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**Agenda Item 1: Opening Remarks**

The Chair of the Funders Forum, Rachel Kyte, CGIAR Fund Council Chair, welcomed participants, noting that the Forum would focus on critical conversations about the future direction of CGIAR. She called attention to the group’s collective ambitions, and underscored the importance of donors and other stakeholders having a strong voice in decisions about CGIAR’s priorities, governance, strategy, delivery of results, mobilization of resources, and stewardship of scarce public funds, including funds used to leverage other forms of capital to support CGIAR’s work.

The Chair reminded participants that they would have an opportunity to share their views on the report and recommendations of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) Panel, and the draft Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) — an essential document that will give direction to the development of the second generation of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs). In turn the CRPs will determine if CGIAR can meet development challenges that are increasingly shaped by climate change and the need to feed an unprecedented number of people at a time when environmental resources are more compromised than ever before. The Chair noted that the policymakers to whom many participants are accountable expect CGIAR to be part of the solution.

The Chair then introduced the Co-Chair of the Funders Forum, Pamela Anderson, Director of Agricultural Development at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Foundation’s representative to the CGIAR Found Council, highlighting her invaluable depth and breadth of experience in CGIAR and beyond, including her years of service as Director General of the International Potato Center.

The Chair thanked the European Commission (EC) for their hospitality, introduced Klaus Rudischhauser, the EC’s Deputy Director General of the Development and Cooperation Directorate—EuropeAid, and invited him to share opening remarks.

**Remarks by EC Representative:**

Mr. Rudischhauser thanked the participants for traveling to Brussels and expressed the EC’s pleasure in hosting CGIAR — a key player in agricultural research — at a critical stage in its evolution. To put the meeting in perspective, he summarized the major global challenges around food security and sustainable development, noting that 800 million people suffer from hunger and more than 100 million children are stunted, and highlighted the European Union’s pledge to reduce the number of stunted children by 7 million by 2025, emphasizing that food, agriculture and nutrition will be key priorities for the EU over the next few years. He also called attention to the challenge of climate change, its impact on agriculture, and the importance of research and technology to delivering on the promise of climate-smart agriculture, noting that the EC is part of the new Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture.
Mr. Rudischhauser pointed out that at least 60 countries have chosen agriculture as a focus for cooperation with the EC, which is active in all developing countries and has allocated approximately 8 billion Euros to agriculture and food security over the next seven years, a major priority which represents roughly 15% of the EC’s spending on development.

Noting that a business-as-usual approach will not solve the development challenges, Mr. Rudischhauser called for new research and technologies, as well as evidence as to how challenges can be effectively addressed, highlighting the importance of factoring in climate change and safeguarding biodiversity. He underscored the importance of research for the EC, and emphasized that research needs to be adapted to local contexts, appropriately targeted at smallholder farmers, and focused on getting the maximum output from agriculture with minimum inputs. He stressed that the EC’s top priority in supporting CGIAR is delivering on the “last mile,” ensuring that research leads to real impact on the ground. In addition to significant resources allocated from development funds, the European Union also has a very large research program for agriculture (about half a billion Euros per year) inside the EU, and seeks strong coherence between targeted research for developing countries and the agricultural research done inside the European Community.

Noting that CGIAR has been a very important development partner for more than 30 years and the EC’s support for reform efforts in hopes of strengthening that partnership in future, Mr. Rudischhauser recalled that the EC has already allocated over 200 million Euros for research through the CGIAR Consortium to address the needs of poor smallholder farmers, especially women. He highlighted successful examples of research that have had direct impact on the ground (e.g., flood-tolerant rice and EverGreen agriculture) and called attention to the need for a private-sector approach to agriculture, expressing EC’s priority interest in helping farmers move out of subsistence agriculture to become economic operators, which requires very practical and targeted input and is key to addressing the world’s food security challenges.

Emphasizing that the European Commission has a strong stake in CGIAR’s reform, he noted that the EC is among the major donors to the CGIAR Fund. Mr. Rudischhauser recalled that he and his EC colleagues have participated actively in the mid-term review (MTR) process, including the consultative briefing in Washington in October on the MTR Panel’s draft report, and expect to contribute to and benefit from the reform process going forward. He expressed pleasure with the clear messages coming out of the review and his hope that the group assembled would develop clear proposals to improve CGIAR governance, achieve greater efficiency and synergy, and fund large-scale research programs (instead of small-scale activities) that would lead to more impact. Noting the EC’s role as an important financing partner that also provides constructive criticism, he provided assurances of the EC’s strong support for CGIAR and cited an urgent need to develop practical ideas for technology transfer and results-oriented innovations. In conclusion, Mr. Rudischhauser expressed his desire to improve activities on the ground prior to 2020 in the 60 developing countries in which the EC is active, hoped that the ongoing meeting would put in place a process to ensure that CGIAR is even better in the foreseeable future, thanked the group members for their participation, and expressed interest in the results of the upcoming discussions.
The Chair of the Funders Forum thanked Mr. Rudischhauser and his EC colleagues for their leadership on development issues, work on the Fund Council, and role as funders of CGIAR research. She encouraged Forum members to participate in the EC’s November 7th program on how the EC operationalizes its approach to research and innovation, noting that the workshop is likely to be highly useful and informative, considering that one of the most remarkable and transformative elements of the EU over the past decades has been its coordinated investment in research—research that has shaped the lives of many Europeans, as well as the lives of many other people around the world.

The Chair then invited Jonathan Wadsworth, Executive Secretary of the CGIAR Fund Council and Head of the Fund Office, to provide an overview on the status of CGIAR’s multi-donor trust fund.

**Agenda Item 2: Fund Status Report**

The Fund Council Executive Secretary thanked CGIAR’s valued donors and partners for participating in the Funders Forum, for their support and commitment to CGIAR, and for their interest in the important issues to be discussed at the meeting. He then highlighted the following key messages from the CGIAR Fund Status Report.

- Since its establishment nearly four years ago, the CGIAR Fund has pooled significant resources to fund research in CGIAR. By the end of 2014, it is expected that the Fund will have received over $2 billion and disbursed $1.99 billion to research programs.
- Windows 1 and 2 combined account for 60% of total funds received through the trust fund, but they have a shortfall ($619 million) due to the very ambitious CGIAR Research Program (CRP) budgets that were put in place when the programs were first approved. This shortfall has been made up in part by W3/bilateral funding, with nine CRPs receiving more W3/bilateral funding than originally budgeted and expected.
- Since December 2010, the Fund has been steadily growing. From 2011 to 2014, the number of Fund donors has increased to 38 and, equally important, the number of donors making multi-year commitments has grown to 18 – excellent news for the sustainability and liquidity of the Fund.
- Projections for Windows 1 and 2 funding in 2014 have decreased slightly due in large part to extraordinary, one-time payments made by a few donors in 2013, leading to the projection of a slightly lower Fund income level for 2014 relative to 2013.
- The Fund is made up predominantly of contributions of less than $20 million (82% of Fund donors provide 23% of funds), and seven donors provide 77% of total funding, which exposes the Fund to some vulnerability and certain risks.
- Bilateral funding represents a significant proportion of funding to CGIAR, accounting for about 45% of CGIAR income in 2014.
In 2013, total funding to CGIAR – bilateral plus contributions channeled through the multi-donor trust fund -- reached the $1 billion mark, thanks to all donors whose contributions enabled CGIAR to achieve its goal of doubling funding over five years – a remarkable achievement.

Going forward, it is expected that both the number of donors and size of the Fund will grow as more investors consider the advantages of collective funding.

There is an urgent need to significantly ramp up funding for agricultural research in order to achieve shared development goals.

Without more support from the entire donor base, CGIAR and its partners will not be able to generate the innovations and scientific breakthroughs needed to feed and nourish 9 billion people in 2050 – sustainably and with fewer resources.

**Agenda Item 3: Mid-Term Review (MTR) Panel Report**

The Funders Forum Chair welcomed Sir John Beddington and thanked him for his remarkable work chairing the MTR Panel. She introduced Warren Evans, Member-Secretary of the MTR Panel, and another Panel member, Howard Shapiro, when he later joined the meeting, noting that Mr. Shapiro has played significant leadership roles in NARS as well as in many other enterprises. The Forum Chair highlighted the importance of a broad range of perspectives provided by the extraordinarily accomplished Panel members, who represent various walks of professional life.

The Chair of the Funders Forum recalled that the MTR review comes in the context of an ongoing commitment to ensure that CGIAR remains relevant to its investors and the beneficiaries of its research, while remaining an attractive place for the best scientists in the world to work, without which everything else is moot. For these and many other reasons, the Fund Council commissioned in 2013 an independent, high-level Panel to carry out a mid-term review of the CGIAR reforms and make informed, evidence-based recommendations to:

- keep the change process on track;
- sustain forward momentum; and
- ensure that CGIAR is well equipped to make significant scientific and technical innovations to tackle global development challenges.

The MTR Panel began its work in January 2014, drawing on as many sources of evidence as was possible, including dozens of interviews with individuals from various CGIAR entities and a survey of stakeholders. After preparing a draft report, the Panel initiated a consultation process to solicit views and comments from donors and other stakeholders, and took this feedback into account in its final report, which contains an annex of comments received.

