REPORT OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

Purpose:

This document presents the Report of the Consortium Board’s Nineteenth meeting (CB19), held at CIMMYT’s headquarters in Texcoco, Mexico on 25 – 26 March 2015.

- **Agenda items.** The meeting comprised the 10 agenda items set out in the table of contents on the following page.

- **Decisions.** This report presents the official record of the meeting including the 9 decisions adopted by the Board, as set out in full text in Annex 1.

- **Participants.** The participant list for CB19 is available at Annex 2.

- **Next Board Meeting.** The Twentieth Consortium Board meeting will be held on 11 May 2015 in Windsor, United Kingdom to coincide with the timing of a meeting of Centers.

This report was approved by the Consortium Board at its Twentieth Meeting in Windsor, (CB/B20/DP03).
Agenda Item 1 - Opening remarks

1. Lynn Haight, Acting Board Chair (Chair) welcomed board colleagues, emphasizing the shared benefit for all with additional Center participants joining Board conversations for the first time.

2. The Chair provided a summary of the overall flow for the meeting and invited comments or additions. Specifically, the Chair referred to the proposal for the Board to approve a Code of Conduct and Declarations of Interest Form at agenda item 8. She reiterated the importance for CGIAR as a whole of all Board participants working to the Edmund Burke model of participation: deliberating and acting in favor of the greater common good, even if it means going against the short-term view of a minority.

3. Decision: The Board approves the Agenda (CB/B19/DP1, Revision 1).

Agenda Item 2 – Consortium Office Progress Report

4. Taking the Consortium Office’s report as read (CB19-02), and emphasizing efforts made to strengthen Center-Consortium Office engagement and relationships, additional points shared by the Consortium CEO as Consortium-wide efforts included:

   a. Major effort to ensure that CGIAR is at the forefront of discussions of climate smart agriculture, with significant engagement planned over the next 6 months, culminating with the COP21 Paris meeting in December 2015. The Consortium CEO highlighted the French government’s focus on sequestration for climate change as a key element – and the excellent positioning of CGIAR to provide the data to have this initiative become a reality.

   b. Renewed focus on closing the gender gap in climate change, with CGIAR joining leading voices in Paris in mid-March 2015 to discuss how to do this effectively.
c. Obtaining accreditation for CGIAR as a first step towards CGIAR system receipt of funding from Green Climate Fund, to join a number of early-accredited partners, NGOs or other entities.

5. The observation was made that CGIAR’s increasing presence at the center of major global events, and the French government’s request for CGIAR support, showed CGIAR’s capacity to lead in its space.

6. Specifically on internal Consortium Office management matters, the Consortium CEO clarified that staffing adjustments were to ensure minimum capacity to deliver on the Consortium’s Program of Work and Budget (PoWB), by replacing personnel rather than growing headcount. In the context of significant 2015 budget uncertainty becoming known across the CGIAR system in recent weeks, and a major redundancy program likely to follow at many Centers, it was acknowledged that Centers may not have prioritized the appointment of a Director of Human Resources and Talent Management at Consortium level.

7. However, the Consortium CEO confirmed that capacity to deliver a holistic, appropriate gender and diversity strategy across the CGIAR system required real capacity, which the Consortium CEO believed unable to be achieved through consultancies. The Consortium CEO affirmed the commitment to work in partnership with the Human Resources Community of Practice as work progressed.

8. **Decision:** The Board adopts the Consortium Office Progress Report (CB/B19/DP2).

9. During the session the Board also reflected on the importance of improving transparency in CGIAR actions and governance. It was recognized that many international organizations publish Board materials on external websites absent an appropriate reason to limit circulation of particularly sensitive material. Here the distinction was made between confidential material, which was accepted to require more limited circulation, and topics that presented factual information even if it showed a less than positive story or outcome, which should be revealed in the ordinary course of a transparent, well-governed organization.

10. **Action point:** The Board agreed to ensure that all final reports of Board meetings, and non-confidential meeting papers, would be made available. Further, that the Consortium would trial a system of marking pre-deliberative materials with a coding system to facilitate ease of interpretation and/or use by Board participants. To commence the coding agreed was:

   a. **Confidential:** The topic and the underlying paper would remain internal to the Board participant group and not be shared beyond.
   
   b. **Partially confidential:** Topic to be shared for Center consultation pre-Board deliberation and feedback thereafter, but not supporting documentation.
   
   c. **Standard document:** all material able to be shared pre-Board deliberation, and follow up material shared after outcomes known.
Agenda Item 3 – Available resources and next steps

11. The Chair opened discussions with a summary of what was acknowledged by all to be a very frustrating period for financial planning: notification in late February 2015 that there was likely to be a further reduction of CGIAR system funding, to add to a late 2014 budget reduction. The new reduction, whilst representing 6-7% of overall system funding, translated into an additional reduction of 19% in window 1 and 2 funding at Center level. There was widespread agreement that this would result in the termination of a range of research actions and associated staff.

12. Noting that the Board would come back to specifics when the Board discussed the Consortium’s proposed Revised 2015 PoWB, the Chair confirmed that the Consortium CEO had worked in advance of CB19 deliberations to reduce Board and Consortium Office expenditure by up to 10% compared to the papers submitted in advance of CB19. The dual purpose of this effort was to join in solidarity with Centers, and simultaneously find the funding to respond directly to Center calls for the Consortium to do more in resource mobilization with non-traditional funding partners in the place of returning this money to the CGIAR Fund.

13. The Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) Chair (Klaus Leisinger) confirmed that the committee had looked at the reduction proposal, and would be supporting it during the ARC report to CB19.

