

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE SCIENCE COUNCIL

ICARDA, Tel Hadya, Aleppo, Syria

12-15 May 2004

END-OF-MEETING REPORT

SC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

June 2004

Table of Contents

	Page
Agenda Item 1 - Opening Session	1
a) Opening Statement by the SC Chair and Welcome by the Host Institution: ICARDA	1
b) Adoption of the Agenda	1
c) Reports from the SC Chair and the CGIAR Director	1
Agenda Item 2 - Sixth External Programme and Management Review of IRRI	3
Agenda Item 3 - Biosafety Study Report	4
Agenda Item 4 - Towards System Priorities	5
Agenda Item 5 - Report from the Standing Panel on Priorities and Strategies (SPPS)	5
a) Planning System Level Priorities and Strategies	6
b) Food Safety Consideration in CGIAR Research	7
c) Ethics and Science in the CGIAR	7
d) International Public Goods in an Era of IPR	8
e) Genomics Research in the CGIAR	8
f) Animal and Fish Genetic Resources Collection and Conservation	8
g) Social Research in the CGIAR	8
Agenda Item 6 - Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)	9
a) Ongoing Studies	9
b) Proposed Studies	10
Agenda Item 7 - Report from the Standing Panel on Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME)	11
a) Changing Monitoring and Evaluation in the CGIAR System	11
b) Progress Reports from the Challenge Programmes	12
c) Evaluation of the MTPs and the CGIAR Research Agenda	12
d) External Reviews of Centres and SWPs	13
e) Ongoing and Proposed Stripe Reviews	13
Agenda Item 8 - Report from the Standing Panel on Mobilizing Science (SPMS)	14
Agenda Item 9 - Council-wide Activities	14
a) Communication Strategy	14
b) Performance Measurement Working Group Report	15
c) Sub-Saharan Africa Task Force Update	15
Agenda Item 10 - Other Business	16
a) Science Council Consultations with Civil Society Organisations	16
b) GRPC Report	16
c) Coordination of Donor Visits	17
d) Additional Items	17

Agenda Item 11 - Future Meetings, and SC Chair's Closing Remarks	17
SC CLOSED SESSION	18
a) Performance Measurement for SC and Donors	18
b) Seating Arrangements at SC Meetings	18
c) Presentation of Reports at SC Meetings	18
d) Meeting Processes for Effective Dialogue and Outcomes	18
e) SC Member Tasks for CGIAR Charter Drafting and Performance Measurement Working Group	18
f) Standing Panel Chair and Member Assignments	19
g) SC Members Attending AGM	19
h) Time Commitment by SC Members	19
i) SC/SP Members Participation in Other Activities (Boards) and Potential for Conflicts of Interest; Need for Disclosure	19
Annex 1 – List of Participants	
Annex 2 – List of Documents	

Agenda Item 1 - Opening Session

a) Opening Statement by the SC Chair and Welcome by the Host Institution: ICARDA

The SC Chair declared the meeting opened and welcomed SC members, donor representatives, ICARDA Centre staff and other Observers present. While this was the first official meeting of the Science Council, an informal organizational meeting attended by all SC members had been held at FAO in Rome earlier in the year.

The Chair had received regrets from SC member Keiji Kainuma, who was unable to attend due to travel restrictions and from Amir Kassam, Acting Executive Secretary to the SC who, due to serious health problems, was unable to attend. The SC Chair recognized the excellent work done by the Secretariat staff, particularly under the currently constrained situation.

The SC currently enjoys tremendous support and goodwill from within and outside the CGIAR, and expectations are high. The Chair emphasized that the SC would conduct its meetings and business in a transparent and open fashion and, wherever possible, take decisions in open sessions after a round of discussions between SC members and input from Observers. Only issues requiring confidential dialogue and decision making would be brought to the closed session.

On behalf of the entire SC, the Chair expressed his appreciation to ICARDA and especially to Dr. Adel El-Beltagy for agreeing to host this meeting.

Dr. Adel El-Beltagy, Director General of ICARDA extended a very warm welcome to the SC and other participants. He noted that many stakeholders in the CGIAR are looking to the SC with great expectation. The CBC/CDC, in particular, looks forward to an independent SC that will report directly to the Group. He wished the SC a very fruitful and productive meeting and looked forward to showing the Council Members some of the current work of ICARDA scientists on the following day.

b) Adoption of the Agenda

The provisional agenda was approved with the following topics added under Agenda Item 10 “Other Business”: Global Assessments of Strategic Investment Options in Agricultural Technologies and Intellectual Property Policies and Practices in the Life Sciences (two recent papers by Phil Pardey and colleagues). The proposal “The CGIAR Initiative for a Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU)” had been added to the documentation mainly for information. The minutes of the Informal Organizational Meeting of the SC are available at the SC website.

c) Reports from the SC Chair and the CGIAR Director

The SC Chair briefed the Members on developments in the CGIAR System and outside that are relevant to the work of the Council. Five Standing Panel (SP) members have recently been appointed and will begin their two-year terms from 1 July 2004. They are Ray Martorell (Honduras) and Chris Barrett (USA) to serve on the standing panel on priorities and strategies (SPPS), Beatriz del Rosario (Philippines) and Leslie Cooksy (USA) to serve

on the standing panel on monitoring and evaluation (SPME) and Maggie Gill (UK) and one other (not-yet-identified) to serve on the standing panel on mobilizing science (SPMS). The fourth standing panel on impact assessment (SPIA) is continuing with members Hermann Waibel (Germany) and Ruben Echeverria (Uruguay). SPIA's chair, Hans Gregersen is an ex-officio SC member appointed by the SC Chair in consultation with ExCo.

With respect to the Executive Director position in the SC Secretariat, the Search Committee chaired by the SC Chair and the Assistant Director General (SD) at FAO would be interviewing 5 short-listed candidates on 25 May, 2004 at FAO. The appointment will be made by the FAO Director General based on the recommendation from the Search Committee.

