

Draft Minutes of the CDC Meeting
Washington, D. C., October 1995

November 16, 1995

Contents

1. Participants
2. Introduction
3. Main Conclusions and Agreements
4. Detailed Minutes of the Meeting
5. Agenda items
6. Members of CDC Committees

1. Participants

Christian Bonte-Friedheim (ISNAR)	James Ryan (ICRISAT)
Lukas Brader (IITA)	Pedro Sanchez (ICRAF)
Adel El-Beltagy (ICARDA)	Jeffrey Sayer (CIFOR)
Hank Fitzhugh (ILRI)	Grant Scobie (CIAT)
Geoffrey Hawtin (IPGRI)	David Seckler (IIMI)
Per Pinstrup-Andersen (IFPRI)	Eugene Terry (WARDA)
Timothy Reeves (CIMMYT)	Meryl Williams (ICLARM)
George Rothschild (IRRI)	Hubert Zandstra (CIP)

2. Introduction

The CDC meetings were held at the World Bank at the time of International Centers Week (ICW) in October 1995. All Directors General attended the meetings. The main meeting, chaired by Christian Bonte-Friedheim, took place October **26-28**. A wrap-up meeting, chaired by Lukas Brader, was held after the close of ICW on November **3**. Doug Horton, served as secretary for the main meeting; Doyle Baker for the wrap-up meeting. The **21** items in the CDC agenda provide the structure for this set of minutes.

3. Main Conclusions and Agreements

During the CDC meeting, the following agreements were reached:

The CDC Executive Committee will prepare a ~~draft~~ TOR for the CDC to be reviewed at the next CDC meeting (Item 1).

In 1996, ~~as~~ in 1995, each center will be expected to contribute US \$3,000 to the CDC joint expenses account (Item 1).

Centers will be expected to share costs of PARC in proportion to the total budget of each center, ~~as~~ it appears in official documents of the CGIAR Secretariat. In the case of EPI, centers will be billed for their actual use of services. (Item 7).

It was agreed to create a network (REM) for resource mobilization similar to that for PA. A workshop will be organized in 1996, to initiate this activity (Item 7).

The following centers volunteered interns for the Disney exhibition: ICRISAT, ICARDA, IITA, CIMMYT, CIAT, IRRI, ILRI, ICRAF and CIP (Item 7).

It was agreed to hire a PARC consultant to coordinate system-wide public awareness activities for 2 years (one year certain; second year depending on performance). The proposed budget of US \$120,000 per year was accepted. The majority of the CDC members felt that the consultant should be based in Europe, at ISNAR or IPGRI. PARC will recruit the person. The contract will be with the institution where the individual is posted, but would report to the Chair of PARC. If PARC finds an especially attractive candidate who is available to work only in the USA, PARC will consult the CDC Chair before making a final decision (Item 7).

The statement of incomes, expenses and commitments and the budget proposed by PARC for 1996 were approved (Item 7).

Centers working in Angola, Rwanda, Somalia, Mozambique and Eritrea were requested to keep others informed of their activities (Item 8.d.).

In its presentation to ICW, the CDC will make the following policy recommendations. (1) link "factor-oriented" system-wide initiatives to ecoregional programs; (2) implement the agreed concept of including non-traditional NARS (e.g., for forestry and fisheries) in workshops and other activities (Item 8.e.).

Contingent upon funding, a position is to be created at ISNAR for an international scientist to monitor and follow up on ecoregional programs and initiatives. CSE recommends that initially the position be half-time for two years. While housed at ISNAR, the individual should report to Chair of the CSE (Item 8.e.).

The proposal to organize a meeting for Directors and managers to take stock of experiences of ecoregional programs was approved in principle, with the suggestions that Internet conferencing be used to the extent possible and that any workshop or meeting be held only after the monitoring process had been in place for 6-12 months (Item 9).

The CGIAR Chair stated that all centers are welcome to participate in any of the CGIAR's task forces and committees ~~as~~ members or observers (Item 13).

The TOR for the CDDC were approved. (The name should be CDDC, not DDGC.) (Item 14).

It was decided to continue with the practice of having the CDDC review the AIARC report before it comes to the CDC (Item 14).

Three decisions were made to ensure that the CDDC provides more useful inputs for CDC meetings: (a) the CDDC meeting should be held (1 or 2 days) earlier than the CDC meeting, (b) the CDDC should report earlier in the CDC meeting; (c) agendas for the two meetings should be more carefully coordinated to maximize complementarily and avoid duplication of effort (Item 14).

There was a consensus that the CDC should have some role in discussions of the CGIAR Finance Committee (Item 16).

Where possible, electronic conferencing should be used to minimize the number and cost of meeting and workshops. Efforts should also be made to improve the coordination of meetings (Item 18.e.).

As a general rule, the DG of a center wishing to hire an employee of another center should notify the DG of the other center at the time the candidate is short listed (Item 18.f.)

The declining share of Board members from the South was noted with concern. Board Chairs should ask their nominating committees to check the list of board members of all centers, to take some corrective actions so that each donor has at least one member on one Board. (Item 19).

The CDC and CBC Chairs should talk with the Chair of the CG Secretariat to ensure that CG-nominated members are also selected from the South and from small donors (Item 19).

CDC agreed, in the light of supportive comments during ICW-95, that a Centers Forum should be organized for ICW-96. The format will be discussed at MTM-96.

The CDC agreed to pre-finance the IVDN up to US\$200,000 if necessary to avoid a cashflow problem. When this money becomes available through the CG Secretariat, the CDC would expect to receive this money back.

It has not been possible to secure donor commitment for funding a half-time position for the next two year. Instead, the consultant will start working for two to three months. On the basis of progress, the CDC will decide how to proceed.

A concern was expressed about the eventual cost of the Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group. The CDC will want to be kept informed on the plan of action as this group gets started

4. Detailed Minutes of the Meeting

Item 1. Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed Timothy Reeves, who ~~was~~ attending his first CDC meeting, and Grant Scobie who was attending his first CDC meeting since formally taking over ~~as~~ DG of CIAT.