14. To provide the Board with thoughtful input in advance of a future decision, Tony Simons and Paul Zuckerman shared a number of key messages during their respective presentations including:

   a. The benefit to the CGIAR system of setting clear minimum funding targets to finance strategic CGIAR research priorities that align with key global priorities in agriculture and development;

   b. Putting forward a robust investment case that identifies a clear return on investment proposition;

   c. The essential need to fully explore the full range of available funding opportunities rather than rely on known sources through a static pillar. This could deliver the dual benefit of building in funding shortfall mitigation mechanisms, but at the same time also act as an incentive to leverage additional funding from traditional supporters who see the overall support for CGIAR grow;

   d. The strength of public-private partnership initiatives as a means of demonstrating the CGIAR value proposition;

   e. Being aware that a holistic resource mobilization strategy needs to also look at the availability of funding for CGIAR partners whose role it is to demonstrate how core research outcomes can be scaled up to deliver impact;

   f. CGIAR needs to also be looking forward and anticipate how it must evolve to meet changing governance requirements, with the presentation highlighting, in particular, the forthcoming requirement for CGIAR to be assessed and meet
the MOPAN framework as a pre-cursor to being an attractive investment prospect; and

g. The importance of a harmonized message coming from CGIAR as a whole under a resource mobilization strategy that reflects the many elements of the system, and draws on comparative advantage throughout.

15. In the discussions that followed, Board colleagues noted a range of additional points, including the following:

a. There was great appreciation to the CGIAR Fund donors and the Fund Office for the contributions and work to date. That the Consortium now wants to also be an active participant in a holistic resource mobilization framework should be taken as intended – putting in place a strategic framework that enables traditional donors to share the burden of fully funding CGIAR research and not obligating them on that;

b. Centers remained an untapped resource to help the Fund Office in their work with the traditional donor pool in the presentation of the investment case for CGIAR system financial support;

c. It is natural for the Consortium Board, Centers and scientists themselves to be engaged in resource mobilization efforts focused on non-traditional financing prospects, as each stakeholder brings to the table different capacities and network access;

d. Competition is inherent in any resource mobilization effort, both because CGIAR is competing with many others for finite resources, but also because Centers can themselves feel in competition with each other. Thus there may need to be some work on getting to a shared vision on the critical need to ensure the system is fully funded, particularly with the vision of more cross-cutting second generation CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs).

16. The Fund Office representative expressed support for a holistic resource mobilization strategy to guide future effort, with comparative advantage also being an important consideration in any outreach. Specifically for the private sector, it was suggested that it might be more effective for the Fund Office to act as a broker for interested stakeholders. This would involve the referral of leads rather than direct Fund Office engagement. Otherwise, the Fund Office representative was supportive of the overall approach, including the engagement at Fund Council and Fund Office level. The Fund Council observer also expressed support for the proposed approach.

17. To close the discussion, the Chair summarized the following broad principles for a resource mobilization strategy:

a. The responsibility to ensure effective resource mobilization for CGIAR rests on all people in the system;

---

1 The Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) is a network of 19 donor countries with a common interest in assessing the organizational effectiveness of the major multilateral entities they fund. [http://www.mopanonline.org/](http://www.mopanonline.org/)
b. Efforts under the strategic direction of the Consortium Board will be to enter new areas through the support of a small central team at the Consortium that works closely with those already expending considerable effort; and c. A key priority of any new effort needs to be on leveraging traditional donor investments, and providing the tools for those donors to demonstrate the leverage effect to national governments.

**Agenda Item 4 – Report of the Science, Programs and Partnerships Committee**

18. The SPPC Chair (Martin Kropff) confirmed that the committee’s meeting had involved an expanded group, which was welcomed because of the complexity and importance of the topics before it. He noted that instead of the SPPC presenting three final documents for Board approval, in line with earlier plans, the SPPC was coming with three ‘almost final documents’, with more work to be done.

19. **Strategy and Results Framework (SRF):** Based on robust discussion at committee level, and particularly very helpful feedback presented as representing the ongoing views of a number of donors, the SRF would require adjustment to incorporate quantitative aspirational targets under the three major goals or System Level Outcomes.

20. The Board was advised that work on such targets would not need to begin from a blank sheet. Rather, that a drafting group could return to a mid-2014 draft SRF document that had begun to incorporate the kind of quantitative measures that the SPPC heard very clearly during its meeting was critical to a robust SRF. The SPPC Chair reported that the committee discussed a number of additional enhancements and stood ready to give this input to that drafting team to take forward.

21. Based on deliberations, the SPPC’s recommendations to CB19 were as follows:

   a. A small group progresses the draft SRF to finalization, incorporating quantitative aspirational targets, drafting edits shared by Centers and other stakeholders, and taking into account the proposal to grow the overall CGIAR system budget to $1.5 billion per annum during the strategy implementation period. That group includes: Fund Council/Fund Office engagement, Center participants on the Board and the Consortium’s Science team, as well as the SPPC itself.

   b. Concurrently – there is engagement with the ISPC chair to convey the logic for inclusion of the aspirational goals in the SRF, recognizing that what is actually able to be achieved depends on the final amount of money on the table and the submission of strong final proposals that the Fund Council can approve; and

   c. By 14 April, there is a robust SRF that is accompanied by a short summary document that sets out in short form the compelling message for investing in the SRF.
22. In the work that lay ahead, the SPPC Chair emphasized the importance of sequencing, with the SRF being the “first in line” of a series of interconnected documents. Thus, amending the draft SRF would require prioritization amongst other work streams to have it ready to take to FC13, and in turn to the Funders Forum for approval, being a necessary step in advance of Board approval of the 2nd call pre-proposal guidance.

23. Action point: The Board requested the formation of a drafting team involving SPPC colleagues working closely with the Science team, and Center participants. Bas Bouman confirmed his willingness to coordinate data to finalize the aspirational quantitative targets. The Board also agreed to meet virtually on 12 April to discuss and approve the amended SRF in advance of submission to the Fund Office on 14 April for transmission to the Fund Council in advance of FC13.

24. **Genebanks Options Paper:** The SPPC Chair commended the paper presented by the Consortium’s Science Team, noting the comprehensive summary of issues surrounding continued support for the ‘crown jewels’ of the CGIAR system. He confirmed the breadth of that appreciation, confirming the support of the Fund Office and Fund Council representatives present at the SPPC meeting.