The Forum Chair then invited Sir John Beddington to share the Panel’s main findings and recommendations, emphasizing CGIAR’s immense gratitude for the significant time and attention that was dedicated to this task, including by other Panel members, and noting that CGIAR is one of the great public goods in the world only because of such commitment.
**Presentation by MTR Panel Chair:**

Sir John Beddington thanked the Chair of the Funders Forum for her remarks, noted that it had been a privilege to work with the other Panel members, and underscored that the report and its recommendations reflect the genuine consensus of the Panel as a whole. He highlighted some extraordinary successes of the reform, including better collaboration among Centers, the general success of the CRPs, and the significant increase in funding, and then focused on significant problems, which are addressed in the MTR Report’s nine recommendations, including the need to develop a clear CGIAR vision and mission and to prioritize research to achieve maximum impact with the least cost. Regarding the latter, the MTR Chair highlighted five areas where the Panel sees potential for very significant improvement:

1. All CGIAR food crop and livestock should include nutritional improvement as an embedded objective, emphasizing that the stunting of children is a global scandal;
2. Investing in degraded land;
3. Alleviating food waste;
4. Improving agriculture’s resilience, especially to the negative effects of climate change; and
5. Comprehensively addressing big data (e.g., genetic and remote sensing information), something that could be done extremely well in collaboration with the private sector.

Noting that the SRF is extremely important, the MTR Chair emphasized the Panel’s belief that the document should be developed at an appropriate pace and with the full involvement of stakeholders to ensure their full buy-in and genuine sense of ownership, as well as the best possible final product.

Sir John Beddington then explained the Panel’s unanimous view that CGIAR needs to move to a single Board, noting that the current two-pillar system does not work; it is problematic and generates unnecessary costs, confusion, and disagreements. He emphasized that a single Board would represent a significant evolution in CGIAR governance, not a reversion to past ways—a view which does not correctly understand the report’s recommendation and reasons for it. The proposed single Board would eliminate ambiguities and be more encompassing by including stakeholders from various regions, NARS, NGOs, and the private sector, as well as representing donors and CGIAR Centers. Not only would a single Board include various stakeholder communities that need to be involved, but it would also address many of the problems identified by the MTR Panel and improve other issues. The development of the Board should be facilitated by a group that would consult with and gain the consensus of all stakeholders in terms of the Board’s representation, size, structure, etc. The MTR Panel Chair also emphasized the urgent and comprehensive need for change, as supported by the available evidence and many interviews with stakeholders.

Professor Beddington highlighted another of the Panel’s recommendations – scaling up partnerships to deal with mega challenges – noting that while CGIAR is a valuable and important organization, it needs to optimize the strength of a broad range of partners in order
to solve major global development issues. While recognizing CGIAR’s success in increasing and doubling its funding, the Panel recommends exploring innovative mechanisms of financing and, on another note, optimizing political impact so that the CGIAR can contribute more to global and regional debates on important issues, such as climate change, food safety and security, water and fisheries management, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Recalling his role as former Chief Scientific Advisor to the UK Government, the MTR Chair underscored the Panel’s concern that scientific input into the CGIAR system is significantly weaker than several years ago and its recommendation that such input be enhanced in both scope and status, nothing that as a scientific institution, CGIAR fails or succeeds based in large part on the quality of its science. He also noted the Panel’s suggestion that the CGIAR’s chief scientist be an ex-officio member of the proposed Board.

The MTR Panel Chair expressed his delight that the Centers and Consortium Board have formally endorsed all nine of the recommendations in the Panel’s final report, noting that there had been some strong criticism when the first draft was shared. In conclusion, he congratulated the CGIAR for its successes and the good work resulting from the reforms, but noted that the Panel was tasked with focusing on and addressing the remaining problems. He emphasized the evolutionary nature of the process and the Panel’s belief that business-as-usual is not an option and that its recommendations could be the necessary and sufficient conditions for taking forward the work needed to address the massive problems identified during the review.

Following the presentation, the Chair of the Funders Forum thanked the MTR Panel Chair for his remarks and then opened the floor for comments. She noted that the Fund Council would in the afternoon consider adopting the report and its recommendations, and encouraged participants to take advantage of this critical last opportunity to provide input.

Comments by Funders Forum Participants:

Germany:

- Requested clarification as to whether the MTR Report is up for discussion or endorsement, and expressed full support for the CGIAR reform.
- Noted that 50% of the total CGIAR budget comes from bilateral sources and called for a stronger appreciation of the contributions of bilateral donors and for their increased participation in strategic discussions to ensure a common system going forward.
- Thanked the Panel for its report and recommendations and agreed with its finding that the current governance structure creates unclear responsibilities, particularly with regard to the dual function of the Consortium, which is expected to both represent Centers’ interests and execute Fund Council decisions.
- Suggested that roles, responsibilities and relationships first need to be clarified, and recommended a gradual adjustment of the current structure, rather than a rushed or
fundamental rearrangement of the system, so as not to jeopardize the functioning of
the system and the CRPs.
• Mentioned that the expectation of increased efficiency and effectiveness that would
enable researchers to concentrate on their work has not fully materialized.
• Agreed that the new SRF should be the centerpiece of the 2nd round of CRPs, that state-
of-the-art science quality is the bedrock of CGIAR research, and that the role of the ISPC
should be strengthened.
• Contended that the ISPC should not only live up to its “S” for Science, but also to its “P”
for Partnerships, which are crucial for achieving widespread development impact, and
specified that the reference to partnerships does not refer to scientific partnerships only
– which are still dominant – but to partnerships with development actors in order to get
research results into use at scale.
• Noted that Germany has increased substantially its investment in agricultural and rural
development and food security and now spends more than 1 billion Euros per year in
this area – roughly 20% of its entire development budget.
• Recalled that the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
recently launched a “One World, No Hunger” initiative that focuses on scaling up
agricultural innovation, improving food and nutrition security, and improving soil health
and land access – all fields that require a crucial role for research in order to provide
innovations for development agencies to implement.
• Expressed a commitment to becoming a stronger CGIAR partner and reiterated
Germany’s interest to be further involved in the system.

European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (Comments made by Norway
on behalf of EIARD members):

• While appreciating the need to streamline the focus of CGIAR, noted that the mission
and vision articulated in the report are different from that in the SRF and suggested that
there is no need for another Task Force, as there is already a Working Group in place to
address the vision and mission statement.
• Agreed that a weakness of the current system is the lack of priorities and guidance on
how to determine them, but questioned how the five priorities suggested by the MTR
Panel fit with the Results Framework (RF), the development of which includes a process
of prioritization that needs to be taken into account, and expressed surprise by the lack
of emphasis on the use of foresight to determine priorities.
• Questioned whether the proposed next steps on prioritization would lead to a solution
and suggested that the ISPC, with external support, could lead this work in the context
of the RF.
- Supported the analysis of the Panel on the SRF, including the need to have it in place prior to the 2nd call for CRPs, recommending competition in the selection of research proposals, and the importance of ownership through broad stakeholder consultation, and raised questions about the criteria for a robust SRF and analysis of how agricultural research can contribute to outcomes and impacts.
- Agreed with the Panel’s analysis of the current governance structure (e.g., on issues related to efficiency, gaps and duplication, overlapping and contradictory roles), but did not find the recommendations and their implications to be sufficiently supported by the information in the Report.
- Noted that opinion is divided about how best to improve the system and on the recommendation to move to a single Board, and explained that EIARD Members will therefore articulate their views separately on the governance issue.
- Expressed serious concerns about the timing of any restructuring, noting the critical importance of the development of the SRF and initiation of the 2nd call for CRPs, as well as uncertainty around the future role of and funding from the World Bank.
- Recognized the importance of scaling up partnerships, but called for clear guidelines on how to engage with various types of partners, including farmers’ organizations, NGOs, development agencies and other partners that play a key role in ensuring that research findings lead to large-scale impact, as well as the private sector, noting the need to consider risks and mitigations of such engagements and requested more guidance from the ISPC in that regard.
- Agreed in principle with the recommendation to explore innovative funding mechanisms, but noted that the Report failed to provide an in-depth analysis of the different funding Windows, as well as a satisfactory explanation as to why Window 3 and bilateral funding are increasing.
- Disagreed with the Panel’s recommendations on the ISPC, noted that the ISPC already plays an important role and provides guidance, cautioned against moving back to a pre-reform situation, and emphasized the need for balance between science and impact.
- Rejected the Panel’s analysis on the functioning of the IEA pending further examination, noting that judgment is premature; expressed satisfaction with the CRP evaluations conducted to date; and suggested that there is no evidence or justification for moving technical monitoring and evaluation from the IEA to the ISPC or for claiming that the IEA is not engaging the appropriate evaluators.
- Clarified that unlike GCARD, the Funders Forum is not a knowledge sharing platform; it represents the wider donor community and endorses the SRF and does not need to undergo change.
Canada:

- Thanked the MTR Panel Chair and the other Panel members for the very useful report that raises a number of important issues.
- Agreed broadly with the MTR recommendations, noting that many highlight how CGIAR could, with more concerted collective action, consolidate gains achieved thus far.
- Emphasized the importance of the SRF as an essential element to enhance resource mobilization efforts focused on a common vision, message, and metrics, and as a platform to seek new and innovative funding sources and mechanisms.
- Noted the value in consistent and improved guidelines for establishing partnerships, coordinating the good work already being done in the system to achieve a more cohesive approach.
- Supported a strong ISPC that is focused on science impact through research and partnerships and that proactively shares analyses and research on trends, results and foresight -- the latter of which can be especially effective in communicating to senior political leadership the case for CGIAR investment.
- Agreed with the Panel’s diagnoses regarding governance challenges and unfulfilled expectations regarding efficiencies, the need to address the challenges, and the opportunity to eliminate governance ambiguities so that CGIAR can deliver on its mission and lead an effort for accelerated, scaled up, and solution-driven private-public collaborations to address food insecurity.
- Emphasized that the proposed change in structure and its implications need to be carefully considered to ensure that CGIAR does not replicate the same challenges, that changes lead to more effective decision-making and increased accountability, and that any new bodies could engage effectively and efficiently with existing management structures – something that is fundamental for the system’s success.
- Emphasized that the legal, administrative, governance and cost implications of setting up any new structures need to be carefully considered in the specific context of the CGIAR system, as do the single-structure, multi-stakeholder governing bodies of other organizations, which were reviewed in the report.

Japan:

- Thanked the MTR Panel members for their hard work and valuable recommendations, including the need for a clear vision and mission and enhanced partnerships.
- Called for a thorough discussion and common understanding among various stakeholders about the legal authority, terms of reference, membership, etc. of a single Board prior to taking any decisions, and suggested that membership on the Board take
into account geographic representation and donors’ cumulative and historic contributions to CGIAR.

- Suggested enhanced collaboration and synergy between CGIAR and partners, such as JICA and JIRCAS, as well as those from the private sector, noting the importance of such partnerships to the dissemination and scale up of CGIAR research results and achievements.

- Noting that the genetic resources held in trust in CGIAR genebanks constitute unique international public goods, emphasized that genebank management is critically important and called for extensive discussions to address such issues as: How should the genebanks and genetic resources be managed in future, and who should manage them? How can CGIAR efficiently and effectively optimize those resources in its research?

- Explained that Japan mainly contributes funds bilaterally and through Window 3, since ear-marked contributions enable Japan to finance research that is directly linked to political priorities and to ensure accountability by facilitating evaluations.

- Expressed Japan’s determination to continue contributing actively to CGIAR, financially and by promoting interaction among researchers and collaboration between CGIAR and private and public Japanese entities to create win-win situations.

**African Development Bank (AfDB):**

- Noted that the Bank supports CGIAR and its reform efforts as food and nutrition security is AfDB’s policy priority.

- Highlighted the Bank’s past support for the Africa Rice Center and core research that led to the development of NERICA rice varieties which, in successfully crossing African and Asian rice species, represents one of the major scientific breakthroughs of the 20th century – work with which AfDB is proudly associated.

- Shared that in 2014, the Bank received a development impact award from the U.S. Treasury for the NERICA diffusion project, which improved the food and nutrition security of tens of thousands of farming families in several West African countries and lifted out of poverty many participating households, the majority of them women-led.

- Noted that AfDB is currently collaborating with four CGIAR Centers on the Support to Agricultural Research for Development of Strategic Crops in Africa – a $62 million project that is being implemented in 20 countries.

- With a few caveats, fully endorsed the MTR Panel’s recommendations, particularly the call for a more streamlined structure and a more focused agenda, noting that the current structure is large, cumbersome and costly.

- Strongly supported the development of a clear vision and mission, including the MTR Panel’s specific suggestion to focus on food and agricultural research to produce technology to meet future food security needs, emphasizing that CGIAR cannot
effectively tackle myriad development challenges, and should focus on extremely strategic and critical issues such as food, as a more narrow focus will lead to greater impact.

- Pointed out that some partners (e.g., national governments in Africa) feel that CGIAR research is externally driven and proposed a more regionally-focused research agenda that is combined with global crop/commodity and livestock research, suggesting that such an approach could address the concerns around research relevance expressed by some governments, while allowing cutting-edge research to flow freely throughout the system.
- Strongly supported a leaner governance structure and the recommendation to move to a single Board that is focused on long-term strategy and accountability, noting several benefits, including reducing CGIAR’s bureaucracy, complexity and administrative costs so that more funds can be spent on research that directly benefits the poor, increasing efficiency in research management, and improving clarity of CGIAR communications.
- Emphasized that capacity building of NARS, particularly in Africa, should receive greater attention, including in the SRF, and that CGIAR should also provide scientific leadership in establishing and operating regional agricultural research networks.

**International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD):**

- Thanked the Panel for including IFAD’s comments in its Report.
- Regarding the five priorities proposed by the Panel:
  - disagreed that CGIAR should focus on human nutrition (although it is very important to development), arguing that it is mainly a public sanitation challenge rather than an agricultural research issue, and large-scale successes in reducing malnutrition (e.g., in Brazil and Bolivia) have resulted from public expenditures, not investment in research;
  - questioned if CGIAR should focus on food waste, noting that as poor countries develop more commercial systems of food production, marketing and consumption, incentives that respond to private investments will evolve; and
  - suggested that national research programs are better placed than CGIAR to work on degraded lands.
- Regretted that the Report did not recommend a new approach that would address Centers’ concerns that current modalities (i.e., research oversight is focused on the CRPs, yet research quality, capacities, and design are essentially managed by the Centers) erode their capacity for global scientific leadership.
- Agreed strongly that scientific and research quality control in the system should be entirely under the oversight of the ISPC – a recommendation that should be implemented going forward.
• Emphasized that focusing on and investing in a series of small development programs in the interest of achieving impact would be a diversion of the mission of CGIAR, a tragic waste of its scientific capacity, and would incur a substantial opportunity cost in terms of CGIAR’s long-term scientific impact.

**New Zealand:**

• Called for a cautious approach to the recommendation of “optimizing political impact” and highlighted potential risks and costs in attempting to influence the global policy agenda, given CGIAR’s limited experience in this arena.
• Suggested that objectives of and procedures for engaging in relevant global and regional policy formulations, negotiations, and actions be established very carefully to avoid creating a new bureaucracy within CGIAR.

**Switzerland:**

• The Swiss delegate noted that he was also speaking on behalf of Norway, Finland, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Ireland, Belgium, Italy, Spain and Germany.
• Agreed that there is a need to improve the current governance structure and address ambiguities, but disagreed with the Panel’s recommendation to move to a single Board and the proposed timing of such an action, suggesting that the case for the single Board is not compelling.
• Argued that the Panel’s single Board proposal is not built on an in-depth analysis of the CGIAR system and fails to answer key questions (e.g., the reasons for moving to the present structure, the gains and shortcomings of the current architecture, and how the shortcomings could be addressed to enable CGIAR to better address global challenges).
• Suggested that the ambiguities between the different system entities are only partially addressed by the single Board proposal, which does not clearly outline the pros, cons or expected results of a one-Board structure.
• Requested that the full costs, gains and implications of a single Board be explored, including how it would improve on the present structure with minimal disruptions.
• Suggested that the Panel did not address implications of a single Board regarding the Consortium’s international status and physical infrastructure and questioned if there was sufficient evidence to replace this major investment (including in time and energy) with something new.
• Argued that the MTR Panel underestimated the time, energy and potential costs and consequences of the proposed change in governance, including potentially disrupting ongoing research and contributing to growing donor distrust, and noted that the Panel did not provide other possibly less disruptive options for consideration.
• Suggested that recent experience shows that CGIAR and its donors have limited capacity to implement major changes simultaneously, and recommended that CGIAR should focus first on the SRF and the 2nd call for CRPs, and thereafter address the governance issues, which may or may not lead to a single Board.
• Welcomed the recent initiative of Center Boards, Directors General, and the Consortium to address ambiguities and requested to be kept informed of their progress.

Russian Federation:
• Supported the Report and noted that Russia’s comments had been earlier provided.
• Regarding the single Board proposal, emphasized the need for clarity around the voting power of members and requested assurances that decisions would be made by consensus and donors’ views would be considered.
• Recommended a rotation system for non-donor Board members to participate as observers.
• Observed that the recommendation to seek inputs from donors and other organizations for the establishment of partnership guidelines is very promising and inspiring and suggested that bringing in new partners could be quite beneficial to the system.
• Fully supported the recommendation to optimize CGIAR’s political impact by participating in global policy negotiations, actions, and conferences and suggested that coordinating with others to achieve development goals would increase both financial incentives and research opportunities.
• Noted that Russia’s G20 Presidency, by including nutrition issues on the agenda, provided an incentive and basis for expanding a nutrition knowledge platform.