Concern was expressed over trends toward centralization in the CGIAR system on the one hand and fragmentation on the other. Some donors were calling meetings of groups of centers and some centers were holding their own donor support group meetings.

After the first selection for the TAC Executive Secretary had been turned down by the FAO Director General, in the second round there were 80 candidates and a short list of 10. The selection was expected to take place before the end of 1995.

The CGIAR Secretariat recently requested a copy of the TOR for the CDC, and in fact there were none. It was agreed that the CDC Executive Committee would prepare draft TOR to be reviewed at the next CDC meeting.

In 1996, as in 1995, each center would be expected to contribute US \$3,000 to the CDC joint expenses account.

The CDC has established an arrangement with E. Tollens to act ~~as~~ contact person with the European Union.

It was noted that the early departure of several Center Directors from USAID Day had caused a negative impression, and it was urged to avoid overlaps in schedules for the various meetings.

General concern was expressed for the proliferation of meetings of questionable value, which distracted attention from the central purposes of the ICW. Many groups request meetings with CDC, but the general principle is that CDC meetings are for the internal business of the DGs.

The Dutch government has created a new fund with approximately US \$6 million for methodological support to eco-regional programs. The Dutch hope that other donors will contribute to this fund. The first advisory committee meeting will take place during ICW.

Grant Scobie announced that Gustavo Nores was being treated for inoperable lung cancer and that Tom Hargrove had sued CIAT for US \$100 million.

Item 2. Adoption of the agenda

It was agreed to expand the time allocated to Item 7 (PARC) to 2 hours.

Item 3. Approval of the minutes of the meetings in Nairobi

The minutes were approved with one correction on page 10 for Item 10: The CGIAR contribution to the Crawford Fund ~~was~~ not to be treated as confidential, but a request had been made to D. Tribe not to publicize it widely.

Item 4. Matters arising from the minutes

The status and chairing of the Documentation and Information Sub-Committee needed to be reassessed.

Some in the EU had expressed reservations about the effectiveness of E. Tollens.

IPGRI has not yet organized the proposed inter-center meeting on ethical concerns related to genetic resources.

The survey of Center-NGO relations was on hold. Concern was expressed that the newly created NGO and Private Sector Committees of the CGIAR had no center participation. Some NGOs had declined to participate on the grounds that the NGO committee was being set up for publicity purposes, and had no defined role in CGIAR decision making.

The USAID "Research constraints project" announced at the MTM in May, 1995 had not materialized.

Concern was expressed that funding from USAID, and also from European countries, would be increasingly tied to CGIAR collaborative projects with developed-country institutions. The consensus view was that centers should be proactive in seeking collaboration and in presenting an agenda and proposals. The "Green Proposal" should be supported. Concern was also expressed that while partnership was much discussed at USAID Day, a key partner - the NARS -- was absent from the discussions.

CDC should write to thank the organizers of USAID Day for the high-level representation of USAID, and to state the CG's interest in collaboration with US universities. The letter should contain some principles and possible areas for collaboration.

The discussion led to two fundamental issues for the CGIAR:

- e Are the centers fundamentally centers of excellence or catalysts and conveners of research and development efforts?
- e The transactions costs of establishing and maintaining collaborative arrangements with US and European organizations are high; to the extent that centers collaborate with these organizations, it limits the amount of research they can do themselves and the time they have for collaboration with NARS.

Item 5. Meeting with the CGIAR Executive Secretary

A. von der Osten and R. Tadvalkar were both present for the meeting. The discussion related mainly to financing and the resource allocation process.

Financial issues and resource allocation decisions. The DGs raised many questions:

- What are the criteria for defining "core" and "complementary" activities? This decision can have a very significant effect on a center's decisions on whether or not it "can afford" to accept project funding.
- What are the guiding principles for allocating new donor funds? Who decides: TAC? CG Secretariat? Donors?
- What happens if a donor comes with funds for a specific area, that raises funding above the TAC-approved amount for that cell in the matrix?
- Is the "agreed research agenda" a set of activities or a dollar amount in the cells of a matrix?
- Are funds "passed through" centers to NARS or research organizations in the north part of the agreed agenda, or above it?
- "What is the role of center management and the BOT in system-wide programs? There are crucial governance issues.

How can centers respond to the three distinct “masters”: NARS, donors, TAC and the CG Secretariat?

None of these things were answered clearly. The DGs want known criteria and an organized arbitration process. Decisions often seem to be taken after-the-fact, and based on ad hoc criteria.

Mr. Tadvalkar stated that the “Agreed Research Agenda” should expand **as** a proportion of the total budget of CG centers, “until everything is part of it.”

The trend toward more program and project funding brings more restrictions and reduces centers’ flexibility. **As** an example, 70% of ICRAF’s funds are restricted and only **30%** unrestricted; of the unrestricted, 20% are for administration and overhead, leaving only 10% flexible money.

If a center gets new funding but the TAC-approved ceiling is fixed, the effective “tax on fund raising” is 100%. To the extent that the new funding came with restrictions, it could bias the center’s research program away **from** priorities or reduce funds available for general expenses, overhead or administration. Hence, the new funding could cause center problems, causing disincentives for fund raising.

Interest was expressed in mechanisms to protect against exchange rate risks. The Secretariat has already looked into this, and is not optimistic about the prospects, due to the autonomy of centers in receiving donor funds.

Membership drive. A few new countries have joined the CGIAR, and there are discussions with several others in all regions. It was noted that continuity and maintaining countries’ interest in the system was perhaps an even bigger issue than attracting countries in the first place.

“Partnership committees”. There is more progress with the private sector committee than with the NGO committee. In both cases, there is an attempt to have balance in the regions and types of organizations. The TOR’s are vague. It **was** noted that centers work with many important NGOs that are not on the committee.

The issue of the south’s representation on center boards, top management and other governance bodies was discussed. There has been in the CG an unwritten principle that half the members of boards should be from the south. Representation of the south has declined significantly in recent years, and the CG is coming in for criticism for this.

The effect of this on the substance and relevance of centers’ work for NARS was questioned. Nevertheless, the political issue remains, and it may pose a threat to the CG’s image and funding.