The SC Chair had participated in the recent CBC/CDC meeting held two weeks ago at ICARDA and in the ExCo meeting held in Montpellier in France during the week before. The CGIAR Director would report on the main outcomes of the ExCo meeting but the SC Chair briefly touched on the highlights which included:

- ExCo's approval of the SC's workplan and budget for 2004-2005;
- Future role of the ExCo's Programme Committee - appears to be limited, if any;
- Impressive, substantive debate within the ExCo on key issues;
- Possible re-scheduling AGM to allow a better sequence of SC-ExCo-AGM meetings;
- Development of a CGIAR Charter (SC input requested); and,
- Assessing Centre's follow-up on previous EPMP recommendations. The SC is responsible for reviewing follow-up reports from the respective Centres and submitting an assessment to ExCo.

Issues related to Challenge Programmes were discussed and are reported under Item 7: Report from SPME.

Francisco Reifschneider presented the CGIAR Director's report to the SC via a video-conference call on the 14th May highlighting the following items:

- Recent meetings with the CBC and CDC were very productive; an important topic that was discussed was the need for increasing partnerships with Science & Technology institutions.
- Based on a proposal from the SC Chair, the CGIAR will examine the possibility, beginning in 2005, of scheduling the AGM in late November/early December to allow a more optimal sequence of SC-ExCo-AGM meeting arrangement.
- The SC Workplan and Budget for 2004-2005 has been approved by ExCo.
- The World Bank is committed to ensuring sustainable support for the SC and its Secretariat and is discussing with donors various options for financing.
- Good progress with the Task Forces for programmatic and structural alignment in the SSA: panel members and ToRs for each TF have been approved by ExCo.
- ISNAR was formally dissolved on 31 March 2004 and is now one of five research programs of IFPRI with its HQs in Addis Ababa.
- The CGIAR Secretariat is organising a leadership and change management course at Harvard later this year for DGs, BoT, CP leaders and CGIAR senior managers.
- Major efforts are underway to communicate the work and impact of the CGIAR to external audiences. Examples were given of some recent opportunities.

- The overall financial situation for the CGIAR is encouraging. The \$381 m for 2003 represents a 7% increase from the previous year. The donor base continues to broaden and several key donors are increasing their share of unrestricted funding.

SC Members requested (further) information on specific points related to: the status of the Program Committee of ExCo (probably to be dissolved but no firm decision as of yet); how ExCo intends to handle the CP on Generation (further discussed under item 7,b); coordinating (if possible) a communications strategy for the SC (further discussed under item 9,a); dealing with governance and management issues arising from the IRRI EPMR; the training program at Harvard (SC Chair requested information to be sent to the SC Secretariat); NGO committee disengagement (further discussed under item 10,a); and GRPC meeting prior to AGM'04 (further discussed under item 10,b).

Agenda Item 2 - Sixth External Programme and Management Review of IRRI

Dr. Richard Flavell, Panel Chair of the 6th EPMR of IRRI, presented the report of the Panel, focusing on the challenges IRRI is facing in the future and the Centre's position in responding to them. He also gave a brief account of the IRRI's achievements. The IRRI Board Chair, Dr. Keijiro Otsuka, presented the Board's response to the recommendations of the report. The Director General of IRRI, Dr. Ron Cantrell confirmed that the Centre agrees with all the recommendations and will follow them. There is only slight disagreement regarding the financial reporting requirement to the Board, where quarterly reporting was considered adequate.

During the discussion the following points were raised:

IRRI's role as a key actor in rice genomics and biotechnology requires that the Centre protect its role as an honest broker particularly with regard to transgenic crops, which in Asia required sensitivity, and when dealing with the private sector which currently does not enjoy a good public image. The private sector's role across the different production systems and technologies is seen as an important factor affecting IRRI's operating environment. PS activities are evolving, creating challenges related to access, licensing and liability. There remains complementarity between the PS activities and the production of public goods created by an organisation like IRRI. IRRI's mandate and role in rice genomics leading to broader understanding on crop functional genomics is noted as of importance to the entire CGIAR System.

Sustainability of production characterizes much of IRRI's rice research including water saving technologies with the associated weed management problems, climate change exacerbating heat and drought problems, and diversification trends in Asia. IRRI needs to capitalise on this broader potential and to develop the necessary partnerships.

The Panel's assessment that social science research requires re-organization for becoming more useful for IRRI's mission triggered comments on social sciences' role and status in the CGIAR in general and at IRRI in particular. For maintaining disciplinary excellence it is important that social scientists are not confined to a service function but have an opportunity to carry out original research. In IRRI's experience, engaging national social scientists for collaborative projects is particularly difficult.

IRRI's opportunities to contribute to poverty alleviation in the different rice production environments were discussed. Some role is necessary for IRRI even in the most recalcitrant upland areas, where its partners have a comparative advantage to operate and where the strategy could be landscape management and exploitation of spill over from research targeted elsewhere. An observer supported IRRI's continuous investment in the unfavourable areas.

IRRI justified its planned presence in Africa – one staff appointed to Sub-Saharan Africa - by the increased need for lowland rice knowledge, water issues emerging in the Challenge Programme that IRRI was involved in, and complementarity with WARDA's applied work.

IRRI is involved in all three current Challenge Programmes. Yet they are found to distort Centre priorities and with large added costs in setting up a parallel systems. The losses for IRRI have included 3-4 positions that the Centre otherwise would have filled, while the gains are opportunities in particular areas of research. An observer thanked IRRI for the candid views and suggested that they should be reflected in the synthesis report to be prepared by the SC.

The recommendations made for improving the Board's ability to provide oversight in financial matters and overall strategic planning were viewed as appropriate. A point was raised about the importance of conducting integrated programme and management reviews and subsequently of the need of the Science Council to consider both programme and management aspects of the Centre in its own assessment.

The Science Council endorsed the recommendations of the 6th IRRI EPMP report and, following further discussions within the working group, a draft commentary was prepared which, when finalized, will be attached to the report.

Agenda Item 3 - BioSafety Study Report

Brian Johnson, Chair of the Biosafety Panel presented the Panel's report; Gabrielle Persely, Scientific Secretary to the panel, was in attendance. Vir Chopra had served as a member of the panel and Amir Kassam had been a resource person on behalf of the SC Secretariat. The thrust of the 12 recommendations made by the report was to increase awareness of biosafety issues in the Centres, for Centres to consider explicitly biosafety needs very early on in the research process, a recommendation for more biosafety research by centres, and the formation of a system-wide Biosafety network.

