

12th CGIAR Fund Council Meeting

November 4-5, 2014

Brussels, Belgium

**FINAL
Meeting Summary**



CGIAR Fund Office

December 19, 2014

Table of Contents

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Agenda Item 1: Opening of FC12	3
Agenda Item 2: CRP Evaluation Update	4
Agenda Item 3: CRP Extension Proposals	7
Agenda Item 4: 2014-2016 CGIAR Financing Plan	11
Agenda Item 5: FC Intellectual Property Report (FCIP)	11
Agenda Item 6: System Entity Reports	14
Agenda Item 7: PRT Report on Entity Work Programs and Budgets	16
Agenda Item 8: Diversity and Inclusion Strategy	18
Agenda Item 9: Resource Mobilization Strategy	22
Agenda Item 10: Strategy and Results Framework Draft	27
Agenda Item 11: Any Other Business	31
Agenda Item 12A: Mid-Term Review Report	36
Agenda Item 12B: Mid-Term Review Report (Decision Session)	39
Annex 1: Amendments to the contract clause for all extension contract Proposals	42
Annex 2: List of Participants	43

Agenda Item 1: Opening of FC12

The Fund Council Chair (Chair) opened the 12th Meeting of the CGIAR Fund Council (FC), thanked the European Commission hosts, and welcomed all participants, particularly, the new and returning members: Rebecca Smart from Canada, Pamela Anderson and Sara Boettiger from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), Mushtaq Ahmed (FC alternate from Canada), Merle Faminow of IDRC, Earnan O’Cleirigh from Ireland, and Wijnand van Ijssel from the Netherlands. The Chair also noted that this is the final FC meeting for Carlos Perez del Castillo, Chair of the Consortium Board, David Bergvinson and Raj Paroda, and thanked them for their contributions. The Chair then broadly welcomed all new alternates and observers.

Following the Chair’s call for nominations for a meeting co-chair, Mr. Roberto Ridolfi, FC representative from the European Commission, was elected.

In response to the Chair’s call for Any Other Business, members proposed a discussion on genebanks management and support and a brief on the dialogue between the Trustee and ICARDA regarding a possible trust fund arrangement. The agenda was adopted as amended.

FC members were asked to declare any conflict of interest regarding FC business and agenda items. The FC observer from the West Asia and North Africa constituency noted that he is a member of the Board of Trustees for ICARDA and David Bergvinson, FC observer from the BMGF, noted that he will become Director General of ICRISAT in January 2015.

The Chair then gave the floor to the co-chair, who welcomed all participants to Brussels and thanked his EC colleagues for organizing the events this week, explaining that one of the EC alternates to the FC (Bernard Rey) would step in and replace him today as co-chair. He noted that his title (Director for Sustainable Growth and Development) reflects a change (namely, the addition of “growth”) that perhaps says something about how the EC views development. His portfolio includes private sector development, financial engineering, and all trade-related aspects of development. He emphasized the importance of delivery and going the last mile, noting that the EC is a development, not research organization. In closing, he expressed pleasure at being back in his former CGIAR role and wished the group good deliberations.

The FC Chair noted that the European Commission is a very important partner that will have a significant role in the next few years as the agricultural research agenda links up in the CGIAR Research Programs to the nutrition, climate and sustainable productivity agendas.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. The representative from the European Commission was elected co-chair of the meeting.
2. The agenda was adopted as amended.

Agenda Item 2: CRP Evaluation Update

The Chair reminded FC members they were being asked to approve the “CRP Evaluation Process for Finalization, Feedback and Decision-making” and to note and comment on the IEA’s “CRP Evaluation Update,” recognizing that completion of the CRP evaluations is an important part of the preparation for the second call. The Chair also underscored the need for FC members to volunteer to help review the evaluation reports in small teams, working closely and intersessionally with the Evaluation and Impact Assessment Committee (EIAC), and suggested that the Consortium indicate how they will ensure that they respond effectively to the CRP evaluations from a management perspective.

The Chair then turned the floor over to the Head of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA), who noted that in 2015, IEA will complete and finalize four CRP evaluations; conduct five additional CRP evaluations; and provide quality assurance to five CRPs that are not undergoing IEA evaluations. Delivering on this ambitious schedule will be contingent on a defined and approved process for finalization, feedback and decision-making for evaluations. That process is outlined in detail in the document up for approval and was developed in consultation with key stakeholders (e.g., CRP directors, Center Directors General, the Consortium and Fund Offices, EIAC).

The IEA Head also proposed that IEA formally submit to the FC the CRP evaluations and the CRP management responses, once ready, rather than waiting for approval from the Consortium Board of the Consortium response, which would still be overseen by IEA while giving the Fund Council more time to consider completed evaluations.

The Head of IEA advised the FC to consider and discuss evaluations substantively through dedicated sessions at a high decision-making level, which is standard practice for most international organizations, and proposed a standing workshop during or prior to FC meetings to discuss evaluations in depth and propose follow-up to the evaluations’ findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Noting that the timeline indicates that many evaluations will be completed after final eligibility decisions are due to be made for the 2nd round of CRP proposals, the FC Chair requested the IEA Head to provide details on how preliminary conclusions and evaluation insights can be brought into the decision-making process.

Discussion:

- a) The Convener of the Evaluation and Impact Assessment Committee (EIAC) commended the IEA for its valuable work on the evaluations to date, noted the challenging workplan with numerous evaluations and quality assurance milestones, and reported that the

EIAC, having considered the role it plays in the process of finalization, feedback and decision-making, is quite comfortable with the process presented, with the proviso that more volunteers are needed, as noted by the FC Chair.

- b) Many members expressed appreciation for the work of the IEA, including work underway to ensure robust evaluations of current CRPs in time to inform decision-making on the second round of CRPs.
- c) Noting the difficulty of evaluating all 15 CRPs within the scheduled timeframe and the resulting proposal that five CRPs will not be evaluated by the IEA, many members requested detailed information on how the evaluations of these five will fit into the agreed timeline, who will oversee the evaluations, and how IEA will ensure high quality, robust evaluations.
- d) A member requested information on how IEA decides whether or not to contract out evaluations, suggested that the FC consider the role of EIAC or another oversight committee in monitoring and following-up on evaluation recommendations, and proposed that the FC should discuss evaluations.
- e) Members expressed concern regarding the high cost per unit evaluation and requested the Head to explain expenses, noting significantly lower costs in the past (e.g., for External Program and Management Reviews, or EPMRs).
- f) Recognizing the importance of the evaluation work, one member (Australia) volunteered to assist, as requested by the FC Chair.
- g) Members requested clarity as to right-sizing of budgets in terms of variation in CRPs, and whether proposed timelines for evaluations can be adjusted for size or complexity.
- h) One member requested clarity regarding the governance system that should be in place to ensure independence of evaluations when there are conflicts of interest.

Consortium CEO:

The CEO expressed satisfaction with the thorough evaluations, reiterated their importance to the preparation of the second round of CRP proposals, noted that the Consortium's two-week window to review evaluations and prepare a Consortium Board-approved Consortium response is unrealistic, and supported the IEA's proposal to share the evaluations with the FC before the Consortium Board has approved them.

Response to Discussion Points:

Head of IEA:

- i. The decision as to whether or not a CRP would receive an IEA evaluation was based on a number of criteria, including type of CRP (e.g., system versus commodity) and maturity

of the program, which was a major factor. Four of the five CRPs not receiving a full IEA evaluation are less mature programs.

- ii. As agreed with the Consortium, IEA will provide a quality advisory consultant to assist the five CRPs at various stages of the evaluation process, and will review and validate the quality of the evaluations at the end of the process (as detailed in a paper available upon request).
- iii. Most of the cost of an evaluation goes to paying the high-caliber and unique experts needed to evaluate complex programs using comprehensive approaches and methodologies that meet international standards, in order to strengthen the independence, credibility and impartiality of the evaluations.
- iv. In addition, travel costs, as well as the overcall cost of conducting an evaluation, have gone up since the last EPMR was conducted within CGIAR, but IEA is endeavoring to downsize costs where possible.
- v. Travel expenses can be high for the more country-based CRPs and due to the fact that CRPs involve many partners and Centers, requiring travel to more than one place to ensure that due diligence is given to the various participants.
- vi. Regarding right-sizing, IEA is trying to downsize the cost of evaluations appropriately depending on the size of the CRPs.
- vii. In response to the FC Chair's query, the Head noted that by the end of 2015, the IEA expects to provide, if not a final report, preliminary findings and conclusions that will be discussed in different fora with various stakeholders and thereby inform decisions on the second round of CRP proposals.

FC Chair:

The Chair summarized the Fund Council's discussion, noting that members welcome and thank the IEA for its work and appreciate the extensive work still underway in order to have preliminary findings available in time for decision-making on the second call, and requested the IEA Head to rigorously review spending patterns and budgeting parameters for evaluations in order to maintain high quality while driving for efficiency, and to consider whether evaluations of some of the smaller, less complex CRPs can be conducted in a quicker timeline.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The Fund Council approved the "CRP Evaluation Process for Finalization, Feedback and Decision-making" and noted the IEA's "CRP Evaluation Update."*
2. *The Fund Council requested the IEA Head to rigorously review spending patterns and budgeting parameters for evaluations, and to consider whether evaluations of some of the smaller, less complex CRPs can be conducted in a quicker timeline.*

Agenda Item 3: CRP Extension Proposals

The Chair noted that the FC was requested to discuss the CRP Extension Proposals submitted for consideration by the Consortium Board, and explained that prior to FC12, she had requested the FO to review the proposals and provide a detailed analysis on each CRP's budget request, taking into consideration ISPC and Consortium Science Team assessments and each CRP's absorptive capacity, prior spending trajectory, and dependency on Windows 1 and 2 funding, as well as the budget growth proposed in the extension proposals.