Impact assessment and evaluation group. The IAEG will have three part-time high-level professionals: a Chair highly expert in evaluation methodology; a biological scientist and a social scientist. It will have one full-time staff person.

Effectiveness of the CGIAR Secretariat. After the meeting with representatives of the CGIAR Secretariat, members of the CDC expressed concern for the lack of clarity on several points and a certain dissatisfaction with the performance of the Secretariat. Donors do not have a proper oversight mechanism for the CG Secretariat. Some specific problems:

DGs find it difficult to relate the allocations reflected in the funding matrix handed out by the CG Secretariat today with their own knowledge of their center budgets and activities. Apparent contradictions were also found among tables.

Inconsistencies in definitions and presentations related to center and system-wide programs and initiatives in different documents.

Item 6. Preparation for meetings during ICW

6.a. Topics to be discussed with the CGIAR Chair

The CDC should be upbeat, and introduce strategic issues, like the following: (1) beyond renewal: the desirability of a period of consolidation in the CGIAR system; (2) repositioning agriculture (and agricultural research) in the global development agenda; (3) the CGIAR's role in emergency relief efforts; (4) Mr. Serageldin's vision for the role of the World Bank and ESDAR in international agricultural research.

6.b. Topics to be discussed with the TAC Chair

The following topics were proposed: (1) TAC consultations with NARS (narrow definition of NARS); (2) reconciling the research agenda with budget ceilings; (3) requirements for 1997 funding request; (4) the expectations for Center participation in the various TAC meetings; (5) concept of "outsourcing" and assumptions behind it (estimates of cost per scientist); (6) preparation of Medium-Term Plans.

It is understood that there will be one more annual program and budget (P&B) document (for 1997) based on the current MTPs; then new 3-year MTPs are to be prepared by all centers. Are these to be quick-&-dirty pieces or substantial and analytical? Are all 16 centers to prepare a P&B document in 1997 for 1998-2000?

6.c. Topics for the CDC/CBC meeting

Four topics were proposed: (1) AIARC salary and benefits study; (2) board policy paper; (3) scheduling of meetings; (4) board membership

6.d. Topics to be discussed with the WB Executive Directors

Given uncertainty over whether or not this meeting will be held, this topic was not discussed.

6.e. Topics for the CDC statement to ICW

The CDC Chair's presentation should be positive. The following points were proposed:

- After renewal: an agenda for the future
 - Looking forward to new priorities and strategies
 - Operational Modes: e.g., system-wide programs
- Funding: amounts and forms
 - Public awareness: How to become better known?
 - Partnership: we are an open system
- Inclusion of non-traditional NARS (forestry and fisheries)
- Design of system-wide programs to mesh with eco-regional programs
 - The state of Centers: the "re-engineered" centers need a period of consolidation
 - Call for reaffirmation of the role of centers: centers of excellence, or conveners and catalysts
 - The need to link "factor-oriented" system-wide initiatives to ecoregional programs

- The need to implement the agreed concept of including non-traditional NARS (e.g., for forestry and fisheries) in workshops and other activities.

Item 7. PARC

Several documents were distributed, including: (1) a proposal for an exhibit at EPCOT Theme Park; (2) a strategy proposal prepared by Julian Cribb; (3) a statement of income, expenses and commitments; (4) TOR for a public awareness consultant; (5) a proposed budget for 1996. Previously, 2 additional documents had been sent to DG's: one on cost sharing; the other on diversifying funding sources.

Cost sharing. It was agreed to share costs of PARC in proportion to the total budget of each center, **as** it appears in official documents of the CGIAR Secretariat. In the case of EPI, centers will be billed for their actual use of services.

Resource mobilization network. It was agreed to create a network (REM) similar to that for PA, but focusing on resource mobilization. A workshop will be organized in 1996, to initiate this activity.

Events. There will be a "Centers' Day" at the ASA meetings in 1996. W. Collins is the contact person.. Negotiations with FAO concerning the World Food Summit, November 1996, will take place.

Disney proposal. The proposed 6-week exhibit presents a unique opportunity to communicate CG messages to millions of Musketeers. Costs to centers would be small. The request is for centers to send 6 "interns" from the South. The following centers volunteered interns: ICRISAT, ICARDA, IITA, CIMMYT, CIAT, IRRI, ILRI, ICRAF and CIP. The PARC Chair will follow up to select six after discussion with EPCOT.

Strategy. To date the approach has been opportunistic. This is due largely to a lack of implementation capacity. The main focus has been on "high-risk donors," which include Canada, US, Germany, UK, Sweden.

PA consultant. The centers' PA staff have done an outstanding job, but are over-stretched to cover system as well **as** center activities. A PA consultant is needed. It has been concluded that the CG Secretariat definitely cannot serve **as** an effective base for the CDC's PA and resource mobilization activities. The proposal is to locate the consultant in IFPRI, IPGRI, ISNAR or at the inter-center office (AIARC) in Arlington.

It was agreed to hire the proposed consultant for 2 years (one year certain; second year dependent on performance). The proposed budget of US \$120,000 per year was accepted. The majority of CDC members felt that the consultant should be based in Europe, at ISNAR or IPGRI. PARC will recruit the person. The contract will be with the institution where the individual is posted. The person will report to the Chair of PARC. If PARC finds an especially attractive candidate who is available in the USA, PARC will consult the CDC Chair before making a final decision.

Statement of incomes, expenses and commitments and proposed budget for 1996. The statement of incomes, expenses and commitments and the proposed budget for 1996 were approved.

Julian Cribb presentation. The CDC considered the proposed strategy to be very promising, and arranged to have Mr. Cribb present it to the CGIAR Chair later in the day.

Item 8. Reports of CDC committees

8.a. Benefits committee

The Chair noted that so far in 1995, only 6 of the 16 centers had contributed the agreed-upon amount of US \$3,000 to the joint-expenses account.

8.b. Information committee

Reported on by DDGs (Item 14).

8.c. Intellectual property rights committee

The committee's activities have focused on developing a set of "Guiding principles on intellectual property protection related to the distribution and use of enhanced plant-germplasm and biotechnological products." A meeting will be held December 1995 at IPGRI HQ to produce a near-final ~~draft~~, which would be sent to all centers for their review. The Swaminathan Committee would like to review the document in April 1996.