The SC agreed that the consideration of Biosafety issues in the CGIAR is important for the SC and Centres for both practical purposes and for public confidence. Points of issue arising from the SC debate of the report included the fact that: the TORs of the panel were limited to consideration of the biosafety aspects of LMOs (GMOs) whilst the issues are generic; the amount of biosafety research that centres themselves can undertake are limited, given cost estimates from other sources, and; policy, planning and compliance issues for CGIAR (LMO) products destined for release should be driven by System needs.

Following the discussions in the plenary and during a working group session chaired by Mike Gale, a draft commentary was prepared which, when finalized, will be presented to ExCo and the Group along with the report.

Agenda Item 4 - Towards System Priorities

Per Pinstup-Andersen introduced a brief on the development of System priorities. He noted that the development of system priorities is an integral part of the priorities and strategies work, and of central importance to the Science Council. A second issue was the probable linkage by donors of performance indicators to the overall system and centre logframes, potentially affecting future disbursements. The brief reflected discussions he had had with the World Bank on the implementation of performance indicators for the Centres, and discussions he had had with other donors in his role as SC Chair.

He noted that the System's Agenda is currently described with reference to around 200 Centre and inter-Centre projects, some of which are open-ended. He believed there is a consensus for the CGIAR to make rapid movement towards a small number of system priorities (perhaps 15–20). The priorities should be forward-looking, trying to identify what research will be needed to produce the required results ten years from now. The priorities should be constructed around units with measurable goals contributing to the System's goals of poverty alleviation, food security and environmental sustainability. The priority areas should encompass a set of time-limited activities which could be described by the log frame approach and which would provide annual markers of achievement. These would be incorporated in new MTP reporting by Centres and allow for measurement of Centre and System performance. The overall approach should encourage flexibility and allow for pilot research. It was suggested that, should the recommendation be adopted, that over 2-3 years around 80% of the (approximately) US\$ 400 million could be focussed on solving 15-20 big problems. Although it is currently unknown, a large share of the future research may be expected to be a continuation of current research; the remainder will be new research. The research areas would be different from CPs in that they would represent collaborative research around *core* subjects. No new management super-structures are anticipated as part of this approach. The aims of adopting the new approach would be to focus CGIAR research on solving a more limited set of critical problems, and on demonstrating CGIAR performance and achievements. This amounts to a paradigm shift in the organisation of research and it is necessary that Centres and donors agree on the approach.

Although the design of the new research areas would be difficult ("the devil will be in the details"), particularly with respect to boundaries/regions, balancing different sorts of research endeavour etc., there was broad acceptance by SC Members and observers for the approach. Strong support came from Centre representatives amongst the observers who feared continuing reduction in Centres' research capacity and status without such means to focus CGIAR efforts on a more limited set of objectives.

In summary, the Chair confirmed the need for the SC to take the initial steps in the design of the new System Priority areas, and to confront the challenges in a careful manner, preserving what is good in the system. The research areas will be identified as an integral part of the Priorities and Strategies work, with the design process anticipated to last until March 2005 (see summary of Agenda item 5).

Agenda Item 5 - Report of the Standing Panel on Priorities and Strategies (SPPS)

The SC Chair introduced the agenda item noting that the major emphasis for the panel was in the development of CGIAR System Priorities. Items (ii) – (vii) comprised items in the work

agenda of the SPPS. The Biosafety study, which also fell under this panel, was the subject of Item 3 (above).

(a) *Planning System Level Priorities and Strategies*

Alain de Janvry reported on the priorities that emerged from the substantial consultation process on CGIAR priorities and strategies, the outcomes of earlier rounds of voting on priorities by SC members, and the updates made to the Report document on Priorities and Strategies for 2005-2010, subsequent to its distribution. During the meeting, SC Members and observers were given further opportunity to refine the ranking of the new priority areas and a framework was presented (describing poverty, assets, systems and contexts) which allows the placing of the new priorities within the poverty-oriented research efforts of the CGIAR.

Major outcomes from the consultation process were:

- An increased emphasis on agricultural systems not including staple plant commodities.
- A move to capitalise on the “new agriculture” (encompassing high value-added, diversification, quality and safety, labelling, post harvest issues and markets).
- Compensation for neglect of research for marginal areas.
- Results confirm the importance of the subject matter of the three current CPs.
- Other priorities such as biosafety, IP issues are identified.
- Suggested reduction in NRM research (coupled with concern of SPIA that impacts of NRM research were poorly quantified).
- A relatively flat profile for socio-economic and policy research – which should therefore be kept flexible and adaptive, including work on poverty and paths out of poverty.
- Regional demands for research are not easy to gauge – e.g. a clear focus on SSA, but contrasting rationales provided for CWANA.
- Moving beyond blueprints (into multidimensional and multidisciplinary research and development issues).
- Consideration of science strategies has led to greater need for multi-centre approaches, but there is no one formula for how these are carried out.

In discussion, the SC noted that the consultation process had been productive and had identified research priorities for marginal or additional funds. The proposed priority areas differed in character and it would be important to define the research that was intended for each priority. Donors (certainly ExCo) require that the SC provide guidance on new CGIAR system priorities, including maintenance research and areas which could be streamlined or relinquished. The next steps therefore should seek to identify the CGIAR’s major areas (System Priorities) as described in Item 4. It would be necessary to define the relationship between regional and global priorities in this aggregation of System activities and to have a forward looking view of the areas the CGIAR will need to address in the future. It was agreed that the subsequent course of action would be:

SC Members to send final comments and amendments on existing material (the rankings of synthesised priorities from the Consultation and other sources, the draft Priorities and Strategies Report and the proposed framework) to the current Panel chair and Secretariat.

A complete final draft of the Priorities and Strategies Report plus an (approximately) 15 page Executive Summary are to be prepared covering the steps taken to date and their outcomes. This could provide summary material for AGM, but it is likely that publication of the Report will be deferred until the work on System Priorities can be included.

By early July, a first draft of the (15-20) proposed major areas for CGIAR research should be developed, based on current and proposed future activities but without details of goals or timelines.