European Commission (EC):
• Thanked the MTR Panel for its report and colleagues for their contributions.
• Noted that he would articulate some independent views on behalf of the European Commission, but that the EC position was aligned in a number of cases with those expressed by the EIARD delegate (e.g., recommendations 7, 8 and 9).
• With regard to recommendation 1, emphasized that CGIAR’s mission and business model must include how the organization will achieve change and impact, and suggested that CGIAR’s public good notion must include consultation with farmers to ensure that their needs are met and research results are delivered.
• Regarding priorities, supported a focus on resilience, wondered about the need to focus on nutrition, food waste, and big data, and underscored the importance of involving farmers in determining CGIAR’s priorities.
• Supported the recommendation for a more open and competitive research proposal process, including the possibility of a non-CGIAR Center lead, suggesting that competition leads to excellence.
• Regarding the SRF, recommended that when considering if it meets the needs of stakeholders, the focus should be on the needs of farmers and others who will apply CGIAR’s research.
• Suggested that if CGIAR can clearly delineate its vision and mission, it would be much easier to find a solution to the governance issue.
• Emphasized that recommendation 5 (optimizing the strength of partners) is extremely critical and fundamental, and reiterated the importance of consulting with farmers and focusing on delivery and going the last mile, with the goal of raising the nobility and capacity of farmers to develop and move from subsistence farming to more healthy and wealthy living.
• Underscored that EC funding for CGIAR comes from a development budget and that continued financing for CGIAR is contingent on delivering research results in full to the intended beneficiaries and that, as part of its public goods mandate, CGIAR must ensure that delivery takes place, but not necessarily by CGIAR itself; partners can play that role.
• Observed that CGIAR is struggling with many of the same issues and challenges that it faced in the pre-reform period.

France:

• Noted that the delegate was speaking as the Chair of the French Commission for International Agriculture Research and on behalf of three Ministries (Agriculture, Food, Fisheries, Rural Affairs and Land Use Planning; Foreign and European Affairs; and Higher Education and Research) and five research organizations (CIRAD, INRA, IRD, IRSTEA, and Agreenium).
• Welcomed the MTR’s report and the presentations by EIARD and Switzerland, noting France’s full support for the latter, and acknowledged that some of the Panel’s findings and recommendations will help CGIAR move forward and become more efficient.
• Stressed that some recommendations are not justified by the findings and that major changes in the general structure of CGIAR would be inappropriate at this time.
• Noted that France has supported CGIAR since its inception as well as the reform, and observed that the proposed single Board structure with a single administrative unit appears to be a reversal to pre-reform architecture and suggested that it was too early in the reform process to assess expected improvements.
• Agreed that the first SRF and round of CRPs were hastily approved, but cautioned against questioning the validity of the current structure based on those findings.
• Agreed that the SRF must be approved before the new CRPs are launched, but stressed that this exercise cannot occur while CGIAR is being restructured.
• Emphasized, from the perspective of a researcher, that reorganizing the current structure would be time-consuming, could jeopardize progress to date, and would not provide the stable, quiet environment researchers need to prepare proposals for the 2nd round of CRPs, which will look drastically different from the first round, representing the most important change in the landscape of the CGIAR.
• Suggested that the Report’s references to ambiguities in governance need to be clarified or corrected, noting that some tensions arise from the two-pillar system (Fund versus Consortium), while other tensions result from the creation of the Consortium itself, including lack of clearly defined roles for the Consortium and Centers in CRP management and Centers’ reduced sovereignty – tensions that would not be resolved by a single Board, nor provide the required accountability regarding targets and system-level outcomes.
• Noted that CGIAR funding is still largely bilateral and Window 3-oriented, and that funding has doubled since the beginning of reform.
• Questioned the appropriateness of the Panel’s prioritization of research challenges.

Sweden:

• Congratulated the Panel on an excellent report and some very sound recommendations.
• Expressed major concern about the absence of any comment in the Report on the future role of the World Bank, noting that it has been the backbone of CGIAR for many years, not only as a provider of unrestricted funding, but also in its role as “honest broker,” Fund Council Chair, and Trustee.
• Noted that the World Bank’s role in the system gave Sweden the confidence to make a multi-year commitment to Window 1 of the Fund.
• Requested clarification from the Panel regarding the future role of the World Bank, referring to it as an essential issue.

United States:

• Welcomed the Report, noting that many of its recommendations are valuable and thought-provoking.
• Strongly supported the Panel’s recommendation for a strengthened science and partnership council and underscored its importance in terms of foresight, solid analysis of strategies and global trends, and independent judgment about research priorities and their tradeoffs.
• Agreed with the Panel’s attention to prioritization, but noted inconsistencies between factors addressed compellingly in the report (e.g., productivity, water, climate change) and other areas identified as priorities, suggesting that an in-depth approach to prioritization is well advised.

• Regretted that the Report gave relatively little attention to certain issues, such as the relationship between the different funding Windows and the effectiveness of the CRPs and their governance, and noted that some stakeholders see a greater degree of urgency around the issue of the SRF than what was reflected in the Report.

• Suggested that the Report might have focused less on fundamental governance issues and more on essential program issues, including recommendations related to the science council, prioritization, and strategies.

• Expressed concern that a single, constituency-based Board would not have the ability to make difficult, impartial and disinterested decisions, and suggested that that proposed single Board is a reversion to the pre-reform structure (i.e., the CGIAR ExCo).

• Noting a preference for subsidiarity over centralization, recommended a problem-solving approach going forward to address issues, such as the conflicting roles within the Consortium, CRP-Center relationships, CRP governance, etc.

• Emphasized that decision-making needs to be linked to investors, that implementers and investors need to be better linked in partnership, and that decisions should be underpinned by sound science, analysis, and priory setting.

• Expressed displeasure with the notion of an independent Fund Council Chair, and argued strongly for the World Bank to continue to provide the Chair, noting the Bank’s unique convening power, connection to the larger global development agenda, and thought leadership.

• Stressed that any diminution of the Bank’s role within CGIAR, including as funder, would send a strong negative signal across the development community.

China:

• Expressed appreciation for the work of the MTR Panel and its Report, noting that it summarized well the outcomes emanating from the reforms (most notably, the SRF and CRPs), as well as the challenges that remain.

• Noted that China expects to see further improvements in the system’s operational and administrative efficiency, particularly with regard to formulation of the SRF and implementation of the CRPs.

• Agreed that most of the Report’s recommendations are appropriate and pertinent, particularly finalization of the SRF, prioritization of research, and optimization of partnerships.
Emphasized that changing the governance structure (i.e., establishing a single Board) needs to be carefully considered, and suggested that establishing a new governing body would incur significant costs and likely disrupt ongoing research, creating greater inefficiencies.

Suggested that strengthening the coordination between the Fund Council and the Consortium is the ideal means to improve CGIAR governance and minimize transaction costs.

Recommended that technology transfer and delivery of research be included in the list of priorities.

Noting that CGIAR produces annually a number of detailed documents and reports to raise awareness and visibility of its initiatives and achievements, suggested that CGIAR also needs to prepare more clear and concise communications and messages for diverse audiences (e.g., different donors, research institutions, and farmers) to improve understanding and impact.

Welcomed the idea of scaling up strategic partnerships and expressed interest in becoming more involved in large-scale CGIAR research collaborations, such as the CRPs, to increase China’s contributions to global food security and global agricultural challenges.

Suggested that the Panel provide an analysis of how to minimize transaction and operational costs under the current framework.

**International Development Research Centre (IDRC):**

Welcomed the work of the MTR Panel and the clarity of the Report.

Observed that overall CGIAR has made a lot of progress since 2005 and is no longer facing Center mismanagement issues.

Suggested that an organization’s vision tends to have a short shelf life and recommended that limited time be spent developing it, since it will likely change over time.

Noted a risk in the Report related to the SRF and new areas of priority and suggested that the CRPs and current research areas be assessed thoroughly before engaging in new strategic priorities to avoid failing to complete what has been started.

Noting that CGIAR is a very unique partnership, which includes 15 Centers and stakeholders who do not have equal weight, observed that multi-stakeholder boards often have difficulty in reaching decisions.

Expressing an agnostic position on the issue of governance, called for a demonstration of a better model and evidence that the current structure is too flawed and unfit for purpose going forward.
- Noted some omissions in the Report, including a discussion of the appropriateness of 15 Centers, CGIAR’s reliance on a few major donors, which exposes the system to risk, and the question of whether or not CGIAR has been able to attract the best researchers.

**United Kingdom:**

- Welcomed the Report, suggesting that it’s accurate, insightful and helpful in setting CGIAR’s future direction.
- Agreed that CGIAR stands and falls on the quality of its science, observed that the quality is currently inconsistent across the system, and suggested that science oversight and review functions need to be more fully developed.
- Strongly endorsed the Panel’s proposal to strengthen the ISPC and expand other oversight functions, noting the need to urgently address this issue in order to continue to attract funding at scale, particularly unrestricted funding.
- Emphasized that two independent reviews that assessed CGIAR’s current governance structure came to the same conclusions about the need for substantial change and both recommended a single Board.
- Reminded colleagues that key elements of the system (i.e., the Centers and Consortium) have clearly stated that the current structure is not working and is unsustainable.
- Cautioned against the implications of not acting on these clear recommendations in a timely fashion, including decreased ability to make a compelling case for investment in CGIAR and a further deterioration in governance, and called for a clearly sequenced, time-bound plan that commits CGIAR to act on the recommendations.

**Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR):**

- Observed that while unquestionably eminent, the Panel’s membership, Terms of Reference, and proposed single Board did not fully take into account the need for broad stakeholder representation (e.g., farmers, NGOs, NARS).
- Emphasized that beyond representation, stakeholders at all levels also need to be considered in impact pathways, collaboration among various actors, etc.
- With regard to governance, noted the need for checks and balances and attention to what is needed beyond the first level of the structure in terms of other bodies and their roles in decision-making.
- Noted room for improvement in terms of rules, processes, and communications.
- Expressed concern that contrary to reform there seems to exist a fourth category of funding (“Window 4”) – namely, bilateral funding that does not contribute to the agreed priorities, as reflected in the CRPs and SRF, distracting researchers and management from focusing on what the system is trying to accomplish.
Syngenta Foundation for Sustainable Agriculture:

- Thanked the Panel for its excellent Report and the Forum organizers for providing the venue for important discussions.
- With regard to the role of the private sector, suggested that CGIAR cannot count on it to be a major donor or committed source of humanitarian technology donations.
- Highlighted three roles of the private sector most relevant for CGIAR:
  i. Source from which to gain market orientation and thinking about demand-led approaches to crop improvement research;
  ii. Conduit for delivery of goods to farmers and consumers, including inputs (e.g., seed systems) and, in the context of value chains and agricultural services, off-take agreements for products produced by farmers; and
  iii. Partner in innovation in research and development and throughout the value chain.
- Noted both a delivery and governance dimension to the role of the private sector, which has become an indispensable mechanism in the quest for impact on the ground.
- Made a plea for CGIAR to focus on its unique value proposition, which lies in the core strengths of specific Centers and the system, most notably the crop genetic resources held in trust.
- Strongly recommended that CGIAR focus on breeding and unlocking the genetic resources, in collaboration with partners.
- Emphasized the need to think about focus and priorities in terms of granular objectives (e.g., the development and adoption of high-yielding drought-resistant crop with X,Y,Z additional characteristics on N million hectares in a specific region by 2025), and suggested that a broader focus on MDGs or rural development solutions can be counter-productive.
- Suggested that there is not a quantitative, evidential basis for how CGIAR thinks and talks about money (i.e., the claim that spending on agricultural research is the best development investment) and recommended formulating priorities in a more granular way in order to secure more funding.

Australia:

- Congratulated the MTR Chair and Panel for their excellent Report, which achieved its objectives.
- While generally satisfied with the recommendations and observations, suggested that the Report was less developed in terms of a discussion of the Fund, particularly Windows 1 and 2, and incentives/disincentives for guiding donor behavior.
• With regard to execution of recommendations and points of vulnerability, observed that establishing a vision and mission and prioritizing research will be enormously challenging tasks.
• Suggested that the transition team should go beyond deliberations regarding the proposed constituency-based Board and address other issues as well, such as the structure of the Fund, relationships between the Consortium Board and Center Boards, and how governance is distributed across the system.
• Expressed appreciation for the Consortium Board’s and Centers’ support of the recommendations, and stressed the importance of momentum going forward to make tough choices and decisions to ensure actual implementation of the recommendations.

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO):**

• Highlighted the importance of developing a new vision and agreed with the Panel regarding the need to take sufficient time to get the SRF right, given its critical importance.
• Agreed with some but not all of the priorities identified by the Panel and suggested that prioritization needs to be done in the context of the SRF development and with appropriate stakeholder consultation.
• Agreed that CGIAR should continue to focus on agriculture and nutrition, but suggested that more consideration needs to be given to the specific areas and aspects of food safety to which CGIAR could contribute.
• Noting a difference between food waste and food loss, suggested that CGIAR has a comparative advantage in reducing food losses.
• Regarding governance, agreed that ambiguities need to be urgently addressed, especially given the Centers’ and Consortium Board’s endorsement of this issue, but noted that FAO is open to further discussions about the best approach – a single Board versus major changes to the current structure.
• Emphasized the importance of CGIAR strengthening its engagement with multilateral development partners, such as FAO, noting that the latter needs CGIAR’s science and research to underpin intergovernmental discussions on policies, while the development partners can provide a platform for scaling up CGIAR research results.
• Noted that following in-depth exchanges with the MTR Panel, the final Report now addresses and shows greater appreciation for enhanced collaboration between CGIAR and development partners.
• Emphasized the importance of continued World Bank leadership in the CGIAR system and questioned the wisdom of an independent Board chair.
Response by the Chair of the MTR Panel:

In response to comments by the participants, Sir John Beddington noted that:

- CGIAR can move forward with governance changes without eroding successes to date; in fact, preserving those successes would be a necessary condition of moving forward.
- The Centers and the Consortium Board – two key stakeholder groups – have endorsed all of the recommendations, yet, curiously – from the MTR Chair’s perspective – participants are challenging the recommendations as either fundamentally wrong or not based on evidence.
- The Panel believes and the Report indicates that IEA is doing a good job, but suggested that the scientific review process should be engaged at all times, not only when CRPs are under review and evaluation.
- Recommendations 1 and 2 were based on strong feedback from a number of stakeholders that they had not been involved in the development of the SRF, vision, or mission statement to date, but acknowledged that this issue will likely be addressed in the ongoing discussions on the SRF.
- While sanitation issues are indeed a factor in nutrition, the matter may not be as clear-cut as IFAD indicates. Significant investment in the high-level global panel on agriculture and nutrition, which he chairs, suggests an important link between the two.
- Regarding the issue of food waste, the Panel was most concerned with pre- and post-harvest loss in developing countries, where there is an urgent need to address new pests and disease as part of a larger focus on resilience.
- While some countries (e.g., China, the United States) can invest in degraded lands and address this issue themselves, the Panel Chair argued that many countries in the developing world do not have the capacity to do so.
- While some participants have faith that the development of a new SRF and second round of CRPs would solve CGIAR’s challenges, the Panel is not convinced that the current governance structure will enable their development in an appropriate way that would actually address key issues.
- The two pillar structure eliminates single strategic leadership, which the Panel deems essential to addressing existing and future challenges. A new SRF and round of CRPs will not provide single strategic leadership.
- The PricewaterhouseCoopers report, which was quite detailed and sophisticated, came to the same conclusion as the MTRP Panel regarding the single Board and provided substantial evidence for their recommendation, evidence that the Panel did not feel needed to be reiterated.
• The Panel did not think that it was part of their Terms of Reference or within their mandate to comment on any particular CGIAR funder, including the World Bank.

• Noting that the Panel was truly independent and that the report reflects consensus among the members, the MTR Chair emphasized that action is urgently needed and that Panel does not feel that business-as-usual is a viable option.

• The Panel Chair thanked the participants for their thoughtful and courteous comments, adding that he looked forward to hearing about the Fund Council’s deliberations and decisions.

Response by the Chair of the Funders Forum:

• Clarified that adoption of the MTR Report and its recommendations will be considered by the Fund Council and noted that Funders Forum participants have the opportunity to inform those decisions.

• Noted that discussion of the SRF at the current Forum is preliminary and that the Funders Forum will be reconvened in some way for endorsement of the SRF once finalized in spring 2015.

• Observed that participants had the opportunity to air their views, in addition to written comments that were previously provided, emphasizing that this exercise is an essential part of the decision-making process around the Report.

• Reflected that there was very little pushback on most of the recommendations and a lot of resonance, particularly on the need for science to play a prominent role throughout the CGIAR system structure and process, and on the importance of partnerships, noting strong areas of emerging consensus as a basis for moving forward.

• Highlighted interesting discussions around the application of CGIAR’s traditional value proposition in a rapidly changing world, how to retain focus, and how to build on what CGIAR is good at while developing new skills.

• Noted points of dissonance, particularly on the governance recommendation, whether further reform is needed, and the timing of any actions that might be taken.

• Noted that the Fund Council will be challenged to find a balance between how CGIAR needs to change versus where it should stay the same in order to be relevant in a changed world.

• Observed that those who were involved in the reform and helped shape it are very clear about what they don’t want in terms of outcomes of any further system evolution, but suggested that it’s unclear what is wanted – something that will be important to clarify.
• Reiterated the urgency in the tone of the MTR Report, and in the responses from the Center Directors General and Board Chairs, and suggested that the group should heed what they said, given their proximity to the researchers.
• Questioned the best way to quickly provide researchers with the stability and certainty that they need.
• Noting that only one person used the word “accountability,” reflected that it was an important concept among funders, who are accountable to investors or political masters and the taxpayers they represent, and for outcomes that funding seeks to support and achieve through the work of individual researchers.
• On behalf of all participants, thanked again the MTR Panel Chair and members for their wisdom and recommendations, noting that their Report was clear, to the point, and insightful.
• Thanked the participants for a full and respectful debate.