25. Action point: Based on committee discussions including Fund Council inputs, the SPPC recommended and the Board endorsed, the following two step approach to presentation of the document:

   a. Officially submit the final genebanks options paper to the Fund Council at the same time as the new generation CRP pre-proposals, by reason that Genebanks funding is part of the system wide approach to the achievement of CGIAR’s vision and mission, and not a mini call for proposals; and

   b. Share an advance copy of the paper to FC13 to stimulate early thinking around key issues arising taking into account a number of editorial inputs provided during the SPPC meeting to further strengthen the already comprehensive draft. Of the suggested improvements discussed at committee level, the SPPC Chair highlighted the opportunity to separate the options between core business that needs to be funded in any event, and those options that could be funded through the core funding or the CRP 2nd call. Second, the SPPC Chair emphasized the benefit of the paper finding ways to bring, to the extent possible, all Centers up to meet the criteria for funding by the endowment. A strategy to consider in this regard would be the introduction of performance agreements. Third, the need to clearly state that the paper is formulated on the basis of a funding assumption of an endowment of US$ 500 million and a return on investment of 4%, to avoid doubt in either regard.

26. **2nd call guidance for pre-proposals:** Reflecting on this third topic also being one that was characterized by robust discussion at committee level, the SPPC Chair confirmed the importance of those deliberations to help the SPPC focus on what is most important.
27. Before presenting the SPPC’s recommendations to CB19, the SPPC Chair noted that:

   a. More so than its partner SRF document, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} call guidance note requires very close collaboration with the ISPC because of its critical role in making independent recommendations to the Fund Council on the strength of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} call proposal materials;
   
   b. There is an essential need for pre-proposals to look significantly different to final proposals to avoid duplication and add value to the process itself; and
   
   c. It is critically important to the longer-term timing of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} calls to have all necessary Board approvals by end May 2015, to launch in early June 2015.

28. **Action point**: As recommended by the SPPC and endorsed by the Board:

   a. The guidance document should focus on the pre-proposal stage, with the strong recommendation that the length of pre-proposals be a maximum of 10 pages with the inclusion of annexes where appropriate and necessary; and
   
   b. Incorporating an accountability matrix to identify drafting changes taken up or not, and taking up the drafting edits discussed at committee level as part of that process.

**Agenda Item 5 – Evolving the CGIAR governance model**

29. To introduce the session, the Chair noted that the work of the Options Team continued to evolve it work, with a further version of the report released mid-stream CB19. The Fund Council representative also shared the planned work program for the Fund Council’s governance committee in the weeks ahead, noting that a final decision was not taken and the report would continue to evolve.

30. Against that background, it was agreed that should the Board submit input to the Options Team as a result of CB19 deliberations, it would be appropriate to comment on the earlier version 2 draft.

31. A draft possible response prepared by the Chair in advance of the session was tabled for Board participant confirmation/input. During the session virtually all session participants contributed to the draft document to strengthen overall messaging and content. Nevertheless, there was agreement amongst participants that formal approval of a submission rested with the voting Board members by reason that there was no uniform Center position that aligned to the Board’s view at 26 March 2015.

32. **Action point**: The Board authorized the Chair to finalize the letter in line with CB19 Board inputs and issue it to the Options Team as soon as possible. The letter as issued to the Options Team is set out at Annex 3.
**Agenda Item 6 – Report of the Audit and Risk Committee**

33. **Preliminary 2014 Consortium Financial Statements:** Recognizing that work on the accounts was continuing in consultation with the Consortium’s auditors, the ARC Chair reported that the preliminary unaudited 2014 Consortium Financial Report shows an overall deficit of approximately US$300,000, with the amount being taken from reserves. The ARC is informed that unbudgeted expenses resulted mainly from Bioversity International overhead charges continuing longer than planned, and more extensive travel than budgeted to support development of the SRF.

34. The ARC Chair also reported on an element requiring more focused attention to resolve, namely outstanding inter-Center receivables of more than US$800,000. It was noted that in particular, one Center, as financial hosting entity of the Internal Audit Unit (IAU) until end 2014, owes the Consortium nearly US$475,000 for services delivered by the IAU and paid by the Consortium Office.

35. **Revised 2015 PoWB:** The ARC recommended approval of the revised 2015 Revised Program of Work and Budget (PoWB, CB19-08), endorsing also the proposal that up to US$ 500,000 of the budget ceiling (approximately 7%) be reallocated towards resource mobilization activities subject to Board review of a strategy and budget for those activities at a future meeting. The ARC Chair reported that the Consortium CEO had confirmed that the US$500,000 reallocation would not prevent the Consortium Office from delivering on core PoWB activities. However, there had been a considerable tightening of resources, no cost-of-living salary increments will be made in 2015, not all vacancies will be filled, and cancellation of events that whilst optional, had been demonstrated in 2014 to demonstrate considerable added value for the CGIAR system as a whole. One example was the CGIAR Development Dialogues.

36. The Board Chair added that she would take more than a 10% reduction in 2015 in Board honoraria, and would be inviting the external independent members to take a 10% reduction themselves. She added that with the history of the Consortium being told that it was not permitted to raise funding separately to the CGIAR Fund, deeper reductions to reallocate more to resource mobilization, a key Center priority, would not be appropriate given the program and fiduciary responsibilities held by the Consortium.

37. Ann Tutwiler confirmed that the independent Bioversity International Board of Trustee members had been asked to demonstrate solidarity with the budget reductions by also taking a reduction in Board fees, and had agreed to do so.

38. Other Center representatives shared variously: the important need to communicate the 7% reallocation in a careful way, emphasizing it was an important sign that the Consortium had worked hard to find this funding to reallocate it to Center needs without jeopardizing the viability of the Consortium as a central management unit; but also that some may still look at the 7% and say that it was not a sufficient amount because the global 6% of CGIAR funding reductions in 2015 would translate to 18% at the window 1 and 2 level (by reason that Window 1 and 2 funds when taken together amount to approximately 32% of total funds).
39. The Consortium CEO noted these points, adding that it may also be helpful in conversations to note that the Consortium has operated on a flat budget ceiling over past years, whilst at the same time Center budgets have grown year on year. He acknowledged that the goal of the Consortium in finding the $500,000 to reallocate to the Center priority of resource mobilization was to share the pain of the projected 2015 budget shortfalls on what had earlier been expected. The Fund Office representative confirmed his willingness to work with any group whose task it was to put together a proposal for Board approval.

40. **Decision:** Subject to the reallocation of up to US$500,000 for resource mobilization activities, the Board approves the 2015 PoWB as presented, with use of the reallocated funds being dependent upon Board approval of a budget and work plan for those funds (CB/B19/DP3).