8.d. Sub-Saharan Africa committee

The committee mainly exchanged information on funding prospects in the European Union and the African Development Bank and on a series of USAID-funded activities.

EU. CG involvement in the EU's programming for agricultural research in SSA is slow. Mr. Werblow has been transferred. The new contact is A. Reithinger. The recommendation is for centers to move ahead independently, liaising with host-country EU representatives, regional organizations and NARS.

USAID. CIP, ICRAF and WARDA have obtained "year-end funds" for technology dissemination and e-mail networking activities. The Greater Horn of Africa Initiative is still on the USAID agenda, but prospects for CG funding are unclear. B. Scott and R. von Kaufmann will keep a watching brief on this. The Seeds of Hope is considered highly successful. CIAT is developing a follow-on project, involving 10 countries, but with a much reduced budget.

African Development Bank. A new president has taken office. But funding is unlikely until 1997.

Master plans. ISNAR distributed a draft report on master plans in SSA, and requested comments and additional information.

Inter-center training program. Some progress is being made, but few joint activities have taken place; ICRISAT, IITA and ISNAR are organizing a joint course in Niger.

Countries coming out of disaster. ICRISAT is beginning work in Angola. Centers working in Angola, Rwanda, Somalia, Mozambique and Eritrea were requested to keep others informed of their activities.

Non-research activities. Concern was expressed for the many requests for CGIAR centers to become engaged in non-research activities in SSA. However, such involvement can have very large PR benefits and, where closely linked with a center's core research activities can have additional benefits, such as: introduction of new, center-related technologies in the area. Bringing center scientists into contact with field conditions and emergencies also gives them new perspectives and can enrich their future strategic research activities. Nevertheless, it

would be inappropriate to consider such assistance-related activities **as** part of the agreed research agenda.

8.e. Committee for sustainability and the environment

Comments on TAC's soil, water and nutrient management paper. The paper was considered quite sound, with a few shortcomings: annex 2; use of the term "applied research"; and use of the watershed **as** the *only* paradigm for natural resource management research (overly restrictive, **as** other spatial scales are in some cases appropriate). All DG's should look at the details in Annex 2 to confirm its accuracy.

Feldafing consultation on SWNM. The outcome was positive: no administrative superstructure was created; four themes were linked to ecoregional initiatives.

Policy recommendations. (1) link "factor-oriented" system-wide initiatives to ecoregional programs; (2) implement the agreed concept of including non-traditional NARS (e.g., for forestry and fisheries) in workshops and other activities.

Monitoring ecoregional programs. A position is to be created at ISNAR for an international scientist to monitor and follow up on ecoregional programs and initiatives, CSE recommends that initially the position be half-time for two years. While housed at ISNAR, the individual should report to CSE. Some specific issues to be addressed:

- initial consultations
- followups
- establishment of initiatives
 - operationalization of the program
- linking of ecoregional programs with the "core" work of a center
- relationships between ecoregional and system-wide programs

8.f. Priorities and strategies committee (CDC/CBC/TAC joint committee)

The minutes of the committee's Nairobi meeting were distributed. The committee has scheduled a breakfast meeting on Friday, November 3.

8.g. FAO/IARC task force

FAO now has a standing committee of senior individuals with whom the CDC can relate. Stein Bee will prepare a document on FAO-CGIAR collaboration to the 1996 MTM.

8.h. Plant genetic resources (CDC/TAC joint committee)

It was agreed to dissolve this committee, since it has been superseded by the Swaminathan Committee, which will report to ICW. There was considerable discussion of the recent trend of countries to develop legislation which could restrict research involving, or international movement of, native germplasm. But there was no consensus **as** to what to do about it.

Item 9. Ecoregional initiatives and programs

Actions were proposed in 3 areas:

- Establishment of a formal process for monitoring experiences with ecoregional initiatives and programs
 - A stock-taking meeting of DGs and managers of ecoregional programs
 - Moves toward greater "coincidence" of system-wide and ecoregional programs

It was agreed that a position would be created at ISNAR to monitor ecoregional initiatives and programs. The individual selected would report to the CDC Committee on the Environment and Sustainability.

The second proposal was agreed on in principle, with the suggestions that Internet conferencing should be used to the extent possible and that any workshop or meeting be held only after the monitoring process had been in place for 6-12 months.

DGs were encouraged to foster greater harmonization of ecoregional and system-wide initiatives and programs.

Item 10. The next priority-setting exercise

A list of 12 issues stimulated animated discussion. At some points, the discussion drifted away from priority setting per se to financial issues and management issues related to the move from center-based to system-wide programs.

The current priority-setting approach is radically different from that used in the previous exercise, where a major feature was setting priorities among regions. In the current exercise, no direct attention will be paid to this; instead, regional priorities are to “fall out” of priorities set among undertakings, production sectors, commodities and system-wide initiatives.

There was much *discussion on projects and programs* as units for priority setting. Some points:

- e The TAC approach attempts to set priorities among vaguely defined development priorities rather than among research activities or products.
- e The project should have been used as the basic unit of research among which priorities are set.
- e If the TAC exercise does not provide priorities among concretely defined activities, then centers should probably not invest much in the exercise or in the preparation of MTPs.
- e Unless the TAC exercise provides clear priorities for specific activities, the CG Secretariat will have no objective basis for resource allocations. And this will result in allocations that no DG can relate to, such as those handed out in today’s meeting.
- e The CG Secretariat asks for financial reports on projects grouped by TAC activity. But, in fact, many projects cut across TAC activity categories. Hence, centers need project budgeting systems that allow financial data to be coded and aggregated for the different categories that TAC and the CG Secretariat request reports. For internal management purposes, however, projects do not need to be artificially forced into one or another financial category.
- Is there an appropriate or ideal size (budget) or number of projects in CG centers? The following figures were cited:
 - IPGRI has 52 projects
 - CIMMYT has 30-35 “outputs” and 250 “cost centers.”
 - ILRI has 62 projects
 - e ICRISAT has 22 global core projects and 40-50 complementary projects
- e Core-funded projects are relatively easy to define and manage, but complementary ones fluctuate greatly in size and number.