Agenda Item 4: Draft Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and Process for Finalization of the New SRF

The Co-Chair of the Funders Forum framed the discussion by noting that the SRF is one of the most important, if not the most important system document, articulating CGIAR’s goals, strategic objectives, expected results, and the strategy to deliver them. The SRF also defines CGIAR’s priorities and will inform the next round of CRPs. The Co-Chair highlighted the opportunity at the Forum for funders’ early input on the current draft – a work in progress. She noted that this feedback will be considered by teams led by the Consortium and ISPC, who will work to further develop the SRF, the final version of which will be presented to the Funders Forum in 2015 for endorsement. The Co-Chair emphasized that it is important that the funders not only approve the SRF, but truly buy into it. She then gave the floor to Wayne Powell, the Consortium Chief Science Officer.

Remarks by Consortium Chief Science Officer:

The Chief Science Officer noted that the SRF provides an opportunity to develop a shared understanding of CGIAR’s challenges and their potential solutions, and to provide direction and positioning for the system over the next decade. The challenges are well documented and interconnected, requiring strong scientific innovation, international collaboration, and interdisciplinary approaches – requiring focus, given the scale of the challenges. He emphasized that the SRF needs to reflect change in the scientific and political landscapes, and the expectation that research delivers impact.
Observing that the challenges and opportunities CGIAR faces surpass, in many ways, those faced by the biomedical community, he emphasized that it was a very exciting time to be involved in agricultural research, in a broader sense and with a modern meaning, and a big opportunity to get things right. Accordingly, he suggested that the SRF – the current draft of which is in the consultation stage – needs to reflect this context to attract not only critically important funding, but also new talent to complement CGIAR’s current capacity, and that CGIAR needs to be creative in how it achieves that.

The Chief Science Officer noted that the SRF is structured around a high-level vision and mission statement that is informed by three system-level outcomes: reduced poverty, improved food and nutrition security and health, and improved natural resource management and ecosystem services. The draft SRF also includes three cross-cutting topics – women and youth, nutrition and health, and climate change. Emphasizing the need to embed gender from both a research and institutional perspective, the Chief Science Officer said he welcomed comments on whether CGIAR should consider institutional incentives in terms of gender mandates. He also noted that the donors, supported by the ISPC, have taken a leadership role in articulating their expectations in the form of the Results Framework, providing accountability for the research that will be conducted – all of critical importance in the development of the SRF. He also emphasized the need for donor input regarding CGIAR’s value proposition: What is its niche and how is it changing? What are CGIAR’s strengths and comparative advantages, and how should they be positioned going forward?

He then highlighted several points in the strategy, many of which are congruent with the MTR recommendations:

- Research should address the most urgent and important agricultural and global issues and maximize returns on investment.
- Prioritization is critical, but also complex, and requires careful consideration (e.g., of the scale of the problem and quality of the solution) and tractable research questions for which CGIAR has a comparative advantage, in order to appropriately address the issue. He anticipated that CGIAR would address fewer problems with more focus, complemented by research concentration, absorptive capacity, and critical mass, in order to deliver solutions with urgency and on the scale required.
- He emphasized the need for a renewed focus on research excellence and scientific rigor as a critical core component of CGIAR business requiring strong oversight by the ISPC and external independent review, and underscored that excellence is critical for driving forward the CGIAR agenda.
• CGIAR needs to engage in scientific risk-taking, but it also needs to balance risks with benefits, to ensure balance between incremental change and the potential for step change.
• The velocity, variety, and complexity of big data are critical to understanding and managing risk, which is at the core of resilience. A system-wide strategy is needed which recognizes that a lot of capacity and expertise for high performance computing, visualization and analytics resides outside CGIAR, making the development of strategic global alliances critical.
• In terms of strategic principles, research should respond to local and national priorities and add value by placing them in the context of global public goods in a way that delivers multiple benefits (e.g., environmental and nutritional), in addition to achieving agricultural productivity, which is essential to the future of the planet.
• This is much more tractable, given both the scientific and product development capacity that is possible through the creation of new types of partnerships.
• Better coordination of CGIAR research facilities in selected environments will maximize synergy, effectiveness and efficiency in the management of resources to visibly deliver value for money.

The Chief Science Officer raised another key issue – how to move from research capacity to impact through new partnerships that reflect mutual commitment, understanding of expectations, and accountability. In conclusion, he stressed that the draft SRF is for review, discussion, and consultation, with a view to generating shared commitment and legitimacy, and noted that a major priority is to integrate the Results Framework and strategy component as soon as possible. In terms of next steps, the ISPC Chair will lead a workshop to further develop the RF and clarify any outstanding issues to provide a platform for the system- and intermediate-level outcomes, together with the launch of a process to identify targets that will enable the production of an integrated document with appropriate scientific challenges and tractable questions that can be strategically formulated in a cost-effective way. In addition, the upcoming consultation process will ensure the input and feedback of a broad range of stakeholders, prior to delivering a final SRF in March.

Following the presentation by the Consortium Chief Science Officer, the Co-Chair of the Funders Forum opened the floor to comments and questions, and particularly encouraged those who were unable to participate in the preceding Fund Council conversation to take the opportunity to contribute.
**Discussion and Comments:**

**European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (Comments made by Norway on behalf of EIARD members):**

- Fully agreed that the SRF must be a high-quality document that captures CGIAR’s objectives, provides convincing and realistic pathways that link research to impact, and sets the basis for the 2nd round of CRPs, noting that the SRF is the foundation for CGIAR’s success and the reference for prioritization of its research.
- Expressed support for the SRF development process and ISPC’s lead in the further development and articulation of the RF at different levels (e.g., intermediate development outcomes [IDO], sub-IDOs), and noted EIARDS’s contributions to system-level outcomes (SLOs) 1, 2 and 3.
- Anticipated eagerly the integration and consolidation of the strategy document with the accountability and results framework and continuation of the work in progress.
- Highlighting the need to have broad ownership of the SRF, underscored the importance of both building in sufficient time for meaningful consultation and finalizing the SRF by May 25, 2015.
- Noted that EIARD members will add their own perspectives.

**Germany:**

- Pointed out that the SRF must provide clear strategic guidance, but be flexible enough to adapt to new challenges.
- Suggested three crucial aspects to formulating a meaningful SRF: a realistic time frame; consultation with all relevant stakeholders; and involvement of implementing partners from the start, so that research results can be better integrated in development activities and brought to scale.
- Expressed concern about proposed reductions in the number of CRPs, noting a lack of sound justification as well as uncertainty at the Center and CRP levels; emphasized that any decisions regarding the number of second generation CRPs must be based on robust IEA evaluations; and suggested that the number of CRPs should substantially change only when CRPs underperform or major new challenges arise.
- Strongly supported the clear call for making gender a key CGIAR issue, argued for integrating gender in all SLOs and IDOs, and suggested that by making gender only a cross-cutting issue it would be marginalized and not systematically considered in all CGIAR research endeavors, despite a system-wide gender strategy.
European Commission (EC):

- Noting the importance of agricultural research to the EC and the unique role of CGIAR in the generation of global public goods, emphasized the fundamental need for a quality results framework that enables CGIAR to deliver on those goods, and aligned the EC’s position on the SRF with that of EIARD.
- In order to make CGIAR an attractive funding proposition, stressed that the SRF must clearly map out both development objectives and the means to achieve them in a way that demonstrates CGIAR’s comparative advantage in contributing to the objectives.
- Noted that a number of the sub-objectives depend on externalities outside the control of CGIAR in order to achieve them and suggested that they need to be specified.
- While recognizing the urgent need to finalize the SRF, welcomed the additional time and attention that is being given to developing a very high-quality document.
- Stressed the importance of consulting more widely with external stakeholders and underscored that, for the EC, farmers’ organizations are not boundary partners, but are essential, indispensable core partners.
- Suggested that GFAR could help CGIAR in consulting with farmers, providing needed reality checks.
- Noting that the private sector is also a core partner, suggested striking a compromise between speed and consultation to ensure broad ownership—the perception of which is as essential as the consultation itself.

Japan:

- Highlighted three elements that should be the basis for a future CGIAR strategy:
  i. significant improvement of agricultural production and productivity to meet ever-increasing global food needs;
  ii. strengthening agricultural production systems in the context of climate change and other global challenges; and
  iii. addressing, from an agricultural perspective, key issues on the global political agenda, such as resilience and gender mainstreaming.
- Welcomed agri-food value chain issues as a focus of CGIAR research over the next 10 years.
- Offered to contribute actively to the efforts to concretize ideas advanced in the draft SRF, including examination of relevant criteria or indicators for evaluating research programs.
- Emphasized Japan’s firm belief that when assessing the alignment of Window 3 or bilateral funding with the CRPs, it is necessary and appropriate that evaluations be conducted in a manner that is non-prejudicial of the funding channel.
France:

- Noting that the SRF will never be perfect, stressed the importance of wrapping up the process, moving to the consultation stage, and finalizing the document as soon as possible, so as to provide CGIAR researchers with the stable framework they need to prepare for the 2nd round of CRPs.
- Acknowledging some contradictions between the text and RF diagram, suggested that the draft text is almost acceptable at this stage, minus the need for slight improvements for the sake of clarity and to take into account feedback from the Fund Council meeting.
- In terms of next priorities, emphasized that the 2nd phase of CRPs will be critical and that they must reflect the reform and spirit of it.