The FO analysis grouped proposals into three categories (A, B and C):

Group A:

- No objection from the ISPC.
- Clear support from the Consortium Science Team.
- No major budgetary concerns from the FO.

Group B:

- Qualified clearance from the ISPC.
- Qualified support from the Consortium Science Team.
- Some budgetary concerns from the FO.

Group C: CRP on Dryland Systems proposal, which given its particular situation is treated in its own category.

The Chair called for approval of the amendments to the contract clause (as outlined in Annex 1) for all CRP extensions, and then opened the floor to comments on the extension proposals.

Discussion:

- a) Members questioned why the CRP on Managing and Sustaining Crop Collections (Genebanks) is not being discussed.
- b) Members requested clarification as to whether the budgets proposed by the FO start fresh as of 2015, or if any underspend by end of 2014 would be included.
- c) A member inquired how IEA expects to indicate how the five CRPs in Group B will improve during their extensions.
- d) While expressing appreciation for the FO's analysis, a few members indicated that the short timeframe that they had to consider the analysis was insufficient.
- e) A member suggested that recognizing performance and rewarding it is important to determining approved budgets, but noted that over 2 years adjustments will be needed.
- f) A member sought clarification regarding the basis for reductions in Group B.

- g) One member (Iran) emphasized the importance of dryland systems to a balanced CGIAR research portfolio, and the vitality of the research to the West Asia and North Africa region and global challenges in general. He noted that the CRP on Dryland Systems had difficulties in its startup, highlighting issues faced by ICARDA, including the relocation of its headquarters, and requested that the FC reduce the W1/2 budget of the CRP on Dryland Systems by only 15%, rather than the proposed 50% reduction in W1/2 funding.
- h) Many members noted that the ISPC had major concerns with five CRPs— Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA), Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH), Dryland Cereals (DC), Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE), and Aquatic Agricultural Systems (AAS) --- and rated the proposal on Dryland Systems as poor; noted that the revised proposals and management responses on FTA, A4NH, DC and AAS had addressed these concerns; noted that the ISPC still has major concerns on the AAS proposal; and supported the recommendation of the CO for the Extension of all CRPs while sharing the concerns of the ISPC on AAS and the CO conditions on the Dryland Systems CRP.
- i) A member suggested that adjusting downward the W1/2 budget of the Dryland Systems CRP should not be seen as negative feedback, noting the importance of the work and the advantages of helping to pace activities appropriately so that the program can be strengthened and become more fully developed as a true systems CRP.
- j) Members emphasized that while the FC would be slowing down projected disbursements to CRPs from W1/2, adjustments could be made later if the CRPs' ability to spend changes.
- k) Some members raised questions regarding the performance and science quality of the CRP on Dryland Systems.
- l) Many members emphasized the importance of drylands research and expressed interest in having a more detailed conversation on CGIAR's approach to dryland systems.

Response to Discussion Points:

FC Chair:

- i. Explained that the Genebanks CRP does not require an extension for the period in question, but noted that genebanks will be discussed in the Any Other Business session.
- ii. Noted that documentation from the CO was received by the FO on October 22, after which the FO reviewed it and then discussed it with the FC Chair, who determined that the documentation wasn't sufficient and therefore asked the FO to prepare a budget analysis of each the CRPs, which was available at the end of October.
- iii. Explained that she had asked the FO to prepare the analysis from a budget management perspective, based on the Window 1 and 2 funds that could effectively and realistically be spent in a two-year period, not to judge the utility or importance of the CRPs.

- iv. Noted that since the CRP on Dryland Systems has relatively low dependence on Windows 1 and 2 funding, the proposed 50% reduction results in an 18.5% reduction of the total CRP budget, while the FC member's suggestion to reduce the W1/2 budget by 15% would equate to a 7% reduction.
- v. Requested the FO to include a discussion on drylands research in the FC13 agenda.
- vi. Asked those with a close association with ICARDA and the CRP on Dryland Systems to communicate that drylands research is a very important issue to the FC.
- vii. The Chair emphasized the importance of getting documents to the FO in due time.

Head of FO/FC Executive Secretary:

- i. Noted that the budgets proposed are for the two-year extension period, and that any underspend would be used to fund the extension budgets approved.
- ii. Explained that the FO has a very good estimate of Windows 1 and 2 funding for 2015, and it wouldn't be good practice to approve budgets above these projections.
- iii. Clarified that the reductions in Group B are based on the previous patterns of spending, which were analyzed in terms of percentage increase per year over the actual CRP so far, taking into consideration the comments of both the Consortium Science Team and the ISPC, and dependency on Windows 1 and 2 funding.

ISPC Chair:

- i. Clarified that the decisions regarding Humidtropics and WLE were based on budgets, not on concerns about the science by either the ISPC or the Consortium Science Team.

Consortium CEO:

- i. Conveyed that the CRPs prepared their budgets with the assumption that underspend would carry over, not be returned to the Trustee.
- ii. Explained that the forecasted expenditure for Humidtropics and WLE increased, so a reduction would be perceived as a real cut, exacerbated by the underspend not carrying over, and suggested that reductions have to be motivated by other reasons, not just burn rates.
- iii. Stated that due to the timing of the FO analysis, Centers did not have sufficient time to respond to these changes.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The FC agreed to hold a session at their next meeting to discuss how research on dryland systems can be strengthened going forward.*
2. *The FC approved the amendments to the contract clause for all CRP extensions.*

3. The Fund Council approved the proposed budget allocations for each CRP as presented in the Fund Office analysis. The budgets for the following CRPs were unchanged: A4NH, CCAFS, Dryland Cereals, FTA, Grain Legumes, GRiSP, Livestock and Fish, Maize, PIM, RTB, and Wheat. The budgets for the remaining CRPs were reduced as follows:
- WLE: 15% of W1/2 request
 - AAS: 25% of W1/2 request
 - Humidtropics: 40% of W1/2 request
 - Dryland Systems: 50% of W1/2 request

CRP Extension Budget 2015-2016 (USD '000)				
CRP Name	Total			
	W 1/2	W3 & Bilateral	Expanded	Total
A4NH, Agriculture for Nutrition and Health	59,000	120,200	67,900	247,100
CCAFS, Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security	99,200	52,500	0	151,700
DC, Dryland Cereals	16,514	30,430	0	46,944
FTA, Forests, Trees and Agroforestry	68,838	127,505	0	196,343
GL, Grain Legumes	35,471	77,912	0	113,383
GRiSP, Rice	86,360	134,570	0	220,930
L&F, Livestock and Fish	34,755	26,100	0	60,855
MAIZE	41,048	102,999	57,366	201,413
PIM, Policies, Institutions and Markets	54,500	141,062	0	195,562
RTB, Roots, Tubers and Bananas	68,456	87,678	0	156,134
Wheat	39,570	60,182	30,937	130,689
AAS, Aquatic Agricultural Systems	31,575	37,500	0	69,075
Humidtropics	25,200	36,241	0	61,441
WLE, Water, Land and Ecosystems	60,690	67,900	0	128,590
DS, Dryland Systems	21,000	71,421	0	92,421
Total	742,177	1,174,200	156,203	2,072,580

Agenda Item 4: 2014-2016 CGIAR Financing Plan

The Chair framed the discussion by introducing two documents: the “Draft Financing Plan 2014-2016,” which is to be noted by the FC, and the “Timeline for disbursement of Funds from Donors to CRPs,” which is a request to approve the proposal to adopt an annual allocation of Window 1 funds by the Fund Council, instead of quarterly, as is currently the case.

The Chair opened the floor to comments.

Discussion:

- a) Several members noted the proposal on the disbursement of Window 1 funds on demand, and asked if this would imply additional costs from the Trustee.
- b) Members requested information on how the genebanks will be financed into 2016.

Response to Discussion Points:

PRT Chair:

- i. The disbursement timeline of Window 1 funds would not incur additional costs of the Trustee.

The Chair:

- i. The Chair suggested that there be a formal discussion on the genebanks during the session on Any Other Business.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The Fund Council noted the “Draft Financing Plan 2014-2016.”*
2. *The Fund Council approved the proposal for an annual allocation of Window 1 funds to the CRPs based on CGIAR Financing Plans for the CRP Portfolio rather than a quarterly allocation.*

Agenda Item 5: FC Intellectual Property Report (FC IP)

The Chair noted that the FC is being asked to adopt the “CGIAR Intellectual Assets Report for Year 2013,” including its five recommendations for improvement.

The Chair opened the floor to comments and shortly thereafter the Fund Council Intellectual Property (FCIP) Group representative, Bram de Jonge, joined the discussion via telephone.

Discussion:

- a) Many members were pleased to see progress on IP issues, expressed full support of the FCIP Group’s recommendations, and commended the Consortium for its leadership on IP initiatives, but requested clarity on why Centers engage in Limited Exclusivity

Agreements (LEAs) and Restricted Use Agreements (RUAs) and requested that Centers' budgets indicate staff activities related to IP issues.

