when we proclaim the importance of partnerships:

• We will align our priorities with those of our development partners.
• We will engage our research partners in the design and management of the CRPs.
• We will implement our programs in such a way that we contribute to building and strengthening capacities on many fronts.

Finally, 2013 will be a year to take a hard look at our system of governance to make sure that it enables us to be the best we can be – so we manage risks effectively and ensure we can indeed deliver on our accountabilities, thereby maximizing our contribution to a food secure future.

I look forward to harmonious and effective collaboration among all CGIAR system elements for a productive 2013.