A “project” is not necessarily a “cost center,” nor does it need to be donor-specific. A center can define its projects the way it wants, and generate reports at different levels of aggregation for donors, the Secretariats, etc.

The TAC procedure for estimating poverty (average national income) is extremely weak.

Despite the various weaknesses of the TAC approach to priority setting, some expressed the view that it might be better to live with these ambiguities than to have a totally clear and methodologically sound procedure that would lead to the centers becoming straight-jacketed by the priorities set.

Item 11. Meeting with the TAC Chair

The various topics proposed by the DGs were introduced and discussed in order. Due to the importance and complexity of the issues and the very short time available, only a few points were covered.

Role of NARS in priority-setting exercise. IFAD, ISNAR and the Ndiritu committee are taking the lead in organizing regional fora; TAC is participating, but does not want to involve itself in organizing the meetings or directing the process.

Project as unit of analysis. The TAC Chair was surprised that center directors would like TAC to set priorities at the project level. His view is that TAC should concern itself with higher-order dimensions (undertakings, sectors, commodities, programs) and that allocations among projects are the domain of the centers themselves. There are issues of: (1) levels of aggregation; (2) variable technical needs, management systems and definitions across centers; (3) TAC's limited capacity to assess options at the project level.

Since all centers are moving to project management, and many have project systems in place, there would be benefits from using more compatible terminology and concepts.

- The four major dimensions of TAC's priority setting exercise are: Undertakings, Sectors, Commodities, and System-wide efforts.

Definitions. In TAC vernacular, system-wide and ecoregional "initiatives" are the design phase of "programs. Cells in the matrix are dollar amounts (rather than approved activities). But if so, priorities will be needed to allocate new funding (over the initially agreed on dollar amount) and to apportion shortfalls in funding. (If, in contrast, cells corresponded to approved activity categories, funding could fluctuate proportionately.)

Unconstrained research. There **was** consensus on the need for "blue sky," "gray sky" and in some cases "rainy-sky" research; the only issue for discussion is how it should be presented by centers and the system: as a single column in a research funding matrix; in separate columns for each program, or not presented at all (folded into programs for purposes of presentation).

Planning cycle. It was reconfirmed, to the displeasure of some DGs, that 1997 would be the last year of single-year funding under the present MTPs, and that in 1997, all centers would need to submit new MTPs with 3-year budgets. Some DG's expressed their opposition to this move.

Concluding comments. In characterizing the complexities of the priority-setting exercise, and drawing on ancient philosophy, Don Winkelmann noted that in this game, "All is but a woven web of guesses."

After the close of the CDC meeting with the TAC Chair, three major concerns were voiced:

- Lack of consultation in reaching major decisions on the system's (and hence the centers') programming cycle (e.g. the new MTP agenda).
- Conceptual problems with the priority-setting exercise

- The extremely short time available for stakeholders consultations (especially NARS) in the priority setting exercise.

Item 12. Centralization of decision-making and servicing the System

The CG System was characterized **as** having itself “convoluted and tied up in little boxes.” Researchers have less and less time for research work, managers have little time to manage and transactions costs of inter-center activities and committees are extremely high.

There is a trend in the CG Secretariat, TAC and the Finance Committee to shift resources from Center Programs to System-wide programs. This trend poses important issues for the roles and responsibilities of BOTs and center management. Centers are losing autonomy and are becoming components of a centrally managed system. “Guidelines” are becoming compliance documents.

There is confusion and concern over the system’s priority-setting and allocation processes. In theory, TAC sets macro priorities, the CG Secretariat defines categories of activities and allocates funds among centers and programs, and centers prioritize and allocate among projects. But in practice the procedures and division of labor are unclear.

The DGs should support the CGIAR Chair in his proposal to organize a review of the CGIAR system in 1997.

Item 13. Meeting with the CGIAR Chair

Mr. Serageldin opened by stating his view that the DGs and the Boards are “the real decision-making structures of the CGIAR,” and that he sees himself **as** the CGIAR’s ambassador. The nature of decision-making is changing all over the world. **So** the process of strengthening the system should not be taken **as** a weakening of centers’ autonomy or responsibility.

Funding and membership. The funding and membership campaigns have been very successful. Funding is well above the \$270 million goal set for the system. The more members we have from the South, the more support we will also have from the North. Nevertheless, CGIAR funding is extremely precarious in a time of dramatically declining funding for ODA in general. “**A**n enormous amount of effort will be required to maintain funding for the system.” The NGO and private sector committees and the IAEG are essential to maintain funding.

Impact assessment and evaluation. The composition of the impact assessment and evaluation group (IAEG) should be announced by the end of ICW. A system-wide evaluation *could* be done in 1997 or later.

E. Europe. The Dutch government has agreed to finance a study of agricultural research needs and opportunities for CGIAR work in Eastern Europe, on the basis of which a fund might be established to finance such work. Two conditions for CGIAR work in the region: (1) comparative advantage; (2) funding outside the agreed research agenda.

ESDAR. The purpose of ESDAR is to leverage World ~~Bank~~ support for agricultural research, including CGIAR-related work. The main block is that Ministers of Finance do not put priority on agricultural research.

Links to the development agenda. The most logical links are to concerns for the environment and poverty; and to thematic issues like forestry, water and marine resources.

ESD meeting. Next year's ESD meeting could focus on agricultural research. It is the week before the WB annual meeting, and has very high-level national **as** well **as** international participation.

Participation of centers in CGIAR committees and task forces. The Mr. Serageldin noted that all centers are welcome to participate in any of the CGIAR's task forces and committees **as** members or observers.

item 14. Report from the CDDC

The issue of how to manage the Information Committee is still unresolved, and the CDC will deal with it under Item 17.

The TOR for the CDDC were approved. (The name should be CDDC, not DDGC.)

An IVDN committee was proposed.

It was decided to continue with the practice of having the CDDC review the AIARC report before it comes to the CDC.