41. **Action point:** A sub-group of the Board to develop the proposal for resource mobilization activities in collaboration with all key stakeholders by end April 2015, for deliberation at the Board’s twentieth meeting (CB20).

42. **Consortium Risk Map:** Noting that ARC discussions had involved a review of risks identified in the IAU’s 2014 Annual Report and 2015 Plan (CB19-10), the ARC Chair suggested an important next step for the Board would be to discuss its appetite to risk as a means of prioritizing and effectively mitigating and managing risk.

43. Pierre Pradal, Director of IAU, observed that it was important that the Consortium’s risk map not simply be a compilation of Center risk maps. Additionally, that Consortium staff changes over past months meant that the process owner of the Consortium’s risk map (a member of management and not IAU) had not been able to sufficiently engage with other risk owners. He recommended that risk therefore be an item on the next in-person Board meeting agenda.

44. Responding to the question of risk prioritization, the Consortium CEO noted that the Consortium could provide a suggested prioritization of risks by email as a follow up to CB19 if helpful. He added that the Audit Oversight Group was also a useful mechanism for a crosscutting approach to risk management across the system. A Center participant suggested that CRP lead Centers should be involved in building risk mitigation measures and responding to risks, to strengthen overall risk management and oversight.

45. **Principles for escalation and whistleblowing:** The ARC reported that the committee had taken a first look at possible principles to apply when setting a CGIAR system wide approach to escalating potential fraud or loss amongst system elements. He confirmed that the main objective of such a policy would be to make clear what kind of issues ought to be brought to whose attention and thus to prevent that minor issues are unnecessarily reported to other than the appropriate organizational or institutional levels, or conversely that relevant issues are not brought to the knowledge of the people who need to know. The ARC Chair noted that the policy was work in progress and should be taken forward by management in cooperation with IAU under the oversight of the Governance and Policy Coordination Committee.
46. **2015 IAU Audit Plan**: From the committee’s earlier deliberations, the ARC Chair highlighted:

a. Overall, the 2015 Audit Plan (CB19-10) presented an ambitious program of work for IAU, and whilst the appeal would normally be to avoid being too ambitious, the Director of IAU confirmed that to date, there had been no limitation on IAU’s ability to deliver its services;

b. One element of the 2015 Audit Plan that involved considerable discussion was the manner of financing assurance activities regarding the financial management of CRPs. IAU’s proposal is to undertake this through comprehensive coverage of participating and lead Centers and substantive testing. Initial plans were to cover this cost by levying an additional US$35,000 from window 1 funds on each CRP. However, considering budget reductions and the need to limit adverse consequences on research activity, the ARC suggested, and IAU agreed, that such assurance audits, in 2015, should be limited to a selection of CRPs deemed to be of highest risk. Nonetheless, the approach of a comprehensive annual review was considered useful and recommended for further years; and

c. The IAU succeeded in November 2014 in closing the first Service Level Agreements with Centers, and is looking at concluding all of them by year-end.

47. Noting one duty arising from the IAU Charter is to communicate to the Board on risks impacting the ability to deliver assurance services, the Director of IAU confirmed that IAU has had the support of all to ensure that IAU has the right resources. However, he also observed that the current IAU funding model drives the need to carry a heavy assignment load, because the volume of work drives funding.

48. Specifically on the CRP audit program, the Director of IAU confirmed his support for a modified 2015 audit approach. In place of auditing all CRPs, IAU will identify a smaller number of instances where there is a need for transactional review, and, with the support of the Consortium CEO, funding for this activity will be taken from Consortium Office sources and not charged back to Centers or CRPs. The Consortium CEO confirmed that this funding, of between US$ 100-150,000, would be additional funding from the Consortium Office’s budget to support the work of IAU on top of a substantial budget contribution already provisioned by the Consortium in 2015. He added that this was not already provisioned in the 2015 PoWB approved by the Board at this meeting, and so additional work would be done internally to enable allocation of these important funds.

49. The Director of IAU also made two other formal statements for Board record taking into account the IAU Charter and the International Standards for the Professional Practice Of Internal Auditing (IIA Standards):

a. Having reviewed the IAU Charter, the Director of IAU believes that it remains appropriate; and

b. Having regard to the IIA Standards, the IAU intends to undergo an external independent assessment in 2015 to renew the assurance credentials of IAU,
and will also be supporting Center internal audit teams in this regard by end March 2016.

50. **Lessons learned from CRP audit engagements to date:** The ARC Chair summarized the following early themes coming from the three CRP audits performed by IAU to date, as reported to the ARC:

   a. Weaknesses in the program management processes and uncertainties about the mandate of Program Management Units;
   b. Unclear process of mapping bilateral funds to the CRPs;
   c. Lack of detailed and transparent budgeting process; and/or
   d. Lack of a formalized monitoring and evaluation plan.

51. Rather than focus on the specifics of the three audits (one final report, and two in draft), the ARC Chair observed that these gave rise to systemic issues that require proactive attention across all CRPs ensure effective oversight. He added that they were also important at Board level in the context of the Board’s overall fiduciary responsibilities.

52. The Director of IAU confirmed that the value IAU saw in the respective reports was that it provided data which the Board could use, in collaboration with Centers and CRP directors, to help define the new generation CRPs. In particular, he suggested that the data could help define more effective governance and oversight arrangements, which would translate into improved trust and confidence by funders.

53. Recognizing that audit reports are not public documents, but are held internally for management action, a proposal was made for a summary document to be put together that synthesized key findings. This therefore alleviated the issue of potentially sharing inappropriate internal data from one Center or CRP across the system.

54. **One Corporate System audit:** The ARC also shared key outcomes from the IAU audit of the One Corporate System (OCS) project, reminding the Board that OCS was initiated at Center level, and now has grown to involve the participation of nine Centers and the Consortium Office, with 3 Centers (CIP, IRRI and WorldFish) having implemented the platform already, and implementation being underway for the others. The ARC Chair shared IAU’s opinion that initial expectations to deliver a fully integrated enterprise-resource planning system for the 10 participating entities will not be fully realized.