- b) A member suggested that attention be paid to the impact of IA management, LEAs, and RUAs on targeted beneficiaries to achieve the CGIAR vision and that this issue should be a key consideration as CGIAR further defines its approach to partnerships.
- c) A member appreciated Center Boards' assurance of compliance for 2013 and the clear improvement in reporting over 2012, regretted that information and transparency are lacking (in the 2013 report) regarding how significant weaknesses from the 2012 report are being addressed, undermining trust that Centers will strictly comply with the IA policy, and suggested that the report should indicate why Centers accepted deviations and how the Consortium or FCIP Group examined the justifications provided.
- d) Noting improvement in compliance and diminished resistance from Centers on the process, a member suggested that small, concrete examples and additional information could add value to the report.
- e) Members requested clarification as to why patents were singled out in Recommendation B (i.e., requiring Centers to provide an explanation and rationale).
- f) A member noted that capacity development should be a high priority, both within the CGIAR system and in partnership with NARS (National Agricultural Research Systems), and highlighted the need for more clarity regarding how benefit sharing will be implemented, particularly with regard to farmers' access to genetic resources.
- g) Many members emphasized the importance of farmers' rights and some, noting the need to develop farmers' rights as both a concept and practice, and that various Centers deal differently with the issue and lack a systematic approach, enquired as to the FCIP Group's vision going forward.
- h) A member further suggested that CGIAR needs to figure out a way to get clarity on farmers' rights and how they will be involved in the decision-making process around IP issues, noting that this matter is at the heart and core of the conversation about IP rights in the CGIAR system, and called for CGIAR to be ambitious in attempting to get consensus globally regarding farmers' rights.

Response to Discussion Points:

FCIP Group representative:

- i. Recommendation B focuses on patents, the strongest form of protection, because one Center made six operational patent applications but did not clearly explain in its report why this form of protection was sought and how it will further CGIAR's work and mission, while applications for other forms of protection (e.g., breeder rights) were

explained. As with any IP application, the FCIP Group needs a clear explanation from the Center to assess whether or not it's appropriate and how it will be beneficial.

- ii. Two documents prepared in the past few months (the Consortium Updated Fund Council Intellectual Assets Reporting and the Consortium Responses to Comments and Recommendations for the Fund Council IP Group Report for 2012) clearly outline what actions have been taken to address all shortcomings noted in the 2012 report, and these actions have also been briefly summarized in Section 2.3 of the Consortium Report.
- iii. The FCIP Group representative noted with satisfaction that the Consortium has taken the lead to ensure that mistakes made in 2012 will not be repeated, and that communication between the Consortium and the FCIP Group as well as the Centers has improved.
- iv. Systems to secure follow-up are being implemented and discussions about noncompliance in 2012 (which revealed differences in interpretation regarding the IP principles) and insufficient justifications have now been resolved to the satisfaction of the FCIP group, which notes considerable improvement in the 2013 reporting cycle and the importance of capacity building for continued progress in future.
- v. Deviations from exemptions in LEAs have not materialized in any agreement, therefore no justifications are required.
- vi. Centers need to learn more about issues related to farmers' rights (e.g., to date, reporting on them has been quite narrow). There is a need to come to a more systematic vision of how Centers could proactively promote farmers' rights, something that the FCIP Group should discuss with the Consortium to address in the coming year.
- vii. The FCIP Group Representative concluded that a lot of work remains to be done and suggested that CGIAR needs to move beyond compliance and focus more on how IP tools can be used to get IA into farmers' fields and to lead on the promotion of farmers' rights.

FC Chair:

- i. In closing, the Chair noted that the FC is beginning to focus not just on compliance, but also on implementation and how CGIAR uses the IP principles to drive its work forward, especially as we will focus more in the second round of CRPs on effective partnerships.
- ii. Both upstream and downstream partnerships are necessary to get high-quality research into the hands of farmers in a quick and fluid way.
- iii. Noting that the FCIP Group is working well, the Chair thanked the representative and the rest of the Group for their work on the report.
- iv. The Chair requested the FCIP Group and Fund Office to prepare an agenda item for an upcoming Fund Council meeting to discuss the issue of farmers' rights in depth.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The Fund Council adopted the “CGIAR Intellectual Assets Report for Year 2013” and the recommendations of the FCIP Group.*
2. *The Fund Office and FCIP will collaborate to organize a session on farmers’ rights as part of an upcoming FC meeting.*

Agenda Item 6: System Entity Reports

The Chair noted that the FC is being asked to adopt the reports of the FO and the Consortium, and opened the floor for comments, questions, and clarifications.

Discussion:

- a) Many members expressed their approval of the system entity reports.
- b) With regard to the FO report, several members enquired about FO action on unpaid funding commitments and consequences for a donor or constituency that is not meeting the minimum funding threshold required for FC eligibility.
- c) Several members repeated a request from last year to provide in one table information on all three funding Windows, as well as bilateral funding.
- d) With regard to Window 3 and bilateral funding, a member asked for an update on the Consortium’s efforts to collect more accurate and up-to-date data.
- e) Given the increased focus on results-based management, a member suggested that the bulk of the reports should provide more detail on what was planned and the outcomes of specific workplans and agreed budgets, with activities listed in an annex.
- f) A member requested a report on the CGIAR Development Dialogues in terms of costs and benefits, lessons learned, and measurements of success.
- g) A member requested that information on FC Working Groups’ membership and mandates be shared more regularly beyond FC meetings.
- h) A member suggested that members provide input as to the kind of information they would like to see in future FO and Consortium reports for discussion during the Any Other Business session of this meeting.

Response to Discussion Points:

FC Executive Secretary/ Head of FO:

- i. If a donor’s contribution falls below one-half million due to nonpayment (or other reasons), they would be ineligible for FC membership. While acknowledging that the payment from Iran had experienced difficulties, he confirmed that the funds are en

route to the Trustee and is recorded as transmitted. The FO works with donors to facilitate and expedite contributions that have been made but not completed.

- ii. The request to include all four income streams in one report will be taken up, but bilateral data, which aren't available until spring of the following year, may be out of date.
- iii. The request for a report based on a workplan and its benefits, documenting what we're trying to achieve and what has been achieved, was deemed a valuable suggestion. The Executive Secretary also noted that at the spring FC meetings, the entities report on a set of results-based performance scorecards.
- iv. The Executive Secretary agreed on the importance and need to share more information on the work of the FC working groups and committees and to encourage more members to participate in collective activities.

Consortium CEO:

- i. There is a forecast on Window 3 and bilateral spending for 2014 in the financing plan that was approved earlier in this meeting, based on data received from the Centers in August. The Consortium can provide a more granular analysis for 2013 by the end of the year.
- ii. Regarding the CGIAR Development Dialogues, the event was funded by \$10,000 contributions from each of the CRPs and several Centers and cost about \$200,000, in addition to covering the costs of some people's attendance. The benefits are harder to estimate. There won't be a cost-benefit analysis in terms of return on investment, but feedback was very positive and participants felt that it was a successful, worthwhile event that is worth repeating. The CO will provide a concise report to the FC.

The Chair:

- i. On behalf of the Fund Council, the Chair requested the FO and CO to meet before the end of the year to develop a plan to improve financial reporting, including what data can be expected, when, and at what level of rigor so that the FC can benefit from a system view of income and more meaningful financial discussions. The plan will be submitted to the FC for its consideration and input, and to determine if the proposed financial reporting meets its needs.
- ii. The Chair suggested that members who would like to provide input to the content and format of future entity reports submit their comments to Maxine Garvey, who will collate them and circulate for discussion during the Any Other Business session of this meeting.

Conclusions and Decisions:

- 1. The Fund Council adopted the Fund Office and Consortium Reports.*
- 2. The CO will provide a concise report to the FC on the CGIAR Development Dialogues.*
- 3. The FC Executive Secretary and Consortium CEO will meet before the end of the year to develop a plan to improve financial reporting, including what data can be expected, when, and at what level of rigor, for submission to the FC for its consideration and input.*
- 4. Maxine Garvey will compile input from members regarding proposed content and format of future entity reports for discussion during the Any Other Business session.*

Agenda Item 7: PRT Report on Entity Work Programs and Budgets

The Convener of the Peer Review Team (PRT), Philip Chiverton, opened his presentation by noting that the PRT's mandate is to scrutinize system entities' workplans and budgets (WPBs) in terms of value for money, particularly given donor calls to demonstrate efficiency gains at both the entity and system levels. The PRT Convener highlighted the following:

- There has been a consistent 10% increase per year in requested combined system costs, which totals \$20 million for 2015. The ISPC's budget, however, has remained static.
- Windows 1 and 2 inflows have imposed a 6% reduction on CRP funding.
- The FO budget request for 2015 increased by 23.8% over 2014, mainly due to the \$1.35 million extra for the operational budget of the proposed Resource Mobilization Strategy (RMS), which includes \$750,000 for pilot activities and \$600,000 for consultants' services. The PRT recommended a less ambitious startup.
- Regarding the IEA budget, the PRT is concerned about unit costs for evaluations, compared to lower costs for EPMRs in years past.
- The Consortium reported an unexpected extra overhead payment of \$687,000 to Bioversity International (due to delayed recognition of the Consortium's International Organization status), and reported a projected 2014 overspend of \$500,000+ due to additional operational costs incurred from a move to new offices. The Consortium withdrew the current budget proposal to resort to the \$6.6 million capped budget for 2015.
- The PRT suggested that the FC either write off this overspend and approve the budget of \$6.6 million, or that the Consortium replaces the overspend gap with reserves and/or revises its workplan for 2015 to fit within the budget.
- The Trustee reported a slight increase in budget from \$600,000 to \$617,000.

The PRT Convener thanked David Bergvinson for his invaluable work on the PRT and reminded colleagues that there are two donor representative vacancies on the PRT.

The FC Chair encouraged members to fill the vacancies on the PRT and then opened the floor to comments.

