

## REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

### Purpose:

This document presents the Report of the Consortium Board's Twenty-First Meeting (Virtual) held on 29 July 2015.

- **Agenda items.** The meeting comprised the 7 agenda items set out in the table of contents on the following page.
- **Decisions.** This report presents the official record of the meeting including the 2 decisions adopted by the Board, as set out in full text in Annex 1.
- **Participants.** The participant list is set out at Annex 2.
- **Next Board Meeting.** The Twenty-Second Consortium Board meeting will be held on 1-2 November 2015 in Washington DC, USA, to coincide with the timing of the FC14 Meeting.

This report was approved by the Consortium Board at its Twenty-Second Meeting, 1 – 2 November 2015 (CB/B22/DP03).

## Contents

AGENDA ITEM 1 - OPENING REMARKS .....	2
AGENDA ITEM 2 – UPDATE ON PRE-PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT .....	2
AGENDA ITEM 3 – TRANSITION, CRP 2016 FUNDING AND RM DISCUSSION .....	5
AGENDA ITEM 4 – BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP UPDATES .....	6
AGENDA ITEM 5 – IEA CRP EVALUATIONS – CONSORTIUM MANAGEMENT RESPONSES.....	7
AGENDA ITEM 7 – OTHER BUSINESS.....	9
ANNEX 1 .....	10
ANNEX 2 .....	11

## Agenda Item 1 - Opening remarks

1. Lynn Haight (Chair) welcomed board colleagues, participants and observers, beginning the meeting by inviting comments or additions to the Indicative Agenda issued earlier, and drawing attention to a proposed revised order of discussions.
2. **Decision:** The Board approves the Agenda (CB/B21/DP1).

## Agenda Item 2 – Update on pre-proposal development

3. To open the discussion, the Chief Science Officer provided an overview of the two step process for the optional review of the ‘draft 0’ pre-proposals, should those developing the proposals wish to take the offer up (with no obligation on people developing these to send them at this stage). He shared that the offer was open to 31 July, with members of the Science, Programs and Partnerships Committee (SPPC) and other Consortium Board members agreeing to meet in closed session on a virtual basis on 27 July and 31 July 2015.
4. It was noted that the two-step process involved an expanded Consortium Office (CO) Science Team preliminary review, and those inputs being fed into the SPPC discussions.
5. Before providing a summary of some of the common points coming from that review, the SPPC Chair confirmed that it had been agreed before beginning the informal review process that any SPPC member with a potential Conflict of Interest would not take part. For this reason, Bas Bouman (CRP representative, and voting SPPC member) and Tony Simons (Center DG representative, and voting SPPC member) would not participate, and Chandra Madramootoo (Center Board Chair, and voting SPPC member) would not take part in any discussion that included any ICRISAT supported submission.

6. The SPPC Chair also expressed her thanks to the CO Science team for the quality of the work in aiding the SPPC review process, particularly noting the volume of work involved due to the larger than expected size of pre-proposals, with maximum limits not having been adhered to in the documents seen to date.
7. Respecting the SPPC's internal agreement that CRP specific feedback would go only to the CRP drafting team in question, the following more generic points were shared for Board information:
  - a. As expected so early in the process, the various drafts were at different levels of maturity and quality at this stage;
  - b. An earlier common theme was that there was greater scope in the majority of the pre-proposals to focus on systematic approaches;
  - c. Also emerging was the opportunity to more clearly explore the full spectrum of partnerships, and develop more fully Theories of Change;
  - d. As pre-proposals were developed, there was the opportunity to refer back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Call Pre-Proposals Guidance on the ways to ensure effective governance; and
  - e. Where the 2016 – 2022 implementation phase appeared to call for an increase in budget relative to earlier interventions, there would need to be greater attention to addressing value for money questions.
8. Following the introduction, Board colleagues made a number of observations as follows:
  - a. Providing more detailed guidance on how value for money would be addressed at this stage may be helpful for those producing the pre-proposals and full proposals, including scenarios of what could be achieved at different levels of funding.
  - b. From the perspective of those with better knowledge of what's taking place at the drafting level, perhaps it would be helpful to have even more clarity on the required governance arrangements, to step back from too much focus on who may be sitting on management committees, and put more focus back on scientific competency?
  - c. Producing a pre-proposal that truly addresses site integration across CRPs is difficult in the very short timeframe available, and that there may be a better time for site integration to be considered.
  - d. The language, particularly use of acronyms, does not make drafts as readable as they could be to those outside the CRPs themselves.
  - e. Climate change may also not be sufficiently addressed, and given the increased importance of agriculture in the climate change negotiations, and the emergence of the Green Climate Fund as one of the few sources of fresh funding, this is important to correct.