55. The Director of IAU confirmed to the Board that the issue was due, principally, to the level of customization being undertaken as the system is rolled out, and the consultative/participatory nature of the project steering group, so that there is not one fully integrated platform that gives system-wide visibility as originally intended.

56. During Board deliberations it was noted that it is a particularly important crosscutting issue that needs to be addressed at the leadership level of the Centers to bring the project into line, thereby ensuring full confidence at all levels of the system. One of the Center participants noted that there was considerable value in the Consortium being escalated to project lead and not simply one of the participating entities, which has
been its status to date by reason that the project evolved from a Center initiative, and therefore came to be supported by a consultative steering group without overall Consortium ownership. That said it was recognized by all that without Center action, the Consortium was not empowered to take overall management of the project.

57. Based on Board deliberations, the Board Chair proposed that Tony Simons work with Centers for Center Director Generals to request that the Consortium take on overall project management.

58. The ARC Chair also confirmed that this issue would feature on the next ARC agenda, with the view to bringing to the Board a revised proposal on overall leadership and management of OCS.

59. As with the CRP audit topic, the proposal was made that in the interim a synthesized document be prepared of the issues arising from the IAU audit, and this gets to the attention of participating Center Director Generals and Chairs of the respective Boards of Trustees.

60. *Update on the work of the Audit Oversight Group (AOG)*: In his dual capacity as Chair of the AOG, the ARC Chair briefly reviewed the outcomes of the February 2015 AOG meeting (CB19-12). The ARC Chair observed that the AOG presents an excellent platform for exchange of thoughts on audit-related issues and the collaborative nature of the group could be a model for moving forward in other areas.

61. The ARC Chair also noted the retirement of Wayne Rogers from his position at WorldFish, therefore bringing to an end his membership of the AOG. Pursuant to the AOG Terms of Reference, the ARC Chair proposed that James Fields, Director of Finance and Administration at IFPRI, be appointed as a member of the AOG with effect from CB19.

62. **Decision:** The Board approves the appointment of James Fields to the Audit Oversight Group for a period of two years commencing from the date of appointment (CB/B19/DP4).

**Agenda Item 7 – Report of the Nominations and Evaluations Committee**

63. Marion Guillou, Chair, provided a summary of the deliberations of the Nominations and Evaluations Committee (NEC), noting in her introduction that the NEC had approached its agenda in the context of the relatively uncertainty created by the ongoing governance review. She confirmed that the NEC had determined it prudent to make a first set of recommendations for Board approval now, but that the NEC decided to hold off on longer-term recommendations until the outcomes of that governance review are known in May 2015.

---

2 The membership proposal was made pursuant to paragraph 3 of Section IV.b of the AOG Terms of Reference.
64. Drawing on the respective supporting documents and the NEC Charter, the NEC recommended for Board approval:

   a. The **Governance and Policy Coordination Committee Charter** (GPCC), as reviewed and endorsed by the NEC (CB19-13, Revision 2), to put into effect the Board’s decision in December 2014 (CB18) that the GPCC be formed to take on the functions of the former the Policy Coordination Committee and the Governance, Risk and Partnerships Committee; and

   b. **11 Committee member assignments** as set out in CB19-13A.

65. The NEC Chair referred to the impending resignation of Martin Kropff as Board member with effect from 31 May 2015, and proposed that the NEC undertake a review of the competencies and skills of Board members, to bring to the Board at its next meeting a recommendation on the desirable skills and experiences for persons to fill all Board and Committee member vacancies that will exist as at 1 June 2015, subject to the outcomes of the ongoing governance review.

66. The NEC Chair also noted that from the Centers’ perspective there is a difference in Board representative appointment processes and terms in the context of the Board currently operating with a revised engagement model pending the outcomes of the governance review. She reported that the Center participants in the NEC were aware of the importance of a degree of continuity in representation on the Board’s Committees to maximize contributions, but that they have not yet decided on how to rotate their members in the Committees. The NEC Chair acknowledged the early identification of this issue by the Center participants and thanked Tony Simons for his offer to take up this topic with Centers and come back to the NEC in a subsequent meeting to take the topic forward.

67. The NEC Chair also commented on the impact of budget adjustments on the planned 2015 NEC work plan. She recalled that the Board had previously agreed to have an annual self-review, and every two years, an assisted review. The NEC Chair noted that in 2015 it should have been the assisted review with external consultants to support that process. However, to support the cost reallocation process to resource mobilization, the NEC Chair noted that the 2015 review would be revised to be a self-review, led by Ganesan Balachander and assisted by the Consortium Office.

68. Finally, the NEC took note that the Board has not formally approved and recorded in a decision point the principle in the Consortium 1.2 document, which put forward a model of 12 Board members: 7 independents, the CEO as ex-officio and 4 Center representatives. The NEC Chair observed that this would be important to come back to after the outcomes of the governance review process were known. At that time, it would be important to ensure that the Board had sufficient membership to address the full responsibilities of the Board taking into account the time required to discharge responsibilities.
69. The Board accepted the proposal from Paul Zuckerman that whilst clear that there had not been a formal decision on ‘Consortium 1.2’ being officially adopted and thus, the necessary changes being made to the Constitution, it be recorded that the Board has agreed to operate in accordance with that arrangement until at least the next Board meeting, when the results of the governance review are known.

70. **Decision**: The Board approves the Charter of the Governance and Policy Committee (‘GPCC’), as set out in document CB19-13, Revision 2, comprising a merger of the responsibilities of the now superseded Governance, Risk and Policy Coordination Committee and Policy and Coordination Committee (CB/B19/DP5).

71. **Decision**: The Board approves the appointment of the 11 persons named in document CB19-13A (CB/B19/DP6).

72. **Action point**: The Board notes the impending resignation of Martin Kropff as Board member with effect from 31 May 2015, and requests the NEC to undertake a review of the competencies and skills of Board members, to bring to the Board at its next in person meeting a recommendation on the desirable skills and experiences for persons to fill all Board and Committee member vacancies that will exist as at 1 June 2015.