Discussion:

- a) Many members expressed concern about system entity costs increasing by 10% while there are 6% reductions to CRP funding, voiced approval for the ISPC and IEA WPBs, insisted that the Consortium maintains its cap, and requested more information on the Open Access work.
- b) Regarding the FO WPB, the same several members requested further prioritization and more details on the cost of piloting the RMS, particularly resources allocated for consultancies, questioned if meeting costs have in fact doubled due to increased payments for Committees and Working Groups, and requested details of those costs.
- c) A member noted that following the upcoming discussion on the RMS (Agenda Item 9), the FC may determine that such an aggressive FO budget is not necessary.
- d) Members expressed the need for the FO and Consortium to maintain budget discipline and noted concern over rising administrative costs as programmatic costs are cut.

Response to Discussion Points:

The FC Chair:

- i. The Chair noted and concurred with the suggestion to defer a decision on the FO budget until after the RMS has been discussed, in order to give the FO more guidance on how the FC wants the strategy to move forward, which will have budget implications.
- ii. The Chair noted the consensus that the ISPC WPB be approved.
- iii. The Chair noted the consensus that the IEA WPB be approved, but emphasized that the IEA needs to demonstrate to the FC that it has unit costs properly under control for evaluations.
- iv. With regard to the Trustee WPB, the Chair noted that if the activity doesn't increase, the costs won't, and the FC should monitor the situation.
- v. The Chair emphasized that the overall increase in system costs is indefensible and suggested that if system entities are unable to constrain their costs the FC should consider budget tools that can drive down costs.
- vi. The Chair noted the consensus that the Fund Council should approve the redirection of the ISPC Chair's honoraria and office support of \$130k from the ISPC budget in 2015 to the Fund Office to enable the Fund Office to handle the Chair's contract and further noted that the action is revenue/cost neutral.

- vii. The Chair asked the PRT Convener whether the PRT could explore how to drive the message of efficiency and synergy through the different system entity budgets.
- viii. The Chair thanked the PRT Convener and David Bergvinson for their service on the PRT.

The Consortium CEO:

The CEO agreed to replace the Consortium's overspend gap with reserves or to revise its 2015 workplan to say within budget.

The PRT Convener:

In response to the FC Chair's request, the PRT Convener expressed his willingness to lead an effort to explore how to spur efficiency and synergy in entity budgets, but noted that he would need two extra FC volunteers to assist with the initiative.

Conclusions and Decisions:

- 1. The Consortium will replace its 2014 overspend gap with reserves or will revise its 2015 workplan in order to cap its budget.*
- 2. The Fund Council approved the 2015 Consortium work program and budget of \$6.6 million.*
- 3. The Fund Council will take a decision on the FO's WPB after it discusses the RMS.*
- 4. The Fund Council approved the 2015 IEA work program and budget of \$3.940 million.*
- 5. The Fund Council approved the 2015 Trustee work program and budget of \$0.617 million.*
- 6. The Fund Council approved the 2015 ISPC work program and budget of \$3.648 million.*
- 7. The Fund Council approved the redirection of the ISPC's Chair's honoraria and office support of \$130,418 from the ISPC budget in 2015 to the Fund Office to enable the Fund Office to handle the Chair's contract.*
- 8. The PRT Convener will lead an effort to explore options for constraining system entity costs.*

Agenda Item 8: Diversity and Inclusion Strategy

The Chair opened the agenda item by reminding FC members that this is the latest discussion in a long-running conversation with the Consortium Board and Office on gender and diversity and, more recently, inclusion, including global developments related to the treatment of sexual minorities in the workplace.

The Chair noted that the “Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2015-2019” and the “Second Consortium Report on Gender and Diversity Performance” were up for discussion, and acknowledged the reviewer comments prepared on behalf of the Fund Office.

The Chair emphasized the growing importance of addressing gender and diversity and inclusion issues more broadly within the CGIAR system for both individual FC members as well as the FC as a whole, reflected on the difference in performance across the system on these issues, encouraged members to be extremely clear during this review of the performance report as to whether or not they are happy about the direction and speed of progress, and to clearly indicate what more or less the FC would like to be done on this issue, or what should be done differently.

The Chair also asked members to consider and comment on whether to address issues of diversity and inclusion together or deal with them as separate issues. She reminded the FC of the multiple aspects of the diversity and inclusion work – diversity and inclusion of the people who work within the system, and how we incorporate diversity and inclusion into CRP strategies so that they are relevant and meaningful to communities for which research results are meant to land and have impact – and underscored that both are priorities for the FC.

The Chair then opened the floor for discussion.

Discussion:

- a) Members welcomed CGIAR’s work regarding gender, diversity and inclusion, but noted that there is a lot of room for improvement.
- b) A member emphasized the importance of CGIAR’s leadership role, and the influence it may have on national systems in the development of an effective strategy.
- c) Members questioned the seriousness of gender strategies within CGIAR, noting that a number of CRPs that were rated “excellent” in an earlier session do not have gender strategies in place yet.
- d) A member expressed that this strategy does not feel different from previous strategies, and suggested evaluating the progress made regarding the investment of CGIAR’s gender and diversity program since its inception.
- e) On the issue of diversity in the workplace, members noted a lack of Center Board accountability and suggested that data be collected and reported.
- f) Members expressed support for the comments prepared on behalf of the FO.
- g) A member noted that Centers and CRPs are not aligning their budgets with the funding needs associated with a gender strategy, and that more could be done to develop monitoring methods.

- h) A member emphasized that gender should be elevated from a subset of technical issues to a development objective in and of itself, similar to climate change and capacity development.
- i) A member requested an update on the funding support given to the Consortium to strengthen gender analysis and inclusion within the CRP portfolio.
- j) A member noted that the strategy does not create institutional incentives for improving performance and for creating a better environment for women at all levels.
- k) A member emphasized their strong support for the Consortium's strategy, particularly the system-wide strategy that allows each Center to develop its own diversity strategy.
- l) A member reiterated the need to not lose sight of inclusion in the strategy.

Response to Discussion Points:

Consortium CEO:

- i. In 2014, the overall budget allocated to gender in research strategies increased to 14 percent.
- ii. Regarding the approved Gender Action Plan, the work has started, particularly for the post-doc program, but the FC still has to approve the Fund Use Agreement.
- iii. This is the first system-wide CGIAR strategy to focus on gender, diversity and inclusion in the workplace and it responds to the first time that the FC has requested action (i.e., setting gender equity targets) for the system as a whole.
- iv. The Centers' strategies will provide the instrument through which the Center Boards will be held accountable.
- v. There is strong pushback from the Centers for a more harmonized HR policy, but four or five Centers are interested to work on this topic.
- vi. The Consortium is developing, together with Centers, a system-wide policy on sexual orientation, the first of its kind for CGIAR.

The Chair:

- i. Recognizing that shifting social norms is not easy, and noting the expertise around the room, the Chair suggested that members' experience is that unless you're entirely dedicated, change will not happen.
- ii. Underscored that how gender inequality plays out across the system has broad implications for what research is done, who works in the system, and the impact of research results.
- iii. Promoting equality and ensuring gender, diversity and inclusiveness is of profound importance. Effectively addressing these issues is at the heart of who we are and what CGIAR is doing.

- iv. Expressed concern regarding the non-integration of gender into the core working budget of the Consortium (e.g., separate line items for gender).
- v. Emphasized that the Strategy needs to become a true system strategy that is incorporated into the SRF, the evaluation of existing CRPs, and how the FC considers future research programs, all of which will be important for collectively mobilizing essential resources.
- vi. Suggested that Center Boards should be dedicated to managing Centers in a way that enables recruitment of the best women and men to achieve the best results and partnerships.
- vii. Noting that the FC has been respectful of Centers, the complexities of CRPs, the oversight role of the Consortium Board, and the need to build capacity at the Consortium Office, the Chair expressed members' desire for action on equality issues.
- viii. Emphasizing the draft Strategy under discussion is a work in progress and far from being an actual strategy, the Chair noted that the continual back-and-forth over the past two years and the quality of the documents produced by the Consortium does not yet represent a seriousness of intent.
- ix. Noted that it is important to identify if this is due to resistance in the institution, benign neglect, or because there are obstacles to achieving this. If there are obstacles, they need to be identified so plans can be made to overcome them.
- x. Noting that most other organizations, as far as the Chair is aware, do not have stand-alone policies on sexual orientation, recommended that the Consortium's policy on sexual orientation be integrated in to the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy.
- xi. The Consortium should consult with similar organizations and review how they address sexual orientation, and how that issue is integrated into an overall approach to diversity and inclusion.
- xii. Thanked colleagues for their work on the Strategy, encouraged them to reach out to FC members, many of whom have deep experience on these issues, and requested them to revert in spring 2015 with a more robust Strategy document.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The Fund Council commented on the "Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2015-2019" and provided input that the Consortium will incorporate into a revised Strategy to be presented for approval at FC13.*
2. *The Fund Council noted the "Second Consortium Report on Gender and Diversity Performance."*
3. *The Fund Council discussed the Consortium's proposal to develop a policy on "Sexual Orientation and the CGIAR" and its incorporation into the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy.*

4. *The Consortium should consult with similar organizations and review how they address the issue of sexual orientation and how that issue is integrated into an overall approach to diversity and inclusion at an institutional level.*
5. *The Diversity and Inclusion Strategy needs to become a true system strategy that is incorporated into the SRF, the evaluation of existing CRPs, and how the FC considers future research programs.*
6. *A strategic approach to diversity and inclusion needs to be integrated into the development of the SRF and reflected in it.*
7. *The Consortium should consult with FC members who have deep experience on issues of gender and diversity for assistance in revising the Strategy.*

Agenda Item 9: Resource Mobilization Strategy (RMS)

The Chair introduced the agenda item by noting that the FC has been asking and waiting for a resource mobilization strategy for a long time, and expressed hopes for a full discussion. The Chair welcomed Charlie Michaud of CCS and Harry Guinness of Lion's Head Global Partners to the first part of the discussion on the RMS. She extended them gratitude for their contribution to the RMS, along with the FC Resource Group and other contributors.