Further discussions would be held by the SC Chair on the System Priority areas with CDC/CBC, donors and NARS as available, leading to a presentation to the ExCo and then to AGM.

The new panel chair would be responsible for the development of the process by which the Priorities and Strategies process can be institutionalised.

A further consultative meeting will convened (e.g. in January 2005) with representatives of all stakeholder groups to address the formulation of the System Priority areas. Based on the outcomes of this meeting, these System Priority areas should be developed as fully as possible in time for discussion at the SC Meeting of March 2005. The recommendations of the SC (and work currently being undertaken by SPME) will provide the basis for decisions on new System Priorities and performance management by the ExCo in May 2005.

(b) Food Safety Consideration in CGIAR Research

Onesmo ole-MoiYoi noted that a concept note and proposal for this initiative had been distributed to all SC members at the February meeting. The Science Council in collaboration with IFPRI will convene a small planning meeting to define the scope and TORs of the study, including panel requirements. The work will have two foci, namely health in developing countries and non-tariff barriers in international trade.

In discussion it was agreed that the major thrust is conceived as relating to food contamination, water quality etc. and how food safety issues affect the operation of the CGIAR, CGIAR clients and research relating to poverty. Prioritising the scope of the study around future food safety issues of greatest importance will ensure the correct focus. LMOs could be considered where they contributed to food safety research, but the study should not make LMOs the principal subject of the study, since they are specifically addressed through the Report on Biosafety.

(c) Ethics and Science in the CGIAR

The Science Council discussed and accepted the process suggested for addressing the important subject of ethics. Professor Peter Sandoe had been invited to prepare a 2 page concept note laying out the substance of a report that he (and one other under his guidance) would produce for consideration by the SC in September 2004. It was intended that the Report would address any significant ethical issues of importance to the CGIAR, and propose the means by which these could be addressed or kept under review by the Science Council.

(d) *International Public Goods in an Era of IPR*

Onesmo ole-MoiYoi reported that following the February meeting, the SC had agreed to move on three fronts: issues which act as constraints to CGIAR Centres; access issues; and mechanisms to transfer innovations to national programmes. It had since been noted that these tasks overlap with intended work of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee. It had now been agreed that the GPRC and the SC will collaborate on the subject of developing guidelines for individual scientists in relation to IP. This will be moved forward by Carl-Gustav Thornstrom of GPRC, who will develop the ToR for this study to be undertaken by CAS on behalf of both the GPRC and SC. The SC will continue to commission the two further papers.

(e) *Genomics Research in the CGIAR*

Mike Gale explained that earlier TAC/iSC studies (including those on plant breeding methodologies and genomics for stress resistance) had foretold the need for reliable high throughput (HTP) genomics services by CGIAR and partner NARS scientists, particularly in marker assisted breeding (MAS). The need for mass genotyping, mostly with microsatellite (SSR) markers today and possibly single nucleotide polymorphism haplotyping in the future, is growing in MAS and diversity studies in crop plants, fish and livestock at Centres. There is a need to review 'best practice' in industry, and the public sector world-wide, to assess whether the current trend of building facilities at each of several Centres is more appropriate than developing larger centralised facilities. Similar discussions should be held at this stage for other applications, such as microarrays, proteomics and metabolomics. This need was also highlighted in the IRRI EPMR report, both for the Centre and the System as a whole. It was unclear at this time whether combining System resources or outsourcing to commercial facilities in the North, or facilities like the NEPAD Centre of Excellence in Biotechnology at ILRI in Nairobi, might be more appropriate.

It was agreed that a consultant will be appointed to carry out a global survey, and that the results will be presented to a meeting of the CGIAR Genomics Task Force where recommendations for the System will be formulated.

(f) *Animal and Fish Genetic Resources Collection and Conservation*

Mike Gale provided information on the proposal which had been developed after consultation with ILRI, WorldFish and the FAO. The intention is to develop a paper, for the consideration of the SC, determining research needs in the area of animal and fish genetic resources to complement policy and development work being undertaken by FAO. It was agreed that the SPPS should proceed with the development of a position paper. In discussion, it was noted that there is donor interest (notably from France) in this field. It was also noted that CDC are considering similar issues. Consultations within the CGIAR should be spread broadly, including also IPGRI, ICARDA and SGRP, together with CDC, to determine the appropriate level of the CGIAR entry into this field.

(g) *Social Research in the CGIAR*

Alain de Janvry reported that there is a general intention by the SC to review non-economic social science across the CGIAR. An earlier Meeting at CIAT on the subject had been developed (by Michael Cernea and Amir Kassam) into a book which is being prepared for

publication. The SPME had agreed to examine the needs for such a social science study once the book has been published, and with due reference to additional requests for the study of policy research in the CGIAR (see item 7 e).

Agenda Item 6 - Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)

Dr. Hans Gregersen, Chair of SPIA introduced a report on the standing panel's activities highlighting some of the strategic issues related to impact assessment and the future needs of the System. On-going or proposed studies were grouped in terms of whether they are theme- or region-focused (aimed at accountability objective) or learning-focused. After a brief description of the on-going and proposed studies, the SPIA Chair welcomed comments and suggestions from the SPIA members and Observers.

a) Ongoing Studies

A brief update on the progress of five on-going SPIA initiatives was provided. The first three reported were theme-based initiatives.

The Poverty impact study, led by IFPRI, involves seven case studies that focus on the pathways between agricultural research and poverty alleviation. SPIA is in close dialogue with IFPRI to ensure successful completion of this study by the end of the year, which includes, among other outputs, publication of a peer-reviewed book synthesizing the case study results. Ruben Echeverria is the SPIA focal point on this study.

The Impacts of CGIAR NRM research study is well underway and progressing satisfactorily: the CDC Task Force on INRM recently submitted its paper to SPIA describing the Centres' perspective on appropriate approaches and methodologies for ex-post IA of NRM research done by the Centres, progress reports from six centre case study leaders have been received, an IA consultant has been hired (David Zilberman) to assist with methods development, and a SPIA workshop is being organized in Hannover, Germany in June to review progress on the case studies. Hermann Waibel is the SPIA focal point on this study.

The Training evaluation and impact assessment, a joint SPIA/SPME activity, was briefly alluded to. This study was addressed under Item 7.