Project management and matrix management issues were discussed (again) J. Ryan was asked to prepare a proposal for the CDC to discuss in its wrap-up meeting. H. Zandstra, G. Rothschild, and G. Scobie were asked to work with T. Reeves in preparing a draft letter to A von der Osten by next Wednesday. The letter would be signed by the CDC chair.

It was decided that if the work of the CDDC was to provide more useful inputs into CDC meetings, the CDDC should meet earlier than the CDC and report to the CDC earlier.

item 15. AIARC Members' meeting

Minutes will be provided by L. Brader.

item 16. Center budgets for 1997 and beyond

A danger of matrix budgeting is the likely increase in the proportion of restricted funding. Another drawback comes from the CG Secretariat's desire to fold **all** donor contributions into the approved agenda. In this case, if a donor is willing to fund something new, a center may not want to, or be able to, accept the money, because it would not increase total funding to the center, but would require diverting resources from other priority activities (or from fixed expense categories, like administration and maintenance).

An often-repeated (unanswered) question: When complementary projects are "folded" into the approved research agenda, will the budget ceiling increase accordingly?

There was a consensus that the CDC should have some role in discussions of the CGIAR Finance Committee.

Discussion returned to the topic of planning periods. Some points:

- "How can you plan for a strategic research institute on a 3-year basis"?
- How would a 3-year planning cycle mesh with the 5-year external review cycle?
- Integration of the two planning processes:
 - Research planning
 - Preparation of P&B documents (administrative planning)
- Harmonization of:
 - System priorities (developed by TAC and the CG Secretariat)
 - Center priorities (proposed in centers' MTPs)

It was noted that all centers need: (1) a strategy; (2) a more specific medium-term plan; and (3) an annual plan. But for research planning purposes centers' MTPs need not all be 3-year plans.

Some important points to discuss with TAC:

- o Translation of system priorities into center priorities
- o Relationships between research planning and budgeting
- o The process of adjusting center budgets to the approved research agenda
- o Relations between external review, research planning and budgeting cycles

It was noted that during the CDC meetings, a great deal of time goes into discussing various aspects of matrix and project management, priority setting and planning, but closure is not reached. TAC and the CG Secretariat (on one hand) and the centers (on the other) are talking past each other. TAC and the CG Secretariat are concerned with planning and setting priorities for system-wide programs; each center is primarily concerned with planning and carrying out its own activities. The challenge for centers is how to fit their activities into viable system-wide programs.

Item 17. Elections of CDC Chair and members of Sub-Committees

CDC committee membership for the period October 1995-October 1996 is indicated in the attached table.

For the sake of simplicity, and following actual usage by most CDC members, in future the CDC Sub-committees will be called "CDC Committees."

It was decided to reverse the decision taken at the last CDC meeting (Nairobi, May 1995) concerning the Information Committee (Draft minutes, page 1, para 4), and to continue with a CDC Information Committee. This committee will rely on the DDGs and on information specialists in various centers for technical work and backstopping. The CDC Information Committee would decide on the advisability of creating the IVDN Committee proposed by the CDDC.

Given the difficulties of calling the Joint CDC/CBC/TAC Committee on Priorities and Strategies, it was decided to resurrect the CDC committee dealing with this topic,

Item 18. Other business

78.a. Inter-center working group on impact assessment and evaluation

A meeting of the working group was held October 24 at IFPRI, with participation of 10 centers. It was deemed premature to determine the committee's TOR before the IAEG was established. **An** executive committee was established (D. Baker, P. Pardey, D. Horton) to interact with the IAEG and begin electronic conferencing. It was proposed to hold a system-wide workshop on impact assessment and evaluation next year, perhaps in April, to synthesize experiences to date, identify gaps and develop a consensus for future actions. Hopefully, proposals could be brought to the 1996 MTM for both the IAEG and the ICWG.

78.b. Improvement of the CDC

A few years ago, the CDC held a retreat in Annapolis, with meetings facilitated by a management consultant. Important decisions were taken about how the CDC should operate, but they have not been respected. The Annapolis outcomes should be circulated to all DG's since many are new since then.

Some suggestions for improvement:

- Discuss only topics of strategic importance, like system governance, system services, and PARC.
- Delegate more to CDDC.
- Keep meetings shorter.
- Keep reports short.
- Use the proposed Agenda Item Information Sheets.
- Avoid duplication with the agenda of the CDDC.
- Be more output oriented.

18.c. CDDC

Operation of the CDDC has improved over time, and the work done on numerous topics is clearly of use to the CDC. Yet, it would be desirable to clarify the role of the CDDC, in relation to the CDC, and to delegate more authority and responsibilities to the CDDC.

The CDC often delegates administrative responsibilities, but many members of the CDDC do not work in administration. Hence, to be effective in dealing with such issues, the CDDC should draw on other center staff members.

It is most useful when the CDDC presents the CDC with options and recommendations for action. To accomplish this and to be useful for CDC's deliberations, the CDDC should meet earlier and report earlier in the CDC meeting.

18.d. Improvement in ICW

Discussion was mainly on the desirability of holding donor support group meetings during ICW. Views varied considerably, and no consensus was reached on some aspects of the topic. There was consensus that there were many legitimate reasons for a center to call a donor meetings during ICW (for example at the time of an emergency, a major transition or a significant new initiative). Donors often call their own meetings with centers. The special case of IFPRI, due to its location in Washington, was also noted.

18.e. Transaction costs of inter-center collaboration

Where possible, electronic conferencing should be used to minimize the number and expense of meeting and workshops. Efforts should also be made to improve the coordination of meetings.

18.f. Communications among DGs when a center wishes to hire an employee of another center

It was agreed that, as a general rule, the DG of a center wishing to hire an employee of another center should notify the DG of the other center at the time the candidate is short listed.

18.g. NGOs

Should centers seek to have NGO representatives on the BOT? While it is generally seen important to seek effective collaboration with NGOs in various ways, CDC members stressed the importance of centers not beginning to operate as inter-governmental organizations, with strong concerns for representation of different groups.