The Co-Chair of the Fund Council Resource Group (RG), Rebecca Smart, framed the discussion by recalling the genesis and progression of the RMS and noting that the strategy was requested by the FC in November 2013, has undergone numerous iterations, and that its interim results were presented at FC11, where it was emphasized that the SRF and RMS should be developed in parallel, with crosswalks between those two to ensure that the processes inform one another. The RG Co-Chair also noted that a workshop was held yesterday to inform members' view. The resulting document up for consideration was developed through a joint process, and the RG Co-Chair noted the contributions of the Consortium Resource Group. She emphasized that the RMS is geared towards helping the system raise more resources from traditional and new donors, in addition to innovative finance, and looks at how CGIAR can develop a more cohesive communications package throughout the system. The RG Co-Chair shared major findings and recommendations, including:

- At present, CGIAR resources cannot fully resource the system, of significant concern given the ambitions of the SRF.
- The CGIAR operates in an increasingly competitive and shifting fundraising landscape.
- Organizations competing for the same funding are better resourced to secure funds through staffing, messaging and ambition for impact.
- There is need to take urgent action through an integrated and system-wide approach, accompanied by basic investment to pilot and fast track activity.

The Resource Group Co-Chair then invited Charlie Michaud of CCS to present the strategy. Mr. Michaud shared the following points:

- The real vulnerabilities and complacency that the CGIAR faces in the realm of RM work, especially at the system level.
- Discussion around the RMS has focused on the optics of increasing the system budget while Centers face cuts, and the RMS return on investment and implementation.
- As a response to comments made on the draft report, Mr. Michaud noted that, in terms of optics, the Centers have been heavily involved in the development of the strategy, provided positive feedback and, in many cases, welcome it and the funding possibilities it would enable. The recommendations are focused on Return on Investment (ROI), demonstrating a clear opportunity to efficiently raise new funds to benefit the system and take advantage of its global reach. Implementation can be done via consultants or in-house capacity, but immediate action is imperative.

The RG Co-Chair then opened the floor for comments and questions for CCS and Lion's Head Global Partners.

Discussion:

- a) Members expressed appreciation of the work that went into developing the RMS and the importance of having an RM plan.
- b) Many members emphasized that developing a strong SRF is critical to an effective resource mobilization strategy.
- c) Many members asked about Centers' fundraising levels, strategies and capacities; questioned whether it is justifiable to commit additional funding to a new resource mobilization strategy when the system is facing budget cuts that affect many CRPs, and noted that there may be a risk in deciding on such investments if there are possible uncertainties about the future of some system entities (i.e., if the recommendations of the MTR are implemented). Members supported the sentiment that there are opportunities in tapping new additional resources, agreed in principle on the RMS, and are open to Option 1 on a pilot basis, on the condition that clear targets, guidelines, and principles are set. Members also recognized that a robust SRF is essential for advocacy and resource mobilization and expressed interest in seeing a revised streamlined budget proposal, along with clear fundraising targets.
- d) A member asked how much CGIAR is spending on fundraising collectively as a system.
- e) Another member noted the importance of the FO and FC roles in seeking major investment and providing RM guidance to Centers, particularly given their budget cuts.

- f) A member commented on the relatively small number of large projects (in the \$50 to \$100 million range) across the system and questioned whether that would affect CGIAR's attractiveness to donors.
- g) While recognizing the importance of investing in research focused on development and impact, a member expressed the view that CGIAR should pay more attention to basic, fundamental research.

Response to Discussion Points:

CCS:

- i. Resource mobilization and communications require investment and CGIAR is lacking capacity at the system level. While CGIAR will benefit from a stronger SRF, even holding on to current resources requires investment.
- ii. Within the current research strategy, there are salable and potentially high-impact outputs that are not being developed, promoted and represented appropriately.
- iii. In general, there is underinvestment in resource mobilization across CGIAR. It would be more cost efficient to invest in resource mobilization capacity at the system level, rather than within each Center.
- iv. Regarding the relatively small size of many CGIAR initiatives, CCS concluded that this is due to a lack of investment, which is seen as an indication of CGIAR's incapacity at the system level, and noted that other organizations take big ideas, invest in robust teams and communications strategies, and engage high level leaders, adding that the SDGs present CGIAR with this precise opportunity to act on higher plane.

Following the discussion and dismissal of the representatives from CCS and Lion's Head Global Partners, the RG Co-Chair acknowledged members' concerns regarding the budget requested for the proposed pilots and directed the FC to a minimum investment proposal prepared by the FO, which was being circulated at that time. The Resource Group Co-Chair also addressed the timing of the RMS in the context of uncertainties around the MTR, suggesting tying implementation of the strategy to the rollout of decisions of the MTR and highlighting MTR-RMS crossroads, including:

- Opportunities to communicate with one voice across the system;
- Using the SRF as a platform for investment;
- Engaging global leadership to raise the profile of CGIAR; and
- Exploring options for innovative finance.

The RG Co-Chair opened the floor for additional comments.

Discussion:

- a) A member of the Resource Group emphasized that it's a good, inspiring and worrying report that shines a light on a sore spot. The member cautioned against CGIAR research being too inward-looking and recommended looking forward.
- b) Members reiterated the importance of the SRF, clear targets and corresponding ideas and programs in driving the RM work.
- c) Noting the challenges of operating at a system level, given the distribution of knowledge and opportunities, one member questioned the rationale for the FO to lead this work, emphasized the importance of tapping the strengths of everyone across the system to tell a compelling story for funding, and expressed concern that, based on past CGIAR experience, bringing in consultants to figure out new and innovative ways to fundraise doesn't tend to lead to new money.
- d) One member noted that the \$1.8 million investment request is quite modest when viewed from a system-wide perspective.
- e) A member suggested that if you collectivized fundraising efforts throughout the CGIAR system, including the considerable time and effort that Directors General invest, you would have a better sense of both capacity and ongoing RM activities in the system.
- f) While noting that Directors General invest a lot of time on fundraising, much of which is ad hoc, reactive and opportunistic, one member welcomed the current initiative to help CGIAR be more proactive and strategic, but emphasized that we first need to know what we're going to deliver (e.g., the SRF as a marketing tool) and what it's going to cost, and suggested that in that sense CGIAR is too narrowly focused on money and needs to take fuller account of other assets and human resources needed and available.
- g) A member noted dissatisfaction with the comparisons of CGIAR made in the report to organizations such as UNICEF and WFP, noting that CGIAR focuses on international public goods generation, which often involves very long time horizons, unlike charities. The member also noted disagreement with the strategy's note on the issue of optics, emphasizing it will not be spending upwards of 20 percent towards fundraising given where much of its funding originates.
- h) Regarding innovative financing, a member expressed interest in examples with organizations more similar to CGIAR and another inquired if a pilot project proposed in the RMS could be completed with fewer resources.
- i) Recognizing that a lot of public goods research is financed through grants and that thinking about funding is changing substantially, one member suggested that innovative finance could be harnessed to deliver impact more effectively and quickly, and emphasized that CGIAR should tap into those sources and engage in pilots, at least at small scale, to test how it might work for CGIAR.

- j)* A member emphasized the importance of the RMS being tied to substance in a real, time-bound and practical way. A member noted that better landscaping is needed to identify possible funding sources and what they support or promote, while noting that non-traditional donors in particular are most interested in systems that deliver impact.
- k)* A member noted the importance of working with developing countries and the emerging economies to raise awareness of what CGIAR is doing to a political level, and cited the example of the FAO South-South Cooperation Initiative with China and Mexico, which led to a commitment of \$100 million.
- l)* A member expressed support for the proposal with the proviso that the cost remains within the existing 2%, that a borrowing framework be developed, and that a clear distinction be made between downstream extension work and upstream research on global public goods, which has and should continue to be CGIAR's mandate.
- m)* One member recommended that the SRF be designed to be innovative finance ready, perhaps with help from the group who assisted in the development of the RMS, and then present some pilot projects for consideration at FC13.

Response to Discussion Points:

The Chair:

- i. Suggested the preparation of a summary minute of what exactly will be done between now and spring 2015, with what capacity (e.g., consultants or in-house), and how much it would cost, and that on the basis of an in-principle decision, present the minute for final approval to the FC on November 5.
- ii. Emphasized that the architecture of development finance is rapidly changing.
- iii. Noted that a lot of work needs to be done between now and the spring to elevate the SRF to something that will galvanize CGIAR colleagues, and others, to form the creative funding partnerships needed.
- iv. Recognized that members seem to acknowledge that the FO is not set up to deliver what donors need in the most dynamic way, and are uncomfortable with the additional budget requested by the FO for resource mobilization.
- v. Noted that innovative financing and focusing on political support for the new SRF are not mutually exclusive. Political support for CGIAR is necessary and will translate into higher-level pressure for scarce resources through more creative and innovative financing.
- vi. Asked the FC members to once again thank the consultants and Resource Group.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The Chair requested that a short summary minute of what will be done between now and spring 2015, based on a corresponding minimum budget, be prepared for discussion and approval during the Any Other Business session of the FC Meeting on November 5.*

Agenda Item 10: Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) Draft

The Chair welcomed Wayne Powell, Consortium Chief Science Officer; Ann Tutwiler, SRF Reference Group Chair; Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair; and other participants to the discussion.

The Chair framed the discussion by stressing the importance of the SRF as the single most important thing that holds together and drives the CGIAR system. She noted the role it will have in guiding the 2nd round of CRP proposals and future evaluations, mobilizing resources, and orienting the debate on the MTR recommendations. She emphasized the importance of both the quality of the SRF and that it is completed in a reasonable amount of time.