Under learning-oriented initiatives, two activities of SPIA are on-going. The first is the development of a CGIAR Impacts website due to be launched by mid-summer. This initiative provides support for the learning and communication functions of SPIA. In response to questions raised about the CGIAR Impacts website, it was clarified that this has been developed in response to strong demand from both CGIAR Centres and from donors--information about CGIAR research impacts (from Centres and from SPIA) need to be more widely available for internal and external use. The new webpage will replace the current outdated and incomplete Impacts webpage on the CGIAR website. One of the most important features of this site is the searchable comprehensive bibliography of CGIAR ex-post IA studies. The site will be housed in the SC website (within SPIA), but linked directly to the CGIAR site.

The second learning-oriented on-going SPIA activity is the Assessment of donor impact information needs. The study builds on the results of a donor survey questionnaire to CGIAR

members and other stakeholders to better understand donor views about the major uses of and demand for ex-post IA in the CGIAR. Issues related to how IA studies are used, breadth vs. depth preferences, and attribution will be examined. A meeting of donors at AGM is planned to discuss the results. Several donors have indicated strong support for this SPIA study but have some questions about how information will be ascertained and whether results from ex-post IA are of value to other CGIAR stakeholders.

b) Proposed Studies

Three theme-based initiatives were proposed as part of the 2004-2005 SPIA workplan and were briefly described.

The first was the Participatory research impacts study, which aims to improve the understanding of the role of participatory approaches in increasing the impact of research products of the CGIAR. In response to questions about the scope of the participatory research (PR) impacts study, the SPIA Chair indicated that to the extent possible, comparisons between participatory and conventional approaches will be made. The SPIA Chair agreed that an assessment of PR must go beyond the CIAT-led systemwide PRGA activities, but this assessment would focus on documenting impacts rather than becoming a full-fledged stripe study, although the latter could well be warranted. He emphasized that the SPIA activity will focus initially in 2004 on definitional issues, determining the scope of PR in the CGIAR, and will involve a synthesis of methods for PR IA prior to launching the impact assessment.

The second theme-based proposal was the Policy research impacts study due to commence in 2005. Policy oriented social science research comprises a growing share of the CGIAR research portfolio, yet may be the area of System activity with the least compiled evidence of impact. This study provides an opportunity to develop appropriate methods and to document policy research impacts from case studies. Members raised questions about the extended scope of the policy impacts study - whether it includes a full social science and policy research stripe review, given the relatively weak performance of social science in the CGIAR. The SPIA Chair emphasised that there have been several requests from the Group for a policy impact study and that the impact component of this study focuses largely on three elements: taxonomy; methodology review and case studies of policy research impact (and not social science research more broadly), but that the impact component is being deferred until mid 2005.

The third theme-based proposed initiative was the Farming systems research (FSR) impact study, also planned for 2005. This study seeks to assess the evidence of the precise effects, diffusion and impacts of the FSR approach in the CGIAR. Several queries were made about the feasibility and the nature of the proposed FSR impact study and the need for differentiating between FSR and PR, FSR and NRM/INRM, and FSR and cropping systems research. SPIA acknowledged the challenge therein but highlighted that FSR represents a major investment in the CGIAR and that little is known about its impacts. The SPIA Chair indicated that it is essential to link FSR to productivity improvements (vs. environmental services for which markets are absent), as is currently being done in the NRM impact study.

Three regionally-oriented impact assessments were also proposed by SPIA for 2004-2005: the Impact of the CGIAR and its partners in Sub-Saharan Africa (follow-up to a preliminary assessment in 2001) - commencing in 2004; and two Benefit diffusion and impacts of the

CGIAR and its partners assessments - one for South Asia and one for Latin America, both planned to start in 2005. In addition to estimating aggregate benefits to the respective regions, these studies would examine more closely evidence for who has and who has not benefited from agricultural research. A request was made by the ICARDA DG for SPIA to initiate a study to assess the impact of the CGIAR research on the CWANA region as well.

SPIA expected to launch in 2005 a Learning from impact assessment study to explore how lessons from impact pathway analysis and constraint analysis and lessons from failures could be utilized to develop a stronger impact culture in the Centre and at the System level. In the discussion that followed, issues related to attribution and identification were raised, and the need for making a distinction between impact and ex-post evaluation. A suggestion was made that, in order to serve the dual purpose of accountability and learning, on-going projects should be selected by SPIA so that 'just-in-time impacts' and the impact process itself can be studied. Not everyone agreed as there were a range of evaluation tools in use for assessing the suitability of specific technologies in the field and, more generally, for evaluating on-going projects and programs. Ex-post IA has focused specifically on documenting the impacts of different types of agricultural research on the ultimate goals of the CGIAR-- alleviation of poverty, hunger and malnutrition. While SPIA acknowledged that few impact studies have rigorously documented this tenuous connection (although studies such as Evenson's were more successful), many impact studies, notwithstanding certain data and methodological constraints, have been able to document intermediate effects (adoption, income) along the impact pathway. Nevertheless, more work needs to be done in more rigorously documenting the impacts from agricultural research, meaning advancing in the development of counterfactuals and establishing attribution.

A point was raised about the overlap between the SPMS and SPIA agenda, in particular, in considering the impact of the CGIAR on the global scientific community.

An additional point was made by an SC member that there may be a need for the SC to provide some guidance to the CGIAR on the appropriate use of new methods, tools, (e.g., new marker aided selection techniques), underpinned by cost-benefit analysis. Band wagon effects can be very costly (e.g. the over-emphasis on or pre-occupation with haploiding). Although probably outside the scope of SPIA's purview, the SC Chair noted the importance of this point and asked Vir Chopra to further consider how this may be done.

In concluding, the SC Chair thanked the SPIA Chair for his presentation indicating there is approval for the proposed SPIA 2004-2005 programme and budget, subject to any modifications SPIA would consider in the light of the comments and suggestions from the Members and Observers.