Canada:

- Thanked the Consortium for sharing the draft strategy and welcomed the upcoming opportunity to engage in the development of criteria for the 2nd round CRP proposals.
- In terms of determining research priorities, suggested that it will be important to pursue a process that combines independent dialogue on foresight and global challenges with CGIAR’s comparative and absolute advantages.
- Noting the strategic importance of the three cross-cutting areas, suggested further reflection on the role of partnerships, including with the private sector and through capacity building, to help ensure that CGIAR research is effective and sustainable.
- Expressed strong support for the pivotal role of women in agricultural production, food security, and nutrition outcomes and, while noting progress in this area at the strategic level, identified a need for CGIAR to bring these commitments to fruition through adequate capacity and integration of gender more systematically across its programs.
- Noted that Canada would appreciate efforts to attract more women to the system.
- Emphasized that as the Results Framework (RF) is further developed, gender must be reflected in the expected outcomes of CGIAR research.
- Highlighted that a RF that helps define mutual accountability for development outcomes would enable investors to better gauge performance.
- Stressed that throughout the implementation of CRPs, donors will need to see evidence of annual progress towards the results in order to convince decision-makers to continue to invest in CGIAR, noting that in a world of scarce financial resources for development, CGIAR cannot afford to be complacent.

Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI):

- Noting that APAARI’s comments are included in the final MTR Report, indicated that APAARI is representing regional fora, including the Association of Agriculture Research
Institutions in the Near East & North Africa (AARINENA) and the Central Asia and the Caucasus Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (CACAARI), making three regional fora that endorse APAARI’s position and statements.

- Referring to CGIAR’s change initiative as an evolutionary process, welcomed and appreciated the reform, mid-term review, lessons learned, and messages shared by the representatives of the Directors General and Board Chairs, noting their endorsement of the Panel’s recommendations.
- Acknowledged that there is often resistance to change, and emphasized the importance of urgently addressing and finding solutions to the difficulties and challenges that CGIAR faces, noting that because some change has already taken place, does not mean that no more changes are needed.
- Noted definite improvements in funding and partnerships, but stressed the need for enhanced partnerships with national systems and more capacity development.
- Expressed concern about the dichotomy between the Fund and Consortium Offices, as well as related bureaucracy, and suggested that the issue needs to be resolved so as not to hinder the system’s future progress.
- Appreciated the wisdom of the MTR Panel Members and noted their presumed lack of a conflict of interest and the value in that.

Response by the Co-Chair of the Funders Forum:

In reflecting on and summarizing comments by the participants, the Co-Chair noted:
- a strong commitment to keep to a timeline so that the SRF is completed by April or May of 2015 in order to inform the 2nd call for CRPs;
- the importance of continued consultation with core partners;
- the need for more attention to the issue of partnerships;
- a strong call to think deeply and broadly about how to clearly incorporate gender in the SRF; and
- the important role of the SRF as both a science and accountability framework.

The Co-Chair indicated that input from the Funders Forum would be taken forward to inform the upcoming ISPC-led workshop, the outcomes from which would be shared with funders for further consultation, and invited the Chief Science Officer to respond.

Response by the Consortium Chief Science Officer:

- Clarified that the SRF does not identify the number of CRPS, although it does refer to fewer problems, and reaffirmed the Consortium’s belief that a sound SRF is needed to guide the development and constitution of future CRPs.
Following the comments, the Chair of the Funders Forum noted how pleased the group was to have been joined by representatives of all system entities, including a representative of the Center Directors General (Tony Simons) and a representative of the Center Board Chairs (Camilla Toulmin), who had the opportunity to listen to the Forum’s deliberations. Emphasizing the importance of the SRF and MTR discussions, and the rare opportunity to have all CGIAR funders gathered in one venue, the Chair invited Ms. Toulmin and Mr. Simons to address the Forum.

Comments by Camilla Toulmin, Representative of the Center Board Chairs:

- Speaking on behalf of all of the Board Chairs of the Centers, noted that following consultations and discussions among Board Chairs and Directors General, there is agreement with all of the MTR Panel’s recommendations.
- Indicated that the Board Chairs are well aware of the situations, pressures and concerns faced by Center scientists on a daily basis.
- Appreciated the Panel’s recognition of the considerable advances made in terms of cross-Center collaboration through the CRPs and in multiple other ways, including collective action by the Centers that is often aligned with the Consortium as a whole.
- Noted that the push to solve major global challenges, as outlined in the MTR Report, and the SRF discussion provide valuable food for thought that will be shared with Board and Center colleagues.
-Expressed strong support in particular for the recommendation of a single Board, supported by a single administrative unit, to steer the work of CGIAR, which is vital to building a governance system that is accountable and inspires confidence and trust within the system.
- Noting numerous areas of confusion and misunderstanding between investors and implementers (e.g., budget misunderstandings about underspend that would be carried forward into 2015), underscored the need to address urgently the high transaction costs and areas of ambiguity resulting from the current arrangements.
- Urged the Fund Council to listen to the voice of Centers in its deliberations and to consider the recommendation of a transition team to work on options for moving forward.
- Observed that the discussions so far do not seem to reflect the concerns of the Center Board Chairs, and once again urged the donors to seriously consider and act on that feedback.

Comments by Tony Simons, representative of the Directors General:

- Expressed appreciation to the Fund Council and Fund Office for inviting his participation.
- Emphasized that that the Centers are incredibly grateful and fortunate to have a high level of engagement, understanding, and attention from the donors.
- Noting that the donors have to some extent “spoiled” the Centers, called for tough love and bold decisions by the Fund Council to do what is needed for the Centers’ benefit.
- Suggested the Fund Council Chair needs to reconcile and align the divergent interests of different donors and CGIAR stakeholders to reduce conflict and achieve greater coherence.
- Noting that the current system is not working, and that Centers receive mixed signals, stressed the need to reduce bureaucracy and transaction costs.
- Recalling that CGIAR was built on social capital, emphasized that trust levels have diminished significantly and are currently very low.
- Observing a lack of a baseline and metrics for defining success, stressed that in the next round of reform CGIAR needs to be clear about what it is trying to achieve and what success should look like in ten years, to be able to identify the key issues raised in the MTR Report around governance, science, partnerships and impact.
- Acknowledged that Centers pursue and promote their own interests, and have had some difficult transactions with the Consortium Board and Consortium Office, which have led to some unfair characterizations of the two entities, but stressed that the Consortium Board and Office have done a fantastic job in helping the Centers thrive and in reinforcing donors’ dedication.
- Noting that it was the Consortium Board Chair’s last Funders Forum and Fund Council meeting, thanked him for helping the Centers and expressed their gratitude for the Chair’s support for close to five years.
- Emphasized that all parts of the system are responsible for the problems and need to be part of the solution going forward.
- Underscored that the new SRF, as CGIAR’s guiding document, needs to work for the donors, partners, and Center staff to give everyone a sense of purpose and reduce fragmentation.
- Quoting Bill Gates, who said that if CGIAR didn’t already exist, the world would need to invent it, encouraged all stakeholders to take up that challenge and carry forward CGIAR’s amazing legacy.
- Noting the tendency to overestimate what can be done in the short term and underestimate what can be done in the long run, suggested that the MTR review and SRF provide a great opportunity to think big about what CGIAR can do in the long term.
- Reiterated that the Centers are extremely grateful for the degree of attention given by the donors and Fund Council.
Response by the Chair of the Funders Forum:

- Thanked everyone for their continued commitment to making CGIAR a better and stronger system, and emphasized the importance of funders gathering together and participating in the Forum as CGIAR works to progress the SRF.
- Noting the accelerated timeline of iteration between the researchers and investors, observed that input shared at the Forum would inform the work of the ISPC Chair and Chief Science Officer as they further develop the draft SRF.
- Highlighted the valuable participation of the representatives of the Directors General and Board Chairs and the importance of transmitting messages back to Centers and researchers as part of the iterative process.
- Emphasized that SRF needs to be a document that inspires and resonates with the researchers in the system, partners who will help deliver results, investors, political decision-makers, and the larger world and development community.
- Noted that 2015 will be an extraordinary year, during which multiple political processes will converge, building up to and framed by the conversation around the Sustainable Development Goals, which is shaping up to be a truly global consultative process.
- Suggested that when the global community convenes in Paris to try to conclude a legally-binding framework on climate change, it will challenge everything known about global governance and decision-making.
- Underscored that CGIAR’s ambitions and the potential outcomes and impacts of its work run through the entire global development agenda, and expressed confidence that CGIAR stakeholders are up to the challenge presented by these multiple processes.
- Indicated that it has been very important as Chair of the Fund Council and Funders Forum to listen to members and the conversations among them, as well as what is conveyed by the silences, as everyone prepares for the hard work ahead.
- Noting the complicated inter-relationships between the SRF, CRPs and system entities, emphasized the need to create a coherent system that is greater than the sum of its parts and that does not include transaction costs and ambiguities that would endanger the results which CGIAR aims to achieve.
- Expressing interest in seeing the work of CGIAR whenever possible during mission travel, noted that it’s always a humbling experience to stand in a field or laboratory with CGIAR researchers, and emphasized the responsibility of the Fund Council and Chair to amplify their work, communicate how it adds up to something that can be game-changing, and explain how that happens and what it takes to produce game-changers that come from CGIAR research.
- Observing shortening political timeframes and waning public patience, underscored that the communications challenge of the complex CGIAR system has never been greater,
that funders have a huge responsibility to communicate clearly, and that it’s very
difficult to communicate clearly if one cannot be clear about what has been decided.
• Appreciated the preponderance of concern, thoughtful insight, and wisdom expressed
during the Funders Forum, noting that it will be helpful to the Fund Council and for
moving forward.
• Most importantly, thanked the funders for their continued financial support and their
remarkable success in increasing and doubling funding, something that many had said
could not be done.
• Noted that once the SRF and CRPs are in place, the focus will be on determining what
resources are needed to fund research, and identifying who will do what research and
when, in order to achieve the results and impact sought by CGIAR and its stakeholders.
• Expressed confidence that with a strong storyline, CGIAR and its investors can be
creative about how to mobilize and increase resources.
• Noting that the funding landscape has completely changed, and that some
environments support experimentation with resource mobilization and concessional
finance while others do not, highlighted the value of educating one another and
collectively exploring options going forward.
• Underscored that what is most important to making decisions related to resource
mobilization is a group of totally committed funders – the very group assembled.
• Reassured Funders Forum participants that the Fund Council would take all of their
comments into consideration, are deeply committed to completing the SRF within the
necessary time frame, and will help investors to align their financial contributions with
their priorities.
• Respectfully acknowledged that donors have options, which are only expanding, as to
where they can contribute their financial resources, and reiterated CGIAR’s gratitude for
their continued commitment, time and diligence.
• Thanked the European Commission for hosting the CGIAR meetings, and everyone for
their participation.
# Annex: Funders Forum Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Organization/Country</th>
<th>Name of Delegate</th>
<th>Title/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTR Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MTR Panel</td>
<td>John Beddington</td>
<td>Chair of MTR; former Chief Science Advisor, UK; the Senior Adviser to the Oxford Martin School; Professor of Natural Resource Management at Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MTR Panel</td>
<td>Howard-Yana Shapiro</td>
<td>MTR Panel Member; Chief Agricultural Officer, Mars, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MTR Panel</td>
<td>James Warren Evans</td>
<td>Panel Member-Secretary and former Environment Director, World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Chairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CGIAR</td>
<td>Rachel Kyte</td>
<td>Chair of the CGIAR Fund Council; World Bank Group Vice President and Special Envoy for Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>Pamela Anderson</td>
<td>Director, Agriculture Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speakers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consortium Office</td>
<td>Wayne Powell</td>
<td>Chief Science Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Klaus Rudischhauser</td>
<td>Deputy Director General of the Directorate General for Development Cooperation, EuropeAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fund Office</td>
<td>Jonathan Wadsworth</td>
<td>FC Executive Secretary; Head of the Fund Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ICARDA</td>
<td>Camilla Toulmin</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>World Agroforestry Centre</td>
<td>Tony Simons</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>Douougou Keita</td>
<td>Manager, Agriculture and Agro-Industry Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Alaa Noureddin Joma</td>
<td>Director of Technical Services at Farmers’ Services Center (ADFSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>APAARI</td>
<td>Raj Paroda</td>
<td>Executive Secretary, Asia Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Nicholas Austin</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Australian Center for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Guenther Schoenleitner</td>
<td>Director, International Financial Institutions Federal Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Reinout van Vaerenbergh</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, DGOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>David Bergvinson</td>
<td>Senior Program Officer, Digital Design for Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>Sara Boettiger</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Michael Gort</td>
<td>Deputy Permanent Representative to the Food and Agriculture Agencies of the U.N. (Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Rebecca Smart</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mushtaq Ahmed</td>
<td>Senior Governance and Economics Specialist, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Lubiao Zhang</td>
<td>Director General, Department of International Cooperation, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Wenbo Liu</td>
<td>Project Officer, Department of International Cooperation, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Consortium Board</td>
<td>Carlos Pérez del Castillo</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Consortium Office</td>
<td>Frank Rijsberman</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Karsten Peter Nielsen</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, Technical Advisory Services, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Bernard Rey</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Unit, C1 - Rural Development, Food Security and Nutrition, European Commission - DG DEVCO Development and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>David Radcliffe</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, European Commission - DG DEVCO Development and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Juergen Anthofer</td>
<td>Executive Secretary, European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Jean-Pierre Halkin</td>
<td>Head of Unit Rural Development, Food &amp; Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Joachim Knoth</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Ren Wang</td>
<td>Assistant Director General, Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Karin Nichterlein</td>
<td>Agricultural Research Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Inia Batikoto Seruiratu</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Rural &amp; Maritime Development and National Disaster Management, Republic of Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Laura Torvinen</td>
<td>Director, Unit for Development Financing Institutions, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Christian Lindholm</td>
<td>Counsellor, Unit for Development Financing Institutions, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Bernard Hubert</td>
<td>President, Agropolis International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Philippe Petithuguenin</td>
<td>Deputy Director General – Research &amp; Strategy, CIRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Michel Trebel</td>
<td>CRAI Executive Secretary, Ministry of Natural Education, Higher Education and Research, Department for European and International Affairs, Service Strategy, Directorate General for Research and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Stefan Schmitz</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner German initiative &quot;One World - No Hunger&quot;, BMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Wolfgang Kasten</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager, GIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Michel Bernhardt</td>
<td>Research Advisor at Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Juan Lucas Restrepo Ibiza</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Mark Holderness</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Harry Palmier</td>
<td>Senior Partnerships Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Global Crop Diversity Trust</td>
<td>Charlotte Lusty</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Heifer International</td>
<td>Geneti Nemera</td>
<td>Southern Africa Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>Jean Lebel</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>John McIntire</td>
<td>Associate VP/Program Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>Shantanu Mathur</td>
<td>Head, Quality Assurance and Grants Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Mojtaba Rajab Beigi</td>
<td>General Director of the International Scientific Relationship Office of Agricultural Research and Extension Organization (AREEO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Earnan O’ Cleirigh</td>
<td>Senior Development Specialist and Policy Lead, Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Cathal O’Donoghue</td>
<td>Head, Rural Economy and Development Programme, Teagasc, the Irish Agriculture and Food Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>IEA</td>
<td>Rachel Bedouin</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>IEA</td>
<td>Sirkka Immonen</td>
<td>Senior Evaluation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>ISPC</td>
<td>Maggie Gill</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>ISPC</td>
<td>Peter Gardiner</td>
<td>Executive Director, ISPC Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mauro Ghirotti</td>
<td>Senior Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Tsutomu Koizumi</td>
<td>Minister of the Mission of Japan to the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yasukazu Hosen</td>
<td>Alternate, Deputy Director of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Kazuyuki Shimamura</td>
<td>Chief for Agriculture, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Japan Global Issues Cooperation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Miguel Marques</td>
<td>Alternate Director, Belgium/Luxembourg/Slovenia, EBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Jorge Rueda Souza</td>
<td>Agricultural Minister Counselor, Mexican Embassy in Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Wijnand van Ijssel</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Vicki Poole</td>
<td>First Secretary (Development, Agriculture) New Zealand Embassy in Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Yusuf Abubakar</td>
<td>Executive Secretary, Agricultural Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Inger Naess</td>
<td>Senior Adviser at the MFA, the Division of Development, Climate and Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Daniel Van Gilst</td>
<td>Senior Agriculture Adviser, Norad; Chair, EIARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Digna L. Sandoval</td>
<td>Head of Institutional Development Division, Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Pavel Evseev</td>
<td>Head of the International development assistance division of Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Tatiana Simakova</td>
<td>Department for International Financial Affairs, Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>María Antonia Rodríguez Parrilla</td>
<td>Head of the Department of Multilateral Relations INIA (Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Anna Maria Oltorp</td>
<td>Head of the Research Cooperation Unit, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Maria-Teresa Bejarano</td>
<td>Research Cooperation Unit, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Philip Chiverton</td>
<td>Research Secretary, Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Peter Bieler</td>
<td>Head, Global Program Food Security, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Carmen Thonnissen</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Syngenta Foundation for Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>Marco Ferroni</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Masum Burak</td>
<td>Director General, General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policies, Turkish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Alan Tollervey</td>
<td>Advisor, DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Hugh McGhie</td>
<td>DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Robert Bertram</td>
<td>Chief Scientist, Bureau for Food Security, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Eric Witte</td>
<td>International Affairs Specialist, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Chris Ryder</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant General Counsel, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Juergen Voegele</td>
<td>Senior Director, Agriculture Global Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Andrea Stumpf</td>
<td>Lead Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>World Bank/Trustee</td>
<td>Pamela Crivelli</td>
<td>Lead Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Office Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fund Office</th>
<th>Antony Kalm</th>
<th>Senior Partnership Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Fund Office</td>
<td>Lynn Brown</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Fund Office</td>
<td>Maxine Garvey</td>
<td>Senior Operations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Fund Office</td>
<td>Michele Pietrowski</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>