The Chair established that the purpose of the session will be to send a very strong message in terms of directions and aspirations for the next draft. The FC will also need to agree on the development process moving forward.

The Chair then opened up the floor for comments.

Discussion:

- a) Many members expressed gratitude to the writers of the draft.
- b) Many members noted that the SRF is the foundation for the success of the CGIAR and fully agreed that the SRF must be a high quality document that captures objectives and provides convincing and realistic pathways linking research outputs to impacts, setting the basis for the second round of CRPs. The SRF will also be the reference document for prioritization of the research work to be undertaken by CGIAR.
- c) Many members noted that the SRF must identify what makes CGIAR unique compared to all the other agriculture-related organizations out there, such as its focus on international public goods.
- d) Many members concur that the mission statement and vision of CGIAR must be ambitious, with one member noting that the current document seems to be diluted from previous drafts. A possible vision suggested was a future food system that is highly productive, highly resilient, and has no environmental footprint.
- e) Members sought clarification regarding how the CRPs and Centers will use the SRF, and how it will measure if CGIAR is delivering against the results framework (RF).

- f) Consistent with the recommendation of the MTR, members supported the view that there should be an element of competition in the selection of future CRPs.
- g) One member emphasized the importance of the genebanks, particularly to conserving and utilizing genetic diversity, and another highlighted the role of farmers and communities in *in-situ* biodiversity conservation.
- h) Members noted the need to focus on enhancing the voice and participation of developing countries.
- i) Members expressed support for nutrition remaining a SLO, but noted that a distinction has to be made between scientific impact and results achieved due to national policy services (e.g., conditional cash transfer programs).
- j) A member emphasized the role of partnerships for research flow, scale and delivery beyond CGIAR's manageable interests. Further clarity is requested for partnerships moving forward, and the role of CGIAR in the global development arena.
- k) A member inquired why capacity development is not considered a cross-cutting objective at or above the IDO level.
- l) A member suggested that the document could be enhanced by providing references to lessons learned and successful experiences of the current CRPs.
- m) A member proposed that there be an additional SLO – increased agricultural productivity – with IDOs including enhanced productivity potential, waste and loss, and processing.
- n) A member reminded the FC that the SRF has a 10-year timeframe and therefore needs to look forward and not only to existing capacities.
- o) A member expressed that climate adaptation and mitigation should be given a more prominent place in the RF and elevated to a place where it is clear that it is what the system is driving to.
- p) Members noted their support for the process of developing the SRF and their contributions to SLOs 1, 2 and 3; expressed pleasure that the ISPC has taken the lead on the further development and articulation of the Results Framework (e.g., at IDO and sub-IDO level); and look forward to seeing the strategy component tightly interwoven with an accountability RF. Members expressed concern that the consolidation or integration of the strategy and RF by March 2015, as proposed by the SRF workplan, seems rather late, considering that is essential to have broad ownership of the SRF as a whole, which requires sufficient time for consultation, and underscored the importance of finalizing the SRF by May 2015.
- q) Members noted that terminology needs to be consistent (e.g., the strategy refers to goals while the Results Framework refers to SLOs), suggested that introducing the concept of 'research domains' alongside SLOs may confuse rather than clarify issues,

and questioned how 'nutrition and health' can be both a goal/SLO and a cross-cutting issue.

- r) Members requested further clarification on the parallel financing model, and questioned if expectations need to be clear up front to avoid uncertainties when it comes to the delivery of results and objectives.
- s) Members agreed that a distinction must be made between the RF and the strategy to get there, noting that for the document to be credible and useful there must be complete congruence between the two.
- t) Members noted that the connection between the SRF and the SDGs must be made clear, and one member cautioned against selecting indicators that are different from the SDGs, particularly if responsibilities of measurement rest with countries that have limited capacity and resources to collect various data.
- u) A member emphasized the importance of political commitments in order to increase investments, and suggested that CGIAR attract senior level politicians to its fora.
- v) Members expressed interest in solidifying the RF down to the IDO level at FC12, and then tasking the resource mobilization team with the landscaping of potential funding opportunities.
- w) Members noted that on the RF diagram on page 26 of the draft SRF, it looks like each sub-IDO flows into the one above it, which could be confusing.
- x) Members emphasized the importance of the sub-IDOs and recognized the work that still needs to be done, including the larger consultation process with farmers, universities, and other stakeholders, which will be important to getting them right and should be initiated as soon as possible.

Response to Discussion Points:

The FC Chair:

- i. To help guide the process, the Chair suggested that donors make absolutely clear what they feel are non-negotiable issues with regard to the SRF.
- ii. The FC must establish clarity regarding the IDOs in order to give DGs and others time to comment, and to allow the strategic piece to be written. Clarifying the IDO level and above will make sub-IDOs easier to define and indicators easier to develop.
- iii. The sub-IDOs must be included, but will not be made final at FC12.
- iv. It is not expected that the ISPC could realistically have a full consultation with all stakeholders by December 15.
- v. The next draft of the SRF must be ready by early March at the latest.

Consortium Chief Science Officer:

- i. It is very important for CGIAR to position itself effectively and appropriately.
- ii. The RF is important to ensure that capacity and capability are aligned, particularly considering the changes taking place in the landscape of science and technology.

SRF Reference Group Chair:

- i. It may be useful to have a subgroup within the reference group that can help identify priorities, including determining concrete numbers on the magnitude of current challenges and those likely to be faced in the future.
- ii. Regarding the disconnect between the RF and strategy, these two processes have developed separately and the goal over the next draft is to bring them together.
- iii. Concur with the comments made regarding the need for a higher vision.

ISPC Chair:

- i. The four IDOs under SLO-3 will likely be consolidated to three, which will be discussed further during the SRF workshop on November 6.
- ii. The plan is for the ISPC to come up with the IDOs and sub-IDOs, and to then consult back with the donors. Given that sub-IDOs are likely to be altered, it does not make sense to identify all of their indicators before December 15.
- iii. The IDOs and sub-IDOs are not exclusive.
- iv. The IDO level and above on the RF must be clarified before leaving Brussels. The ISPC Chair will come up with two alternatives for discussion at the Thursday SRF workshop.
- v. December 15 is reasonable to have agreement on the sub-IDOs, but not the indicators, which will require additional consultations with various stakeholders.

Consortium CEO:

- i. Expressed satisfaction in the proposal for the FC to have absolute clarity on the IDO level and above, noting that once this is established, consultations with CRPs, Centers, and other stakeholders can begin.
- ii. Noted areas that still need work, like where to place gender and climate change.
- iii. Once the SRF is set, the CRPs can be developed and much more detailed country-level consultations can take place – all of which does not need to occur before FC13.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *The ISPC Chair will come up with two alternatives regarding the IDOs for discussion at the SRF workshop on November 6.*
2. *At that workshop, participants will:*
 - a. *Seek consensus on the vision, mission, SLOs, and IDOs; and*

- b. Invite participation across the system, and beyond it, to finalize the draft Results Framework down to the level of sub-IDOs.*
- 3. By December 15, the ISPC will circulate for comment and inputs the draft Results Framework (down to the level of sub-IDOs) to the FC and CO.*

Agenda Item 11: Any Other Business

The Chair opened the Any Other Business session by inviting comments on support to and management of the genebanks.

A) Genebanks

Discussion:

- a) Noting the vital importance of safeguarding and properly managing CGIAR's unique genebank collections, a member (Japan) asked about the relationship between CGIAR and the Global Crop Diversity Trust (GCDT) at the end of 2016 when the genebanks CRP ends, whether or not there are plans or intentions to extend the CRP beyond 2016, and implications and fundraising plans in the event that the GCDT doesn't reach its endowment target of \$500 million.
- b) A member noted that all of the genebanks may not reach the minimum quality standards by 2016, which would have funding implications.
- c) One member asked if the FC would also have a discussion about the sustainability of Bioversity International.

Response to Discussion Points:

FC Chair:

- i. The GCDT aims to fully fund the CGIAR genebanks with approximately \$20 million a year from its endowment income, and to drive up the management standards of the genebanks.
- ii. To be eligible for funding, CGIAR will need to manage the genebanks in line with the required quality standards developed by GCDT.
- iii. The Consortium and the FO have begun discussing a short-term transition plan for funding should the GCDT endowment fall short. The \$500 million target will be difficult to reach and CGIAR may have to play a role, financially speaking, in order to reach that goal. \$300-\$350 million is probably a more realistic projection of what can be achieved in the allotted time.

- iv. The Chair suggested that the FO conduct an analysis of the situation, identify potential implications, propose a plan, and submit the work to the PRT for their review and input.
- v. Investment in some of the genebanks will be required in order to meet the quality standards.
- vi. Regarding the query about Bioversity International, the Chair will seek advice offline as to whether or not an in-depth discussion is needed on the issue at the next FC meeting.

Conclusions and Decisions:

- 1. *The FC expects that contributions from the GCDT endowment in collaboration with CGIAR will provide full funding for the genebanks when the CRP concludes at the end of 2016. If necessary, in order to protect the collections, a funding mechanism will be found until the GCDT endowment reaches the required level.*
- 2. *Prior to FC13, the FO will prepare an analysis of the funding for and management of the genebanks, including identifying potential implications in the event of a short fall in the GCDT's target endowment and proposing a plan for submission to the PRT for its review and input.*
- 3. *The FC will have a full discussion on the issue of genebanks, including funding and quality standards, at FC13.*

B) Resource Mobilization Strategy (RMS) and Fund Office 2015 Budget

The Chair called the FC's attention to a draft of the revised RMS proposal, which was circulated that day, and asked members to submit their comments. The revised proposal will be submitted to the FC intersessionally for a decision.