Agenda Item 7 - Report from the Standing Panel on Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME)

Dr. Richard Harwood, Chair of the SPME, introduced the Standing Panel's activities.

a) *Changing Monitoring and Evaluation in the CGIAR System*

The document *Changing Monitoring and Evaluation in the CGIAR* has not been formally discussed by the ExCo and the Group although the document has been annexed to the Report

of the iSC and SC/iSC Transition for AGM'03. The main theses of the report, moving more oversight responsibility of performance monitoring to the Boards, and developing better instruments for self-assessment are very relevant. The changes that are taking place including the use of Medium Term Plans (MTPs) as a tool for planning and monitoring the relevance and quality of science. Thus, a strengthened assessment of MTPs and implementation of a performance measurement system in the CGIAR need to be reflected in the report. A revised document, including strengthened guidelines for CCERs and for the transition from a full fledged EPMR to more of an auditing EPMR, will be brought to SC2 in September for finalisation and subsequently submitted to the ExCo and to the group at AGM'04.

b) Progress Reports from the Challenge Programmes

The SC needs to take a strategic look at the Challenge Programmes. The progress reports SC have received do not provide enough detail on substance to allow assessment of the research. The SC members expressed concerns of the CP experience so far. The proposals and progress reports continue to be unsatisfactory regarding scientific detail and research-product linkages, the monetary and opportunity transaction costs are high, there is duplication of governance and management, and signs of drift with too broad CPs, and the process seem driven by funds rather than subject matter. The SC decided, however, that it would be damaging to judge the merits of any CP at this point for recommending continuation or closure, as they have not had sufficient time to develop and the forthcoming MTPs would present the first proper science plans. The CPs will be sent a letter advising them that the SC expects well developed MTPs that outline the direction and the monitoring of science. Members from within the SC and its Standing Panels will review the new MTP and the progress reports (any available workplans) to provide an assessment report to the CP leadership. The SC will also prepare a report to ExCo and the Group, which will include a synthesis on generic lessons learnt and an analysis on how the CPs related to the Centre programmes and Systemwide programmes. The SC will be undertaking an assessment of each of the three CPs. In autumn 2005, ExCo with advice from the SC will make its final decision on this programmatic approach, the future of the CPs currently in progress, and moving forward with further CPs.

The revised full-proposal of the Sub-Saharan CP is expected to be submitted by the end of June and two external reviewers will assist the SC in its review.

c) Evaluation of the MTPs and the CGIAR Research Agenda

The guidelines for the MTPs for 2005-2007 and Financial Plans (FPs) for 2005 are being finalised in collaboration with the CGIAR Secretariat. MTPs are expected from Centres by July 31st on their Centre project portfolio and Systemwide/Ecoregional programmes and from the CPs. Reviewing the MTPs will be a collective SC responsibility. Each SC member will read each Centre and CP MTP, a total of 18, and contribute to preparing the commentary for six MTPs. The SC will assess each Centre's MTP, and the Systemwide programme/CP interface with Centre research. The SC will develop a database for assessing achievements of milestones and already in the review of the MTPs for 2005-2007 will pay particular attention to the number and quality of milestones. Monitoring of achievement will commence with the MTP 2006-2008 submissions. The MTPs will form the basis of developing research performance indicators for outputs, outcome and impact.

d) *External Reviews of Centres and SWPs*

Dick Harwood, the Chair of the SPME, is overseeing this EPMR process on behalf of the SC Chair. The IFPRI EPMR is on schedule with Bruce Gardener as Chair and the Panel membership nearly finalised. The SC discussed issues about which the EPMR Panel would be briefed, in addition to the standard EPMR Terms of Reference. IFPRI is a prominent institute with a Systemwide function regarding policy research, whereas the specialised social science research is done at each Centre. An important issue is how IFPRI is interacting with other Centres, the nature of the relationship and the division of labour. Additional issues include IFPRI's new strategic plan viz. the CGIAR Vision and Strategy, the Centre leadership and involvement in the Challenge Programmes and implications for the core programme; strategy for absorbing the ISNAR mandate and function; new organisational structure; and increasingly decentralised operations.

For the CIMMYT 5th EPMR, the Chair selection was going on and a short list of candidates was discussed by the Council in its closed session. The issues raised included the Centre's new strategic plan and the future and relevance of both maize and wheat breeding; CIMMYT's contribution to production systems and agronomy research, CIMMYT's contribution to social science and economics research, CIMMYT's role in the different regions: Africa, Asia and CWANA in particular, the handling of IPR as related to the private sector (PS) (including both Centre-derived IP and the PS IPR); management and governance; and IRRI-CIMMYT alliance.

The Council decided to commission the EPMRs of CIFOR, World Agroforestry Centre, and WorldFish Centre, all due to be started in 2005, and the EPMR of IWMI due to be started in 2006. The Council emphasised that with regard to Panel Chair and member selection, a clear conflict of interest was the only acceptable reason for the Centre to veto a candidate.

Regarding external Systemwide programme reviews, the review of the SWP on Alternatives to Slash and Burn is on schedule and the Chair will be selected in due course. The Council decided not to move forward with the review of the Systemwide Programme on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis until SPIA has completed its inventory for a future impact study on participatory research.

e) *Ongoing and Proposed Stripe Reviews*

The joint SPIA/SPME review on training is on schedule and the review panel consisting of Elliot Stern as Chair and John Lynam and Lucia de Vaccaro as members is about to conduct a pilot field survey in Kenya. An Inception Report has been shared with the Centres and their many useful comments and suggestions are being incorporated into the study plan.

SPME and SPIA have made preliminarily plans for a joint study on policy impact and social science research in the CGIAR. SPIA reminded the SC that members have repeatedly requested that an impact study focus specifically on policy. The Standing Panel is moving forward with this study but with a one-year delay. SPME has decided to wait with its decision on whether or not to implement a social science stripe study until the Book following the social science conference in Cali 2002 is published, after which a clearer assessment of the need for and scope of such a study can be made.

Agenda Item 8 - Report of the Standing Panel on Mobilising Science (SPMS)

Lisa Sennerby-Forsse introduced the paper outlining a proposal for a workplan for the SPMS which had been prepared by herself and panel co-chair Keiji Kainuma. The strategy for Mobilising Science focussed on three areas of (i) Facilitating and supporting external cooperation, (ii) Establishing a focal point for international networking, and (iii) Enhancing and promoting the quality, relevance and impact of science in the CGIAR. The suggested activities included *inter alia* a review of current Centre collaborations, development of a roster of potential collaborators (scientists and institutes) and the holding of a major consultative workshop on new science and technologies for agricultural research.