- f. Proposals could better enunciate what is different from before and partnerships.
- 9. On the budgetary guidance and value for money questions, the Consortium CEO and SPPC Chair confirmed that a clear decision was made during the development of the 2nd Call Pre-proposals Guidance document to stay at a higher level, and ask pre-proposals to make a clear assertion on how priorities would be chosen and to make a value for money proposal in terms of how they contribute to achievement of 2016 – 2030 SRF targets. Following submission of the pre-proposals the Consortium Office will undertake a “value-for-money” evaluation of the pre-proposals as one input to prepare the Consortium’s overall recommendations for the Fund Council to allocate CRP2 budgets in line with expected resource mobilization scenarios. A science quality review will also be undertaken and discussed at Committee level before formally coming to the Consortium Board. At the full proposal stage there is therefore expected to be detailed guidance on budget preparation as well as overall budget envelopes available for each approved pre-proposal. For the value for money exercise, the Consortium Office will undertake its analysis based on the pre-proposals submitted and will then propose additional detailed guidance in the “Full-Proposal-Guidance” document.
- 10. The SPPC Chair also re-confirmed that the purpose of the SPPC pre-review was to provide an opportunity for those preparing the proposals to have some informal thoughts and insights from experienced individuals not on the drafting team. She reiterated it was not a decision making function. Recognizing that some CRPs are starting from the ground up rather than expanding on existing concept, a number of Board colleagues supported the proposition that innovation should not be penalized at this time, just because it is not as well-developed at this point. Instead, constructive honest feedback would add more value now, in advance of more formal SPPC feedback after the pre-proposals were submitted with the amended deadline of 12:00pm Montpellier, France time on Monday 17 August 2015.
- 11. On other points raised, the Consortium CEO noted that:
  - a. the required governance arrangements are those agreed among Centers, Consortium and Fund Council following the IEA review of governance and management, as summarized in the Pre-Proposal Guidance; and
  - b. The pre-proposals are asked to list the countries for which each CRP expects to engage in site-integration during the full proposal stage.
- 12. It was also confirmed that all responses do not automatically confer upon the authors the right to have their preproposal sent forward to the next stage, and that this fact was clearly understood.

### Agenda Item 3 – Transition, CRP 2016 funding and RM Discussion

13. To introduce the agenda item, the Chair referred to a letter of 23 July 2015 sent on behalf of the Consortium Board to Rachel Kyte (Fund Council Chair) and World Bank senior leadership regarding the need for much earlier than usual confirmation on the status of CRP funding for 2016. She added that the Head of the Fund Office, Jonathan Wadsworth, had agreed to reach out to the Fund Council to stress the need for a firmer than usual resource statement by the end of Q3, to be followed by confirmed information in November 2015 following the FC14 meeting. The Head of the Fund Office confirmed that these conversations had begun.
14. Noting that the recent appointments at the World Bank may result in some changes for the leadership of the Fund Council, the Chair confirmed she had asked for a meeting with relevant stakeholders as soon as possible, and called on the Head of the Fund Office to assist to clarify the situation too.
15. With regards to the evolving transition plan, the Chair reported that frequent communication had taken place over recent days with Patricia Bliss-Guest (the Core Team lead), who has confirmed that a new draft of the Transition Plan has now been approved by the Fund Council Governance Committee. However, at the Consortium Board Chair's request, the release of the proposed final plan to the Fund Council has been held back until after the Consortium Board call, to determine whether the Center representatives (Tony Simons or Chandra Madramootoo) could confirm that the Centers' had made a submission regarding the earlier draft, and had received feedback. The Board Chair confirmed that she would, immediately following the end of the Board call, convey the status (no new information) to Patricia Bliss-Guest, so that the final draft transition plan could be issued to the Fund Council. Unfortunately, neither Tony Simons nor Chandra Madramootoo could be on the call, and therefore the Board had to proceed in any case. (*Board Chair Update*: two letters have been subsequently been sent to the Fund Council Chair from the Consortium Board on the subject of the Transition Plan, and copied to all Board colleagues).
16. On Resource Mobilization (RM), Alain Vidal (CO) and Jonathan Wadsworth (FO) gave a report on the RM strategy that is being developed under the leadership of the Fund Office in close collaboration and partnership with the Consortium Office, noting that:
  - a. A RM Community of Practice is scheduled to take place in October 2015 in Nairobi, where the focus will be Centers working together to build a value proposition for the next generation CRPs on a portfolio basis; and
  - b. A consultant, a specialist in multi-year funding, has been contracted and will begin work from 30 July 2015 at the FO to support the joint FO/CO resource mobilization efforts.