The Chair requested the FC to approve the 2015 Core Budget of the Fund Office and to agree to any additional funding that would be adopted along with final agreement on the RMS proposal.

Conclusions and Decisions:

- 1. *FC members will submit their comments on the draft and a revised RMS proposal will be submitted intersessionally for decision by the FC.*
- 2. *The Fund Council approved the 2015 FO work program and core budget of \$3.496 million.*

Note: With the approval of the FO budget, for ease of reference, all system entity budgets are provided below.

System Entities' Budgets			
<i>in US\$ millions</i>			
	2015 Budget	2015 Financing	
		<i>CGIAR Fund</i>	<i>Bilateral</i>
Consortium	6.600	6.600	
Fund Office	3.496	3.496	
ISPC	3.648	2.298	1.350
IEA	3.940	3.940	
Trustee	0.617	0.617	
Total	18.301	16.951	1.350

C) ICARDA request to establish a Trust Fund with the World Bank

The Trustee briefed the FC on the ongoing conversation between ICARDA and the World Bank regarding ICARDA's request to establish a trust fund to receive and invest their donor contributions and to administer their international financial transactions. Discussions have focused on learning more about ICARDA's needs, exploring options and fleshing out details. As a point of clarification, the Trustee noted that ICARDA has not asked the World Bank to take on any operational role, the Bank would not play any oversight role, the proposed trust fund is completely independent of the arrangements that ICARDA has with the FC, and there are not any linkages with the CGIAR Fund.

In response to the briefing, one member noted that half of their account is maintained with ICARDA with donors that prefer to use the CGIAR system, and that they will need to explore the implications of the proposed arrangement.

The Chair took the opportunity to thank the Trustee for her valuable work and contributions.

D) Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)

The Chair opened the session on the SRF process that runs until March 1, 2015 by asking members to review and endorse the "FC Note on SRF completion process," which had been circulated earlier, and by inviting amendments, if needed. The Chair noted her understanding that the ISPC Chair, who wanted but was unable to participate in this session, accepts the note.

Discussion:

- a) A member sought clarification as to whether or not there are two separate SRF processes and asked if there was an endorsement by the Funders Forum.

- b) A member inquired if there would be an opportunity to review and approve the indicators and targets once they are closer to finalization and suggested that it would be useful to discuss the final details in person to reach agreement on them, as well as how the Results Framework would be integrated with strategy, particularly given earlier comments about the disconnect between the two processes.
- c) A member suggested leaving the consultation period open until just before the Bern workshop.
- d) A member expressed concern about the scale and timeline of the consultation process, as well as possible response from overwhelmed stakeholders, suggesting that it might be most effective to focus first on the intermediate development outcomes (IDOs) before getting into the sub-IDOs, and then develop a process whereby work at the sub-IDO and CRP level could lead into the GCARD process.
- e) While noting the need for a meaningful consultation on the entire SRF, a member suggested that consultation does not need to happen all at once, but could be staged.
- f) A member emphasized that the SRF should be finalized before even beginning a meaningful discussion about the second generation of CRPs and noted the challenge of having meaningful dialogue with approximately 20 different countries in a short timeframe.
- g) A member requested clarification as to if the CRP second call guidance will be part of this process, noted that it's critically important to have it included in the core documentation, and suggested that it would be most efficient to coordinate all elements, including writing of the strategy , during in-person meetings.
- h) A member inquired if defining priority areas of intervention was in reference to the prioritization process led by the ISPC, noting that in the document it seems to be led by the Consortium.
- i) A member shared the understanding that one aspect of prioritization is about types of interventions rather than areas.

Response to Discussion Points:

FC Chair:

- i. Clarified that there is not a separate process, nor endorsement by the Funders Forum.
- ii. Noted that work on the indicators will begin immediately after the workshop in Bern, after which they will be integrated into the draft SRF, and suggested that a face-to-face meeting could occur in February to iron out details before the final SRF is up for agreement in early March.
- iii. Agreed that the consultation period be left open until just before the Bern workshop.

- iv. Noted members' suggestion that the November 6 workshop should focus on getting agreement on the IDOs, which would enable consultations on them to begin on November 7.
- v. Underscored the importance of meaningful consultation, as expressed by the members, in multiple phases, and recognized that could be suboptimal given the necessarily compressed timeframe.
- vi. Emphasized that the SRF must be finalized by April.
- vii. Noted that the process regarding guidance for the 2nd call for CRPs and strategy writing should be clarified at the November 6 workshop.
- viii. Clarified that inputs from the Consortium are in essence heat maps, as prioritization rests with the ISPC, so developing indicators and targets isn't the responsibility of the Consortium.
- ix. In the context of the discussion about the Results Framework and the need for sufficient time for meaningful consultation, noted a gap in communication that needs to be filled (i.e., some FC members were consulting with ISPC Chair, while others had dialogued with the Consortium CEO about this issue).
- x. Noted that questions regarding the responsibility of prioritization must be clarified to the satisfaction of all FC members.

Conclusions and Decisions:

1. *An in-person meeting will be held in February to finalize indicators and reach agreement on how the Results Framework will be integrated with the strategy component of the SRF.*
2. *The consultation process will be left open until just before the Bern workshop.*
3. *Questions regarding the responsibility of prioritization (ISPC versus Consortium roles) must be clarified to the satisfaction of all FC members.*

Before closing the meeting, the Chair announced a new member of the PRT (Sara Boettiger from the Gates Foundation); and thanked David Radcliffe, Roberto Ridolfi, Bernard Rey and all of the staff of the European Commission; the Trustee; and Jonathan Wadsworth and the entire Fund Office team for their work.

The Chair extended particular thanks to all FC members for progress made, encouraged them to keep up the momentum, and wished them productive workshops.

Agenda Item 12A: Mid-Term Review Report

The Chair invited those who did not have an opportunity to speak at the Funders Forum to share their remarks on the MTR Report.

Discussion:

- a) One member (Nigeria) commended the MTR Panel for its report; noted that Recommendation #4 on governance is most critical; called for urgent action to move the process forward by initiating transitional arrangements that will lead to a better, more acceptable governance structure; suggested that the critical role of the World Bank in providing leadership needs to be given due attention when considering a new structure; and, noting that the implementers in the CGIAR system spoke with a very clear, strong, and unanimous voice, suggested that the FC needs to heed their words.
- b) One member (Sweden) reiterated interest in hearing about the Bank's future role. With regard to governance, the member noted the urgent need for reform and prompt action; questioned if the single board is the best solution; called for external experts and/or internal experts (e.g., FC Governance Committee) to consider issues and questions raised and present different governance options for discussion (i.e., at FC13); and suggested that the Centers, Consortium Office, and donors should focus on the SRF and second generation of CRPs.

Consortium Board Chair:

- c) Noted that the Consortium fully agrees with the recommendations to have a clearer vision, mission, and research priorities as part of a much more robust SRF, leading to a strengthened CRP portfolio.
- d) Noted that the Consortium fully agrees with the recommendations on partnership, including need for more engagement with advanced research organizations from both developed and developing countries, the private sector, and NARS, including greater capacity development
- e) Acknowledged that the current governance system is not functioning properly and that there are ambiguities that need to be addressed. Regarding the common position presented by the Consortium and the Centers on the MTR Panel recommendation on governance, there was agreement in principle that a single board could be an effective way to integrate Fund Council and Consortium Board functions. The key question was how this could be addressed in practice.
- f) Conveyed that the Consortium believes that the current problems between the Consortium Board, Consortium Office, Centers, and Fund Council with regard to the roles, responsibilities, functions, and accountabilities of these different entities, need to be tackled head on. Otherwise, no institutional design change will solve the problems and any new governance architecture will inherit them.

- g) Recommended that what is needed as a follow-up is a problem-solving approach with the participation of donors, Centers and the Consortium, noting to that effect the success of past joint reference committees.
- h) Reported that the Consortium Board and the Centers recently put in place a taskforce to address ambiguities, repair relations, and establish the trust and confidence necessary to make the CGIAR a more effective system, and invited donors to join in this exercise.

Response to Discussion Points:

World Bank representative to the Fund Council:

- i. Clarified that the Bank plays four different roles within CGIAR: Trustee for the Fund, Chair of the Fund Council, host of the Fund Office, and donor.
- ii. Representing the Bank in its role as donor, emphasized that the Bank remains a strong and committed donor and supporter of CGIAR and has no intention whatsoever to withdraw or lessen its support in future.
- iii. Repeated points made in Mexico at FC11 that as a result of the Bank's internal expenditure review and reductions, all grant-making facilities, including CGIAR, will be supported in a different way. Exploring new funding options, including those in line with the broader CGIAR system initiatives (e.g., innovative funding mechanisms), is receiving attention at the highest level.
- iv. Emphasized that the Bank has made a very clear commitment at the highest levels that it will continue to support CGIAR, including the Bank's CFO and President Jim Kim.
- v. Conveyed a direct message from President Kim, who takes the issue of support and funding for CGIAR "very seriously" and considers it on his to-do list.
- vi. Emphasized the importance of agriculture and noted his strong conviction that the World Bank cannot succeed in its mission to eliminate poverty, boost shared prosperity, and ensure environmental sustainability unless it continues to support CGIAR and the research results that will deliver necessary tools.

FC Chair:

- vii. Speaking both as Chair of the CGIAR Fund Council and a World Bank Group (WBG) Vice President, emphasized that there has been no conversation whatsoever about a) any change in the way Trusteeship duties are performed, b) the Bank withdrawing its support to the Fund Office, or c) the Bank's role in chairing the Fund Council.
- viii. Noted that she has spoken to both the WBG President and Chief Operating Officer and they have taken a clear and pragmatic position about the need to complete the process underway and WBG leadership is very interested in the outcomes and decisions of this meeting.
- ix. Noted that at the June 2014 WBG Board meeting on the financial issues related to the budget a number of members spoke and very clearly conveyed that the Bank should not

alter in any way its financial commitment to CGIAR—a message that was very well understood by WBG Senior Management.