The SC confirmed the three major thrusts suggested but urged that the effort be placed at the appropriate level, since Centres and centre scientists possess very extensive collaborative networks. There is an opportunity for the Science Council to link with the “other 96%” of agricultural research providers, to interact more specifically with Science Academies and Research Councils to enhance awareness of the CGIAR, and to promote scientific and financial investment in the CGIAR’s poverty focussed research. The effort should extend to negotiating joint agendas with donor agencies and large NARS (e.g. Brazil, China, India) and identifying constraints in funding collaborative initiatives to help augment possibilities for collaborative research. Whilst there is a need to promote awareness of the best of CGIAR science, efforts should be developed in conjunction with the public awareness activities of the CGIAR Secretariat and the Future Harvest initiative. The value of large international conferences sponsored by the CGIAR was thought to be less than being able to influence other major international science “events”. Providing a “science alert service” for the System and seeking to identify scientific gaps and opportunities that could contribute to the CGIAR’s priorities and strategies would enhance efficiencies in developing CGIAR products to meet these needs. This might be a regular annual feature of the SPMS programme. As 2004 is the panel’s inaugural year, the SC Chair would provide an outline paper for this year’s AGM.

It was agreed that the Co-chairs would revise the workplan for the panel, and that Lisa Sennerby-Forsse will share the elements of the draft revised strategy with Centres, if possible through the next meeting of the CDC, subject to time availability on the latter’s agenda. The revised strategy for the SPMS will be presented to the next SC Meeting in September.

Agenda Item 9 - Council-wide Activities

a) Communication Strategy

Ms. Fionna Douglas from CGIAR Secretariat presented a communications strategy for the SC touching on the following main issues: the overarching goals, key assumptions, broad key messages and target audiences. There was general concurrence with the goals, messages and target audience although the discussion ranged over many topics, including the need to target the right audience and package material accordingly, the need to communicate SC study reports more effectively (not just green cover reports), the question of promoting the SC itself (vs. the message), the unique opportunities of the SC at the forefront of world class science focused on a mission and the need to promote the ‘stars’ within the CGIAR. On the issue of whether the SC should promote itself, the general feeling was that it should not, but

that it should earn its credibility through good work. A prospering CGIAR System is the best promotion for the SC. It was agreed that short Science Briefs, e.g., the recent “snapshot of CGIAR impact”, drawing on material already available present an immediate opportunity for communicating the work and output of the SC. Ms. Douglas suggested that SC members are also needed as spokespeople for the CGIAR and that the SC should be more visible at the AGM. The need to participate in existing scientific fora and conferences, as an alternative to organizing SC conferences, or to host special side events at AGM (pre or post) was mentioned. Enhancing interaction with the ‘other 96%’ of the global agricultural research system is needed, along with the need to create a more interactive SC website to enhance dialogue - though this would require a dedicated effort. The SC Chair thanked Ms. Douglas encouraging her to move forward with some specific proposed activities based on this discussion. At the same time, he encouraged SC members to send specific suggestions to Ms. Douglas.

b) Performance Measurement Working Group Report

The SC Chair introduced the progress in developing a Performance Measurement (PM) system for the CGIAR. The Science Council is in charge of developing the programmatic aspects of the PM system. The aim is to focus on milestones arising from the specific programmatic elements in a workplan rather than apply uniform measures which present themselves because they are easily measurable. The World Bank had requested Centre to provide reports on performance indicators. Despite a chance to revise the proposed set of indicators, the CDC is still not pleased with the exercise. However, 12.5 % of the WB funds are already being allocated based on the indicators. In response to the suggestion from the SC Chair, the PM Working Group Co-chair, Kevin Cleaver has expressed support of developing the programme performance system within the framework of the MTPs. For ExCo improvement of performance and accountability are the primary reasons for developing a PM system, whereas resource allocation is not. The governance and financial indicators are not within the SC’s mandate, except research management.

SPME will lead the exercise by nominating a small team who, with support from the SC Secretariat will develop the performance measurement approach and indicators for the science elements. The Working Group has been informed that this year the MTP reporting would not yet be sufficient for performance monitoring but in the next reporting (MTPs for 2006-2008), Centres will be requested to report achievement of stated milestones for PM purposes. Centres will be asked to improve the formulation of their milestones, both in terms of quality and quantity to facilitate performance monitoring. The Centre representative present supported SC’s role in developing the programmatic indicators and felt that it is very important that all could agree with the result. The SC considers it highly disruptive if several parallel systems are developed for assessing Centre performance. The World Bank has agreed to a single measurement system and is willing to replace its own indicators by the CGIAR approved system. However, it would be desirable that also the EU agrees to a CGIAR system once it is in place. A view was presented that for the System to perform well, all three independent partners, the Centres, the donors and the Science Council would have to perform. The SC was commended for assuming its role in the PM process effectively.

c) Sub-Saharan Africa Task Force Update

The SC Chair reported that as part of the continuing reform programme of the CGIAR, the Group had established two Task Forces to conduct studies in sub-Saharan Africa. The Task

Forces would consider issues of Programmatic Alignment, and Structural Options/Organisational Alignment separately. The Terms of Reference for the Programmatic Alignment Task Force (Task Force 1) were provided to the SC for information. Per Pinstруп-Andersen will co-chair this Task Force, with Paco Serme of CORAF/WECARD. Onesmo ole-MoiYoi is a member of the panel. The panels would consider the activities of all Centres having work in Africa, not just those Centres headquartered on the continent. The Programmatic Alignment Task Force is due to provide its report by April/May2005.

Agenda Item 10 - Other Business

a) Science Council Consultations with Civil Society Organisations

Per Pinstруп-Andersen spoke about a paper he had prepared on the subject of promoting SC consultation with civil society organisations, particularly farmers' associations. This suggestion followed the non-functioning of the CGIAR's previously established NGO committee, and the need to be able to discern the requirements of development NGOs and major farmer organisations in such areas as priority setting. The aim was to identify development partners who could strengthen the two-way flow of information contributing to the CGIAR priorities rather than governance aspects of the CGIAR agenda.