17. Ann Tutwiler reported to the Board that a potential opportunity to support the resource mobilization effort has arisen through knowledge that the U.S. Congressional Research Service, an official government support body, has been asked to prepare a briefing paper to the U.S. House of Representatives on the importance of the World Bank's contribution to CGIAR. An offer to support the briefing through information has been provided to Ann for conveyance to the right persons.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Board and Committee membership updates**

18. *Nomination of two new Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) members:* The Nominations and Evaluations Committee (NEC) Chair confirmed that the three CB voting members had confirmed their support of the nomination of two new ARC members, as outlined in the NEC Background Paper (Document 2), and recommended that the Board approve the appointment of the new members.
19. **Decision:** With effect from 1 September 2015, and pursuant to Article 8(4) of the CGIAR Consortium Constitution, the Consortium Board:
  1. Appoints Mr. J. Graham Joscelyne and Ms. Hilary Wild as non-Board member external independent members of the Audit and Risk Committee until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board.
  2. Approves the payment of an honorarium from the Consortium to J. Graham Joscelyne and Hilary Wild, at the same daily rate as they respectively receive for their continuing service on their Boards of Trustees to a maximum of US\$ 4,500 each for the period 1 September – 31 December 2015, and a maximum of US\$ 7,000 each for the period 1 January 2016 -30 June 2016.
  3. Notes that the daily honorarium arrangements may need revision by the Consortium Board if either or both of J. Graham Joscelyne and/or Hilary Wild ceases to serve as a member of a Center Board during their service as an ARC member. (CB/B21/DP2).
20. **Action point:** Klaus Leisinger; head of the ARC; to formally communicate the appointment decision on behalf of the Consortium Board Chair. Consortium Board Chair to brief the new participants.
21. *Update on Board Member terms:* The Chair reported that the majority of independent external members have reconfirmed their commitment continue their service through to July 2016 (the expected transition phase), with one member wishing to leave Committee membership open.

22. **Action point:** The Board Secretary is to write to the Consortium Board's existing Center and CRP Representatives to invite clarity on their continuing roles at the end of the 2015 calendar year.

#### **Agenda Item 5 – IEA CRP Evaluations, Proposed Consortium Management Responses**

23. To introduce the session, the Chair asked the Consortium CEO to speak to the key purpose of the Consortium Management Responses and how these differ from the IEA report, and the CRP Management Responses. The Consortium CEO confirmed that the Consortium Management responses are primarily directed to the Fund Council to:
- a. Respond directly to recommendations made to the Consortium; and
  - b. Comment on whether the lead Center Management Response to the recommendations of the IEA report is satisfactory from an overall perspective,
- with the intention of this information contributing to efforts to maximize the effectiveness of the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of CRPs, from the early 2017 horizon.
24. On the text of the responses themselves, one Board member noted the importance of adding in to the Maize management response additional information on genetics management and environment to stress the importance of a global program director, and clarity in responsibilities.
25. The Board then discussed whether in addition to supporting the forward looking process encompassed in the Consortium Management responses circulated for the meeting, there is a need to take action sooner where concerns have been raised in an IEA report. On the one hand it was noted that a clearly effective way to ensure that recommendations from an IEA report are taken into account is to expressly consider this information when assessing the adequacy of the 2nd round of CRP proposals to ensure that those recommendations are shown to have been taken into account. However it was agreed that it would be important to issue a formal communication from the Consortium Board to a particular lead Center if the circumstances necessitated it, to highlight areas that appear possible and important to address at an earlier time.
26. To mitigate the risk that two separate communications would be released at potentially different times and create confusion (i.e. a management response to the current IEA reviews and then a Consortium Board letter addressing one or two key points), the Board accepted it would not issue the proposed Consortium Management Responses until it had been possible the Chairs of the Committees to determine whether there were one or two stand out important points for attention in the current phase of CRP implementation, rather than wait for 2017 – 2022 implementation period.

27. The Head of the Fund Office/Executive Secretary of the Fund Council observed that the Fund Council looks closely at the Consortium's discharge of its responsibilities, and this would lend itself therefore to the Consortium Board taking up direct communication with relevant Centers if the circumstances arose. He noted, particularly in regard to some of the governance recommendations from the IEA reviews, there may be a reticence for specific Centers to fully implement the recommendations. He observed that it may therefore be beneficial for there to be a direct communication on the need for such recommendations to be taken up.
28. **Action point:** The Consortium CEO to work with the Chairs of the SPPC and Governance and Policy Coordination Committee to discuss where letters might need to be issued where management action is required in the next 18 months, and report back to the Board by 21 August 2015.