**Agenda Item 8 – Report of the Governance and Policy Coordination Committee**

73. Paul Zuckerman, Chair of the newly formed Governance and Policy Coordination Committee (GPCC) reported that following committee deliberations, the GPCC endorsed:

   a. The Consortium Office’s revised policy development proposals as set out in the proposed Revised 2015 PoWB (CB19-08) as in input into ARC review of the associated budget. He noted that this information had been pre-briefed to the ARC to facilitate the Board’s approval of the PoWB based on both GPCC and ARC review;

   b. A revised Statement of Assurance Framework that had come back to the committee after a further round of discussions with Centers, and which was adjusted during GPCC deliberations to cover both financial and scientific fraud and controls (CB19-14, Revision 1). It was noted that the now annual framework was supported by the GPCC in the current context, but that the GPCC reserved the right to return to the Board and ask for the statement to be given at Center level more frequently if compliance issues arise at a future time;

   c. A Consortium Office specific Delegations of Authority Policy (CB19-15); and

   d. The Board Chair sponsored Consortium Board Code of Conduct and Conflicts of Interest disclosure form (CB19-16), as introduced during the opening session of the Board meeting.
74. To conclude the report, the GPCC Chair noted the committee’s expectation that when the outcomes of FC13 are known in regard to the governance options to take forward, it will be the GPCC that has overall responsibility for taking the issues forward under the oversight of the Board.

75. **Decision:** The Board approves the revised Statement of Assurance as presented in document number CB19-14 (CB/B19/DP7).

76. **Decision:** The Board approves the Delegations of Authority policy as submitted in document number CB19-15 (CB/B19/DP8).

77. **Decision:** The Board approves the document titled ‘Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Form’ as set out in document CB19-16 (CB/B19/DP9).

78. **Action point:** The Board requests all Board members, Committee members and Center participants in Consortium Board meetings to sign the new form and return it to the Consortium’s General Counsel by not later than 15 April 2015.

### Agenda Item 9 – Other Business

79. **Centers’ Report:** Tony Simons shared the following as key points arising from Center communications/engagements over past months:

   a. Adopting the Consortium 1.2 as the in-practice manner of working at Board level is well appreciated through the system, as are efforts to improve the timelines of communications. There is still the perception that there could be advance consultation on key points for the Board, and so that is a matter to look at as things go forward.

   b. A majority of Centers thought it helpful that the Consortium Board and Office, and ISPC join the Centers’ 11-13 May 2015 meeting to seek to design the 2nd call for proposals, and so planning will move forward on that basis. In conjunction, the work continues under Ann Tutwiler’s leadership on the level-playing field concept.

   c. The Centers have different views on the Options Team work in progress, meaning that any Board response could not include the Centers as a unified group, and nor was it likely that there would be a further all-Center response moving forward. That said, there is universal thought that the wrong decision is better than no decision at all, and Centers do want higher level engagement with the world’s funders and actors in this space.

   d. The Centers are appreciative of the Consortium’s favorable response to the demand for focused resource mobilization efforts, with this being an example where earlier advice that the Consortium would find a way to reallocate funding to this priority would have been helpful for all.
80. Ann Tutwiler also shared Centers’ ongoing concern about the longer-term impacts of the substantially revised-down budget projections for 2015. Specifically, she noted that it remained interesting to see if a cross-Center reserves policy could be developed, to help mitigate unexpected budget fluctuations if they were being felt more severely by some Centers at a given time. She also returned to the likelihood of a significant wave of redundancies across the system and thought it important to ensure that this message is communicated to the appropriate audience.

81. Bas Bouman shared this concern, noting that in the very recent hours/days, two CRP Directors had resigned to take up other roles that perhaps offered more certainty. The Board did not welcome this news. One independent Board member also suggested that this type of issue is a material risk for success and notice should be given to the Board as soon as it is known.

82. An additional point raised was the importance of using 2016 as the year to bring results based management into the CRP portfolio on a holistic basis, to help demonstrate a more strategic allocation of funding.

83. **Action point:** The Board Chair suggested that the Centers collate high-level data for use by the Chair in discussions at FC13 on the implications of budget uncertainty and the risks posed to delivery of CGIAR’s mission.

84. **Other observations:** The Fund Council and Fund Office representatives commended the Board for the conduct of the meeting, noting the strengths arising from the Center participation also. The Center Board of Trustees member, who participated in the meeting by virtual means, shared this view, noting that the inputs would bring another perspective to the ongoing discussions across the network of Center Board Chairs.

85. A number of Board members returned to the SRF discussions, noting also the Board Chair’s receipt immediately before commencement of the meeting, of a letter from the Fund Council Chair noting a requirement for quantitative targets to be included in any SRF presented to the Fund Council for decision to recommend to the Funders Forum.

86. **Action point:** The Board endorsed the proposal that the Chair write a clarifying letter to the Fund Council Chair, also updating the Fund Council Chair on next steps.

87. **Next Board meetings/deliberations:** In view of the various actions arising from the Board deliberations it was agreed that the Board would meet:

   a. By virtual means as an out-of-session discussion on Sunday 12 April to review and approve the final SRF; and

   b. On a date in early May, to focus on the Options Team outcomes at FC, the 2014 audited Financial Statements and other agenda matters arising.
88. **Action point:** The Board Chair proposed the introduction of a consent Agenda system for Board meetings.

89. There was also support across the Board for use of electronic decision points when appropriate, as used by other governing mechanisms.

**Agenda Item 10 – In camera session**

90. The voting members of the Board met in camera as a routine practice planned for each meeting. No decision points were taken during the in camera session that require follow up at the current time.
Decisions of the Consortium Board’s Nineteenth Meeting

Purpose
This annex sets out the full text of decisions taken by the Consortium Board at its Nineteenth meeting.

CB/B19/DP01: Approval of the Agenda (Agenda Item 1)

The Board approves the Agenda, Revision 2, dated 25 March 2015 (CB19-01).

CB/B19/DP02: Consortium Office Progress Report (Agenda Item 2)


CB/B19/DP03: Revised 2015 Consortium Office Program of Work and Budget (Agenda Item 6.b)

Subject to the reallocation of up to US$500,000 for resource mobilization activities, the Board approves the Revised 2015 Program of Work and Budget as presented in document number CB19-08, with use of the reallocated funds being dependent upon Board approval of a budget and work plan for those funds.