Item 19. Joint CDC/CBC meeting

AIARC Salaries and benefits study. This will cover international staff only. It will include estimates of the value of in-kind benefits. A progress report will be presented at the 1996 MTM.

Board policy paper. This paper is one of several guidelines papers being prepared by the CG Secretariat for boards; it has been prepared in response to questions of the Oversight Committee **as** to the effectiveness of Boards and their relations to DG. **This** second draft is much improved, but has several shortcomings: It's tone is inappropriate, **as** if directives were being given. It is somewhat incomplete. There are factual errors. It is ~~probably~~ inappropriate to call this paper a "CGIAR Policy Paper."

The consensus was that the guidelines being prepared should state principles of board responsibilities and functions, but should not give operating procedures, because each board has already established its mode of operation. The point should not be *how it operates*, but with what *effectiveness and efficiency*. Hence, it would be useful if the guidelines could present some performance indicators for boards. Board performance should also be reviewed as a standard feature of EPMRs.

Although the paper had many weaknesses, it might be better for the CBC not to prepare a formal comment and suggestions for improvement, because then it might be seen **as** agreed upon by the CBC, and binding. It would be better to keep it as a CG Secretariat document, that could be used by boards **as** they see fit, **as** guidelines. The CBC will take up the matter with the Chair of the Oversight Committee.

Schedule of meetings. The new cycle of planning and budget preparation requires centers and boards to prepare plans and budgets in the first 3 months of the year, just when they must also produce and sign off on audited accounting reports.

Board membership. Small donors and members from the South are poorly represented on boards. Board Chairs should ask their nominating committees to check the list of board members of all centers, to take some corrective actions so that each donor has at least one member on one board.

The CDC and CBC Chairs should talk with the Chair of the CG Secretariat ensure that CG-nominated members are also selected from the South and from small donors.

Involvement of DGs on Boards. There is variation among centers. In most cases the DG does not participate in the audit committee; in some cases not in the program or nominating committees. Boards should not be expected to have uniform practices.

Item 20. Lunch of CDC with WB Executive Directors

No minutes were taken.

Item 21. CDC Wrap-up session

G. Rothschild, P. Sanchez and P. Seckler were absent. Minutes for the main meeting were circulated for comments during ICW. It was requested that additional comments be sent to Bonte-Friedheim. Approval will be at MTM-96.

21.a. TAC planning and timetable.

A brief discussion was held with the TAC Chair to help clarify TAC's planning strategy and timetable. The following points were covered:

Rolling three-year budgets are needed for TAC financial planning, but this does not preclude longer-term center planning for research. TAC welcomes longer-term center plans, which can serve as basis for preparing rolling budget proposals. However, medium term planning during 1996/1997 will relate to the three-year rolling budget cycle for 1998-2000.

Submissions to TAC in March must include a budget and narrative for 1997. Centers should include estimated 1995 spending and an updated budget and narrative for 1996.

TAC and donors would like to see greater consistency in project definition across centers. The TAC Chair said that he would expect to see 30-50 projects for large centers. TAC will have a consultant review current projects and make recommendations on harmonization. The TAC Chair agreed that center involvement is important, and said he would welcome notes from each center characterizing the process used to define and develop projects.

The CDC asked TAC to provide feedback during the December TAC meeting, to help with 1997 planning. The TAC Chair was uncertain of TAC progress by that time. Several center directors will be in Nairobi during the TAC meeting, and will arrange for a meeting at that time on behalf of CDC.

The TAC Chair expects TAC to take a stance that off-agenda bilateral activities must be submitted to TAC for endorsement. TAC would focus on two issues: (a) Should these be incorporated into the agenda? (b) If not, why are these being done? In either case, TAC would want to ensure that all overheads are covered.

The CDC advised the TAC Chair against this approach, and suggested that TAC set up principles and criteria to help centers make appropriate determinations. The TAC Chair requested notes from the centers as a starting point for discussion.

The issue of including training as a separate component of the agenda was briefly discussed without resolution.

Systemwide programs should be included in 1996 submissions, along with institute projects, even though the former are not yet in the matrix. The CDC requested clarification from TAC on how and when programs will move in and out of the matrix, and implications for funding continuity.

21.b. Briefing by Japan Representative

The representative from Japan, Mr. Nakamura, gave a valuable briefing covering the timetable for Japanese financial planning, expectations for use of the CGIAR agenda and matrix, and assistance available through Ministry of Foreign Affairs for accessing technologies and scientists. Center Directors received hand-written confidential notes. The main points raised were:

Projects approaches should be harmonized across the system.

During ICW, Japan got many questions on Japanese financial systems.

For 1997, Japan will fund only projects which are approved and included in the CGIAR agenda as institute projects or systemwide programs. A complete list of endorsed projects is needed by May to conform with Japanese budgeting cycle. Japan expects to earmark selected high priority projects, but most funds will continue to be made available for allocation by centers in accordance with the approved agenda. Disbursement to centers will continue as in the past.

Japan would expect to maintain continuity in support of earmarked projects, but does not use multi-year financial planning.

Funding requests should be sent through the appropriate local embassy. Proposals for JIRCAS and JICA collaboration also should be sent through embassy attachés.

Centers can receive help in recruiting by sending notices directly to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. These notices will be widely distributed. Centers also are welcome to send notices directly to Japanese nationals in foreign universities and international organizations.

21.c. Priorities and Strategies Committee

Jim Ryan reported on discussions held during ICW-95 by the committee and the TAC Chair. Several issues were discussed with only modest success in improving clarity:

- **Projects.** Definitional issues remain, particularly for aggregation. Even after harmonization and aggregation, the TAC does not expect to rank individual projects.
- **Priorities for undertakings.** TAC expects to determine undertaking priorities only a global level, for the overall agenda. TAC does not yet know how this will be done.
- **Priorities for systemwide programs.** TAC expects to evaluate priorities for systemwide programs based on outputs. TAC intends to consider systemwide program priorities when assessing institute priorities, but it was not yet clear how this would be done.
- **Center allocations.** The committee was unable to get a clear statement on whether TAC intends to move away from center allocations.
- **Poverty.** The committee asked TAC to reinforce efforts to clarify use of poverty in priority setting, and recommended that TAC specifically address linkages between productivity and poverty alleviation.
- **Dollar allocation.** TAC intends to derive a dollar value resource allocation through the upcoming priority setting exercise.
- **Unconstrained column.** TAC has not taken a decision on this but currently is leaning toward not having an unconstrained column.
- **Priority setting spreadsheet.** TAC might use spreadsheets for internal analysis but does not intend to distribute publicly as basis for priority setting.
- **TAC role in regional fora.** The committee had urged the TAC Chair to ensure that a clear statement is made to regional fora at the beginning of deliberations stressing that the mission of the CGIAR related to international public goods. The committee was uncertain whether TAC would follow up on this recommendation.
- **Multiple undertaking projects.** The committee again expressed concern about the requirement that projects be linked to a single CGIAR undertaking category.