#### **Agenda Item 6 – CB Activities to December 2015**

29. *Center BOT Meetings and CB attendance:* Reflecting on Center feedback of current scheduled meetings, the Chair asked whether any Board Members had received invitations to any Center Board Meetings, noting that she has been invited to CIMMYT's Board Meeting but is unable to attend; and therefore also asked if anyone would wish to attend in her place. It was highlighted that:
- a. Paul Zuckerman has been invited to ICRISAT in India in September, and would attend if possible; and
  - b. Marion Guillou has been invited to CIP in Peru in December 2015.
30. Some members highlighted the importance of prioritizing visits, with a possible focus on those Centers where the Board feels that direct engagement may be beneficial, in addition to those where formal invitations had been issued.
31. **Action point:** The Board Secretary to follow up with Board colleagues where they see a particular need for Consortium Board presence at a Center Board meeting, with suggestions being compiled for consideration by the ARC based on additional inputs from the Director of IAU.
32. *Schedule of CB and FC November Meetings:* The Head of the Fund Office proposed that the provisionally scheduled joint CB/FC half-day meeting on 3 November be expanded to a full day joint meeting on that date, with the CRP 2<sup>nd</sup> call pre-proposals and the System Transition as the two agenda items.
33. The Chair noted the suggestion of a full day joint meeting and agreed to respond over the course of the coming weeks once agendas have been more fully established and for further discussion.



## **Agenda Item 7 – Other Business and meeting close**

34. *Directors and Officers Insurance*: The Board Secretary shared an update with the Board on the CGIAR's Directors and Officers Insurance covering the following key points:
- a. The current insurance policy (contracted annually) contains an exclusion for any claim filed in the U.S. or Canada. Nothing that in the ordinary course of events one would not normally expect a claim to be filed in either jurisdiction, the risk was still one that remained possible and a risk to consider. Further, that even in the circumstances of a vexatious claim, defense costs were likely to be incurred in getting such a claim dismissed, or having it moved to a more appropriate jurisdiction.
  - b. Enquiries are underway for a more appropriate policy that can afford worldwide coverage, with some prospect that broader coverage could entail a different annual premium.
  - c. Information arising from the present enquires will be brought to the Board through the ARC.
35. The Chair thanked the Board for their time and closed the meeting

## Decisions of the Consortium Board's Twenty-First Meeting

### Purpose

*This annex sets out the full text of decisions taken by the Consortium Board at its Twenty-First meeting.*

#### **CB/B21/DP01: Approval of the Agenda (Agenda Item 1)**

The Board approves the Agenda.

#### **CB/B21/DP02: Board and Committee Membership Updates (Agenda Item 2)**

With effect from 1 September 2015, and pursuant to Article 8(4) of the CGIAR Consortium Constitution, the Consortium Board:

4. Appoints Mr. J. Graham Joscelyne and Ms. Hilary Wild as non-Board member external independent members of the Audit and Risk Committee until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board.
5. Approves the payment of an honorarium from the Consortium to J. Graham Joscelyne and Hilary Wild, at the same daily rate as they respectively receive for their continuing service on their Boards of Trustees to a maximum of US\$ 4,500 each for the period 1 September – 31 December 2015, and a maximum of US\$ 7,000 each for the period 1 January 2016 -30 June 2016.
6. Notes that the daily honorarium arrangements may need revision by the Consortium Board if either or both of J. Graham Joscelyne and/or Hilary Wild ceases to serve as a member of a Center Board during their service as an ARC member.

**CB21 Participants List**

Attendee	Role
Lynn Haight	Consortium Board Chair
Ganesan Balachander	Board Member
Marion Guillou	Board Member
Molly Jahn	Board Member
Klaus Leisinger	Board Member
Agnes Mwang'ombe	Board Member
Paul Zuckerman	Board Member
Frank Rijsberman	Ex-Officio Board Member
Bas Bouman	CRP Representative
Ann Tutwiler	Centers' DG Representative
Carmen Thönnissen	Observer, Fund Council
Jonathan Wadsworth	Observer, Fund Office
Karmen Bennett	Senior Advisor, Governance/Board Secretary CGIAR Consortium
Wayne Powell	Chief Science Officer, CGIAR Consortium
Pierre Pradal	Director – Internal Audit Unit
Alain Vidal	Director of Strategic Partnerships
Olwen Cussen	Assistant to the Executive Office