CB/B19/DP04: Appointment of new Audit Oversight Group member (Agenda Item 6.g)

The Board approves the appointment of James Fields to the Audit Oversight Group for a period of two years commencing from the date of appointment.

CB/B19/DP05: Governance and Policy Coordination Committee Charter (Agenda Item 7.a)

The Board approves the Charter of the Governance and Policy Committee (‘GPCC’), as set out in document CB19-13, Revision 2, comprising a merger of the responsibilities of the now superseded Governance, Risk and Policy Coordination Committee and Policy and Coordination Committee.
CB/B19/DP06: Committee member appointments (Agenda Item 7.b)

The Board approves the appointment of the following persons as members of the respective Committees, to serve in their personal capacity and work in the best interests of the CGIAR Consortium as a whole, for a term that begins upon appointment and continues at the pleasure of the Board:

a. In respect of the Audit and Risk Committee:
   • Ganesan Balachander, to serve in place of Frank Rijsberman

b. In respect of the Governance and Policy Coordination Committee:
   • Klaus Leisinger
   • Frank Rijsberman, Ex-officio
   • Tony Simons
   • Ann Tutweiler
   • Bas Bouman

c. In respect of the Nominations and Evaluations Committee
   • Tony Simons, to serve in place of Robert Ziegler
   • Chandra Madramootoo, to serve in place of John Lynam

d. In respect of the Science, Programs and Partnerships Committee
   • Marion Guillou-Charpin as member and Chair of the SPPC to succeed Martin Kropff
   • Chandra Madramootoo
   • Bas Bouman

CB/B19/DP07: Annual Statement of Assurance approach (Agenda Item 8.a)

The Board approves the revised Statement of Assurance as presented in document number CB19-14.

CB/B19/DP08: Consortium Office Delegations of Authority (Agenda Item 8.b)

The Board approves the Delegations of Authority policy as submitted in document number CB19-15.

CB/B19/DP09: Consortium Board Code of Conduct and Conflicts of Interest (Agenda Item 8.c)

The Board approves the document titled ‘Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Form’ as set out in document CB19-16.
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Letter from Consortium Board Chair to Options Team
In response to Draft 2, Options Team Report

Letter is set out on the next page
26 March 2015, Mexico

Dear Patricia and colleagues,

RESPONSE TO OPTIONS TEAM REPORT, V2, 12 MARCH 2015

Thank you for the opportunity to review your much revised 12 March 2015 draft report.

As you know, this draft arrived as we were preparing for the Consortium Board’s Nineteenth meeting in Mexico. We are therefore grateful for your agreement that this input could come during our time here in Mexico, rather than the proposed 19 March deadline. The comments in this letter are those therefore of the Consortium Board and the Consortium Office.

As we have evaluated the possible options, we have kept in mind the five fundamental principles expressed in the CGIAR Joint Declaration. We have also reflected on the importance that key stakeholders place on the preservation of clear and accountable fiduciary responsibility for public money, and the essential need for independence of all quantitative and qualitative evaluation if one is to have full trust in reported results.

After detailed reflection, our preference remains option 2 with both fiduciary responsibility for the CRPs and the internal science function remaining with the consortium, together with the independent Fund Council Chair option. The composition and modus operandi of the Fund Council as set out in this option appears very effective.

I also wish to reiterate my earlier comments about disrupting science which needs a stable funding and organizational foundation, rather than introducing another radical reform. Indeed you have said the same thing in your observations for both versions of option 5 (paragraphs 110 and 111, and 123 and 124). Significant additional implementation expenditure and time of all involved on the reform process would also seem highly unwelcome at this time for the CG system as a whole.

With specific comments on the particular options themselves set out in the annex to this letter, we provide the following thoughts that we believe to be very important to the proper functioning of the CGIAR system as a whole.

1. The fiduciary responsibility of the Consortium for the CRPs is a critical design element of the reform. The donors need a locus of financial fiduciary responsibility separate from the Centers. Likewise, a key design feature is that fiduciary responsibility for the CRP portfolio is borne by a Board with a majority of independent directors. In most of the options, the relative number of independent versus ‘interested’ Board members is not expressed.
We do, however, agree that the Consortium Board needs to be better balanced and require greater ownership by the Centers. Your report - as well as the measures we have already put in place - can ensure this.

2. The recommendation for strengthening and consolidating the science direction and evaluation with the ISPC/IEA is excellent for the system as a whole. However the same is not true for those options that contemplate that the current functions of the Consortium Office’s science team and the ISPC be wrapped up into one function. We find the separation of roles between internal and external audit as a very useful analogy to highlight the fundamental difference of the science team’s facilitative role and that of the ISPC. The role of the internal science team is a facilitative role to help build a strong CRP portfolio. The ISPC has a different task, and it cannot be the monitor and the judge.

3. Some of the options propose change in the leadership of the Fund Council, and others do not. We believe that an independent Fund Council Chair, with knowledge of the key issues, is the most appropriate model to send a clear message of an organization being governed according to best-practice principles.

4. Although they can clearly bring some important strengths, double weighted majority decisions (an element in some but not all of the draft options for Fund Council decision making) can still end up with blocking votes and halt progress on time-critical policies, budgets and other items that are essential to the Consortium fulfilling its mandate.

5. Should two governing entities remain a proposed option, together with an annual joint meeting, the draft report is silent on dealing with the key issue of which entity is superior in the event of material disagreement on a matter revered for joint discussion and approval. We feel that if there is commitment to topics being up for joint discussion and approval – then specific rules of engagement (and voting) may need to be adopted to ensure parity in voting.

6. The question of ensuring predictable and sustainable funding for CRPs through effective resource mobilization is more complicated than one might imagine from the draft paper. We believe that resource mobilization would greatly benefit from the involvement of parts of the system under a consolidated strategy. The system ought to use all its strengths to raise sufficient funding for the system as a whole, and that includes the skills and abilities of the centers and the consortium, in additional to the skills of people who are typically working with member state based financing arrangements. The provision of funding by traditional donors is a key, but not the only, pillar of a comprehensive funding strategy. The Consortium should therefore be a key stakeholder in the design and coordination of this policy for the whole system with the Fund Council and the Centers.