21.d. PARC

Per Pinstrup-Andersen gave a quick briefing on two issues:

Public awareness consultant. The preference is still to base this person in Europe.

Disney collaboration. Disney welcomes use of CGIAR identity. They need props, and advice from various centers on themes. A total of six interns should be provided by the centers. The deadline for interns is to be in Florida on January 1. Centers will be expected to pay travel, salary, and any personal support at their discretion. Disney will pay lodging and food. Interns must be nationals **from** a developing country, with a degree in agriculture and strong English communication skills. Interns should be quite knowledgeable of center from where they come. Disney will accept interns for a minimum of **3** months but want interns to stay six months if possible. It might be possible to rate after three months. The focus of the internship will be public relations skills.

Eight centers expressed interest: CIAT, IITA, ILRI, ICRISAT, ICARDA, CIFOR, CIP and CIMMYT. Center directors should let the PARC Chair know **as soon as** possible whether it has been possible to identify and appropriate intern.

21.e. Centers Forum

CDC agreed, in the light of supportive comments during ICW-95, that a Centers Forum should be organized for ICW-96. The format will be discussed at MTM-96.

21.f. Dates of future meetings

The following dates were accepted for meetings in relation to MTM-96:

- 17-18 May: NARS consultation meeting
- 17 and 19 May: Committee meetings, in the evening if necessary
- 19 May: CDC meeting
- 20-22 May: MTM-96

An agenda will be sent out around two months before, in March. At that time, directors interested in addressing specific issues are encouraged to circulate email messages to begin interaction.

21.g. European Union

The European Union does not have a framework which easily relates to the CGIAR matrix. Most directs agreed that the best strategy at this time is to collaborate on development of a few large projects for the home countries. Recent discussions have indicated that the EU does view training **as** a high priority. Directors agreed that this might be **an** opportunity to fund an inter-center training program. When developing proposals, centers should work closely with delegations in host countries.

21.h. SACCAR meeting

Tim Reeves will soon attend a SACCAR planning meeting. He would like ideas from other directors on what intercenter activities might be appropriate for presentation to SACCAR.

21.i. IVDN

The CDC agreed to pre-finance the IVDN up to US\$200,000 if necessary to avoid a cashflow problem. When this money becomes available through the CG Secretariat, the CDC would expect to receive this money back.

21.j. Consultant to study systemwide programs

It has not been possible to secure donor commitment for funding a half-time position for the next two year. Instead, the consultant will ~~start~~ working for two to three months. On the basis of progress, the CDC will decide how to proceed.

Item 21.k. IAEG

A concern ~~was~~ expressed about the eventual cost of the Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group. The CDC will want to be kept informed on the plan of action ~~as~~ this group gets started

6. CDC Committee Membership October 1995 - October 1996

Executive Committee	Brader (Chair) Zandstra Bonte-Friedheim
Benefits Committee	Brader (Chair) Reeves
Information Committee	Rothschild (Chair) Hawtin Seckler
Public Awareness and Resource Committee	Anderson (Chair) Hawtin Terry Zandstra
Intellectual Property Rights Committee	Reeves (Chair) Brader El-Beltagy Hawtin Rothschild Ryan Williams
Sub-Saharan Africa Committee	Fitzhugh (Chair) Bonte-Friedheim Brader Sanchez Scobie Ryan Terry
Committee for Sustainability and the Environment	Sanchez (Chair) El-Beltagy Reeves Sayer Scobie Seckler Williams Zandstra
Priorities and Strategies Committee	Ryan (Chair) El-Beltagy Rothschild Scobie Terry Williams
FAO/IARC Task Force	Hawtin (Chair) Bonte-Friedheim Brader Sayer Williams

Decision Summary for CDC from Intercenter Working Group on Impact Assessment

Meeting: 24 October
Centers: IFPRI, ISNAR, IPGRI, CIP, WARDA, ILRI, ICRAF, CIMMYT, CIAT, IITA

Function of inter-center component:

- a) stimulate information sharing among on impact assessment.
- b) harmonize data generation and analysis methodology
- c) interact with IAEG to determine what is doable for system-level

Working group terms of reference:

- a) Cannot be prepared until IAEG appointed and have terms of reference
- b) Not yet year that there is sufficient basis to form a standing inter-center working group; suggest that proposal on this prepared for CDC at MTM.

Modalities:

- a) Interim task force (Baker, Pardey, Horton)
 - 1) Pardey - liaison with Secretariat and IAEG
 - 2) Horton - coordinate electronic conferencing
 - 3) Baker - convene, reporting to CDC, updates to center representatives
- b) Center representatives
 - 1) Communication and action focal points
 - 2) Expert input for methodology harmonization
 - 3) Center input on priorities for system level studies
 - 4) Stimulate center activities; organize center-level IA group

Follow-up actions:

- a) Electronic conferencing:
 - 1) center activities, priorities and interests
 - 2) methodological approaches for difficult issues
- b) Task force meeting with IAEG in February:
 - 1) review needs and strategies
 - 2) discuss terms of reference and starting priorities
- c) Inter-center workshop with IAEG in April:
 - 1) Synthesis of centers' progress and interests
 - 2) Review of outstanding problems for impact assessment
 - 3) Consensus on approach system impact assessment and evaluation
- d) Report back to CDC at MTM in May.