- x. Suggested that if any members have concerns about the role that the World Bank is playing in CGIAR they should contact their colleagues who sit on the WBG Board, as they are very clear about what members' capitals want.

Before closing the Open Session of the FC meeting, the Chair thanked the Consortium Board Chair for his service to CGIAR on behalf of the entire FC, as well as its two former Chairs and passed along their good wishes.

The Consortium Board Chair expressed that it has been his privilege and honor to serve the CGIAR over the last four-and-a-half years. CGIAR has come a long way since the first Consortium Board meeting in March 2010. It has been a long and difficult journey and there are issues that still need to be addressed, but CGIAR today is a much stronger organization than in the past. The Consortium Board Chair expressed his conviction that CGIAR will grow even stronger in the coming years. He thanked all Fund Council members for their support and the policy space they gave him to carry out his work. Besides having experienced his share of frustrations and disappointments, he steps down with great memories, useful experiences and new friends, and looks forward to learning about CGIAR's impressive successes in future.

Agenda Item 12B: Mid-Term Review Report (Decision Session)

Following a discussion on the MTR Report and Recommendations, the Fund Council members agreed the following.

Recommendation 1.

Develop a clear and focused vision for the CGIAR to guide decisions on priorities and strategy that will achieve expected results.

Action:

The Working Group will develop the SRF within a clear and focused vision, with proper consultation.

Recommendation 2.

The ISPC should lead a systematic process of prioritization of research areas in order to sharpen CGIAR focus and impact. Implementation will be aligned with the SRF development and consultation process as endorsed by the CGIAR Fund Council.

Action:

The process will develop a menu of options for CGIAR and its partners that:

- a) Determines how to maximize benefits for both upstream and downstream research.
- b) Identifies where donors might achieve greatest rates of return in addressing the drivers of the SLOs.
- c) Identifies potential high risk – high reward research areas.

Recommendation 3.

The SRF development process should establish clear criteria to determine whether the SRF in preparation meets the needs of the Fund Council and Consortium Board.

Action: Criteria will ensure that the SRF:

- a) Enables prioritization of research for greatest impact
- b) Allocates funding that is necessary and sufficient to achieve research goals
- c) Has targets and indicators that are adequate for reviewing research progress and achievement of strategic objectives.
- d) Is developed with sufficient stakeholder participation to ensure joint ownership.
- e) Is finalized to the Fund Council's full satisfaction before the second CRP call is issued.

Recommendation 4.

With a sense of urgency around governance issues and in response to MTR Recommendation #4, the Fund Council will establish an Options Team (Team).

The Team will be recruited by the Chair of the Fund Council in consultation with the Fund Council Governance Committee (FCGC). It will, in respect of agreed action items flowing from accepted recommendations, propose specific implementation. The Team will work under the

guidance of the FCGC, which will engage other system entities and have oversight of the process (develop the Terms of Reference, etc.).

The Team will conduct a system accountability analysis and problem identification. This will provide a basis for its implementation proposals. It will review and propose specific governance options, including one board, the current model, including modifications thereto, and other models, and present the strengths and weaknesses and broader implications of each option. The options should also address how the governance model would be supported administratively and how it would interact with system entities, including Centers.

These options will be presented to the FC for its 13th meeting.

The Team's process should include full consultation with other system entities. The FC Chair, responding to the Team's suggestions, can tap other expert resources, as necessary.

Recommendation 5.

CGIAR should develop guidelines for identifying, establishing, managing, reviewing and optimizing partnerships.

Action:

- a) In response to Recommendation #5, the ISPC will seek the assistance of key organizations engaged in research with global reach to develop guidelines for effective upstream and downstream partnerships.
- b) These guidelines should ensure that the partnerships meet the strategic objectives and results delineated in the SRF.

Recommendation 6.

CGIAR should scale-up partnerships capable of tackling mega challenges.

Action:

After adopting the new SRF and approving new CRPs, the ISPC should organize a global assessment to:

- a) Evaluate the extent to which its research programs and those of other leading institutions and companies are sufficient to address priority food security and nutrition challenges.
- b) Identify significant gaps that require new global partnerships and long-term mega-programs.
- c) Propose a framework of action for global partnerships at scale to tackle global challenges that are beyond the reach of any individual partner working alone.

Recommendation 7:

Scale-up financing through traditional and new modalities.

This recommendation has been incorporated into the ongoing Resource Mobilization plan.

Recommendation 8. Increase the influence of CGIAR at regional and international levels.

Action:

Round two of the CRPs should include a resourced Communications and Advocacy Plan that includes the publication of policy–relevant evidence and/or policy briefs.

Recommendation 9.

The Fund Council should elevate ISPC responsibilities to empower it to be more proactive in providing strategic guidance, foresight analyses, and monitoring the quality of ongoing research.

Action:

The Fund Council authorizes the Chair to establish a task force immediately that will:

- a) Be led by the Chair of the ISPC and include Centers and their Boards, Fund Council members, the Consortium Board, and major research councils.
- b) Prepare a detailed proposal outlining an action plan to strengthen the outreach to and inclusion of the best science in its work.
- c) Prepare a detailed proposal to substantially strengthen the ISPC capacity to advise on and assess the quality of effective partnerships in the delivery of the CRPs. The ISPC recognizes the need to closely collaborate with GFAR, regional development organizations, etc.
- d) In drafting its operating principles, the Fund Council expects to see a proposal on how to access external expertise as and when necessary.

Annex 1: Amendments to the contract clause for all extension contract proposals

The Consortium has confirmed to the Fund Council that, for the 2015 / 16 period, the science and budget sections in each CRP extension request replace those of the previously approved CRP. The CPA amendments will accordingly supersede any prior (and in a few cases continuing) science and budget terms that were approved through the original CRPs. In addition, the Consortium has confirmed its acceptance of the following supplemental provisions as applicable to all CRPs through the CPA amendments:

- i. Governance and Management of the CRP. CRP governance and management arrangements will be adjusted as appropriate to reflect the aspirational principles agreed between the EIAC of the FC and the Consortium in response to the IEA governance and management review of May 2014.
- ii. Intellectual Assets. CRPs will comply with the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets (CGIAR IA Principles) in the Common Operational Framework, as well as the IA Policy adopted by the Consortium and Centers.
- iii. Monitoring and Evaluation. Lead Centers will establish monitoring and evaluation systems for the CRPs in close collaboration with the IEA in anticipation of the IEA's evaluation of the CRPs in 2015-16 [with particular attention to CRP delivery products, structure and process, partnership and the quality of work with partners (including with other CRPs), and financial management].
- iv. Linkages with other CRPs. Lead Centers will investigate potential collaboration with other CRPs to develop synergies and maximize envisioned impacts [with particular attention to countries where research sites overlap among CRPs].

Annex 2: List of Participants

Rachel Kyte (FC Chair) and		
Jonathan Wadsworth (FC Executive Secretary)		
FC Members	FC Member Representatives	FC Member Representative Alternates
APAARI	Raj Paroda	
Australia	Nick Austin	Melissa Wood
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	Pamela Anderson	David Bergvinson, Sara Boettiger
Canada	Rebecca Smart	Mushtaq Ahmed
China	Lubiao Zhang	Wenbo Liu
European Commission	Bernard Rey	David Radcliffe, Juergen Anthofer, Joachim Knoth
FAO	Ren Wang	Karin Nichterlein
GFAR	Juan Lucas Restrepo Ibiza	Mark Holderness, Harry Palmier
IDRC	Jean Lebel	Merle Faminov
IFAD	John McIntire	Shantanu Mathur
Iran	Mojtaba Beigi	
Ireland	Earnan O'Cleirigh	Cathal O'Donnoghue
Japan	Kazuyuki Shimamura	Yasukazu Hosen
The Netherlands	Wijnand van IJssel	
Nigeria	Yusuf Abubakar	
Norway	Daniel Van Gilst	
Russia	Pavel Evseev	Tatiana Simakova
Sweden	Philip Chiverton	
Switzerland	Carmen Thoennissen	
UK	Alan Tollervey	Hugh McGhie
USA	Robert Bertram	Christopher Ryder, Eric Witte
World Bank	Juergen Voegelé	Andrea Stumpf
Guest Speakers		
MTR Members	John Beddington, Howard-Yana Shapiro	
CCS Fundraising	Charlie Michaud	
Lion's Head	Christopher Egerton-Warburton	
FC Standing Observers		
Consortium Board Chair	Carlos Perez Del Castillo	Lynn Haight
Consortium CEO	Frank Rijsberman	
ISPC Chair	Maggie Gill	Peter Gardiner
IEA	Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin	Sirkka Immonen
Fund Trustee	Pamela Crivelli	

Donor Observer		
Denmark	Karsten Peter Nielsen	
European Commission	Jean-Pierre Halkin	
Finland	Laura Torvinen, Christian Lindholm	
France	Michel Trebel	
Italy	Mauro Ghirotti	
Turkey	Masum Burak	
Non Donor Observers		
World Agroforestry Center	Tony Simons	
Bioversity International	Ann Tutwiler	
Consortium Office	Nthisana Phillips, Wayne Powell	
Fund Office	Antony Kalm, James Evans, Lynn Brown, Marlene Amos, Maxine Garvey, Michele Pietrowski, Min Li, Pietro Turilli, Samy Gaiji	