7. The early reflections of perceived cost savings for the respective options should, we believe, be treated with caution. If time is against the Options Team providing robust analysis on costings, then efficiency of the reforms versus the human resources/administrative burden that another significant change is likely to place on the CGIAR system may be better markers than estimated costs.

Looking forward, we believe that you have made a very constructive analysis and made some very helpful recommendations for both the multi-year funding cycles (paragraphs 298 and following),
and for the streamlined funds flow and legal support (paragraphs 305 and following). If the donors accept your suggestions, this should solve a considerable part of the funding issue without the attendant drawbacks of putting in place a radical new structure which at its heart has fewer checks and balances than we believe are embedded in option 2. Indeed unless these funding issues and transactional difficulties are resolved, no amount of organizational change will be effective.

For the report itself, we would recommend that you include a table that compares each of the options against generally accepted standards of good governance such as the OECD or MOPAN. In closing, thank you for the manner in which you have conducted this exercise.

Signed
Lynn Haight
Acting Board Chair

Copy: Rachel Kyte, Fund Council Chair
ANNEX

Specific observations on the options themselves

With the inputs from our letter in mind, our reflections are as follows:

- **Option 1**: We believe to have been superseded by option 2 with the addition of an annual joint meeting, and therefore will not be referred to again.

- **Option 2**: This remains our preferred option, with the Consortium maintaining fiduciary responsibility for the CRPs as now, with increased participation of Center representatives on the Consortium Board – which we would formalize through a change to the Constitution. If fiduciary responsibility is transferred to the CRP lead Centers (it is not clear whether this is actually being recommended) there could exist a lack of consistent financial and auditing standards. Great care would be needed to preserve the portfolio approach to CRPs and monitoring and this is why the Consortium should remain in charge of coherence of the scientific value of the proposals before the Fund Council decides on the CRPs.

Suggestions for the communication of the pillars are endorsed. The science agenda requires sharpening now (as for all options), but the tools are in place through joint efforts of the ISPC, IEA and CO for that to happen. Independence of internal monitoring (CB/CO) and external evaluation (IEA) functions are in place.

Of particular relevance to this option is the very rational size reduction and modus operandi proposed for the Fund Council (paras 140 through 156), which would assist it in providing a coherent and multi-year funding base. We come back to this as a cross-cutting reflection in Part B below. We believe that the majority of Consortium Board members should continue to be independent.

- **Option 3**: This option resembles most closely the CGIAR pre-reform, with the Consortium essentially regressing to the role and functions of the pre-reform Alliance of the Centers, and the Fund Office reverting to the role and functions of the pre-reform CGIAR Secretariat. We do not see any logic to the proposal to undo reforms that have had positive impact.

On the option itself, fiduciary responsibility for the CRPs would be held by the Fund Office, the same organ which acts for the Fund Council in its own operations. Beyond the inherent conflicts of interest that will clearly arise, this would certainly require expertise which the Fund Office has not been set up to provide, and at some considerable cost. The science agenda is as with option 2, except that now there is a potentially bigger communication gap relating to science between the FC and the Consortium/Centers. No independence of financial analysis is provided, although the Internal Audits for CRPs (paragraph 191) and Center external audits would be read, collated and acted upon by the Consortium Board, and independent evaluation comes via the IEA. There are no independent Board members for the reformulated Consortium Board, nor an independent Chair, although such a role would seem critically important to ensure that there is an “honest broker” in place when dealing with topics that have the potential to create significant disharmony between the Centers.
Option 3 is also silent on the considerable additional oversight work (at both Board and Committee level) for those Consortium Board members who hold office at Center level if the Board is to discharge its governance duties. Under this option it is also not clear who prepares the recommendations for CRP fund allocation – with annex F attributing ‘oversight’ to the Fund Office, and ‘coordination’ to the Consortium Board and Consortium Office. Finally, there is no mention of the reform of the FC and operations as in Option 2, which is essential to address the issues that are very well articulated in paragraphs 26 to 30 of the revised draft report.

- **Option 4**: A key question in our mind is whether due diligence in regard to CRPs can be truly independent if the combined offices are under the direction of one officer reporting apparently to two masters? It is not hard to imagine the situation where there are contradictory directives coming from the two unequal governing bodies, and the common management office is placed in the position of interpreting disclosure obligations in the context of wearing two ‘hats’. Option 2 with improved communications would be essentially the same without the arising risks. It thus potentially lacks an appropriate framework for separation of fiduciary responsibilities for the CRPs and overall financial monitoring. Comments for pro-poor science agenda and independent qualitative examination are as before. Whilst the elaboration part of the report mentions the International Organization status of the Consortium (paragraph 207), there is no analysis of the complexity of deregistering this status and the implications for the operations of the Consortium throughout the transition period.

- **Option 5**: On first glance, a significant attraction of this option appears to be the possibility of higher external profile through a focal point (in the Chair presumably) for the external world. This is desperately needed. In the context of recent advice of material budget reductions for 2015, that profile may be a catalyst for increased budgetary support from innovative sources, which we believe is required to realize the full potential of the SRF. Option 5 is also presented as the way of bringing together all parties – via a single ‘CGIAR Council’ – comprised of both voting members and non-voting observers. However, we find it difficult to reconcile the proposal for the Council to be of a “manageable size” (paragraph 98) with the articulate analysis set out on pages 33 and 34 under the title “justification for proposed changes to the Fund Council”. Even with a constituency-based model applying to voting and non-voting stakeholders alike, the numbers of interested parties participating in Council deliberations, as mentioned in paragraph 98 and 216, seem to preclude that outcome. Fiduciary responsibility for the CRPs would be held out by the combined office, mentioned before as problematic (5a), or the two offices (5b). The combined office of 5(b) would retain the Consortium’s legal entity, but not 5(a), unless it is assumed that the FO would be amalgamated with the CO under that moniker.

A final comment on option 5 is that the examples of multi-year pledging organizations which have been given – for example GAVI – are organizations which mainly operate through agencies, and therefore decision making at a Board level can be more easily concentrated. Were the Centers to be an independent group acting as implementing agencies, and open to competitive bidding, this option would certainly be worth considering. But this is not the animus of the CGIAR, which was conceived and recognizes itself as a total system.