The SC members noted that it is very difficult, given the heterogeneity of NGOs and their constituencies, to establish a representative group with which to interact. National level issues may best be pursued with NARES encompassing all research and development-related groups. The larger farmer organisations may not always speak effectively on behalf of poorer farmers, and development CSOs do not necessarily cover the wider natural resource management issues required to feed into comprehensive CGIAR assessments for Agriculture.

The SC therefore agreed not to pursue a formal SC level interaction with NGOs. However, Alain de Janvry reported on the success of the SPPS in gaining broad NGO input through virtual consultative means. The SC encouraged the continuation of this mechanism by the SPPS, as and when appropriate, as a part of the participatory approach to the development of new CGIAR Priorities and Strategies.

b) GRPC Report

Dr. Mike Gale, member of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) briefed the Council on the February meeting of the Committee. The main items included; agreement of all Centres on a Material Transfer Agreement for both crops included in the multilateral system of exchange and those outside it; the Global Diversity Trust developed jointly by FAO and IGPRI on behalf of the CGIAR; possibility of safety storage of CGIAR *ex situ* collections in Svalbard; CDC paper on policies related to GMOs; and parallel interests between the SC and the GRPC on impact studies on technology transfer, IPR issues, problems associated with invasive species, and issues of ethics. An item calling for SC decision was a proposed joint GRPC/SC workshop to discuss the policy implications of perceived GMO threats on germplasm storage and exchange and in particular the immense resource requirements if Centres were required to certify their accessions for not containing elements of GMOs. CIMMYT had faced such requests and subsequently drafted a policy paper for testing all seed samples. A precedent set by one Centre could lead to subsequent

requests from other Centres and result in unbearable costs. Instead of organising an AGM'04 linked event, the GRPC was proposing a separate half-day meeting in Mexico for discussing these issues among the Centres and reporting to the AGM. The SC decided it has an obligation to attend, as scientific advice was needed. Mike Gale should attend the workshop and lead the SC involvement in the event.

c) *Coordination of Donor Visits*

In an effort to be as inclusive as possible and to become better acquainted with the stakeholder's views, the SC Chair highlighted the value of SC members visiting donors and CGIAR centres whenever feasible. He emphasized that this need not compromise the independence of the Science Council. It may not require special trips but could well be done in coordination with other SC or non-SC related assignments. SC members and Observers were generally in favour of the idea, provided the objectives of the visits are determined ahead of time (vs. courtesy visits). It might be preferable to conduct such visits after the priority and strategies exercise is completed. Several SC members commented on the value in visiting centres and a proposal was made to increase the frequency of SC meetings held at the centres, i.e., meet only once every two years at FAO, instead of once a year.

d) *Additional Items*

Two papers: Global Assessments of Strategic Investment Options in Agricultural Technologies, and Intellectual Property Policies and Practices in the Life Sciences had been distributed to the SC members for discussion and a third one, The CGIAR Initiative for a Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU), for information. Due to lack of time, the SC decided to postpone the discussion on the first two papers until its September meeting.

Agenda Item 11 - Future Meetings, and SC Chair's Closing Remarks

The SC confirmed the dates and venue for the next meeting as follows: 6 – 10 September 2004 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. The meetings of the standing panels were scheduled for the first two days (6-7 September), followed by three days in plenary (8-10 September). SC Members agreed to hold the Spring 2005 meeting from 4 – 8 April 2005. The venue was yet to be confirmed but IWMI (Colombo, Sri Lanka) would be given first option. It was agreed to hold the Autumn 2005 SC meeting at a Centre as well; the specific place and date to be determined later.

Due to time constraints, the SC Chair did not attempt to summarise the meeting but indicated that the major items of discussion and SC decisions would be found in the minutes. He thanked the Members and Observers for a very constructive meeting and for the many useful interventions that have played a role in the SC deliberations. The Chair brought the open session of the Inaugural Meeting to a close, after which the SC meeting proceeded in closed session.

Closed Session: Non-Confidential Items

(a) Performance Measurement for SC and Donors

Following up on the point made by the Chair of the CBC that the three main (independent) parts of the CGIAR System (Centres, SC and Donors) are also highly interdependent in terms of achieving their goals, evaluating the performance of only the Centres is inadequate and gives an incomplete picture. The SC agreed and decided that the SC should subject itself to a regular evaluation of its own performance. The SC does not feel it should attempt to evaluate donor performance - for several reasons - but it does support and would suggest to the Members they consider a system of self-evaluation of donor behaviour.

(b) Seating Arrangements at SC Meetings

For purposes of facilitating organized discussions and for effective decision-making, the Council Members and the Executive Director sitting around the inner table will have the first opportunity to speak to a particular agenda item following a presentation or after the introduction by the Chair. The Chair will then open the floor to SP members, Donors and other Observers - sitting behind the SC members. This will be followed by subsequent deliberations by the SC members, summing of the issue by the Chair and SC decision making, if appropriate.

(c) Presentation of Reports at SC Meetings

For items where the relevant reports or other documentation have been made available for review by the SC members prior to the meeting, speakers will be requested to limit their presentations to 10-15 minutes. These should emphasize the key results of the report. A set of instructions will be developed and circulated to speakers prior to the next SC meeting. If required, the SC may choose to allocate some time prior to the presentation for a discussion of key issues.

(d) Meeting Processes for Effective Dialogue and Outcomes

Several topics were addressed under this item. Members are comfortable with the Chair's direct and transparent approach ("persuasive guidance with freedom of expression") and the need for substantive dialogue and interventions from SC members in particular, including from those with different viewpoints. SC Secretariat staff are encouraged to contribute to the discussion in terms of both clarification of items and in providing their professional judgement on issues. With respect to the volume of work, SC members felt the current agenda is probably too much and that either the meeting agenda needs to be reduced--with more handled virtually, or that the Standing Panels need to assume more of the workload - and to present their findings and recommendations in plenary for consideration and decision making by the SC.

(e) SC Member Tasks for CGIAR Charter Drafting and Performance Measurement Working Group

As there were no volunteers to join the team drafting the CGIAR Charter, the SC Chair indicated he would assume that responsibility.

Vir Chopra has agreed to chair a small SC team to develop indicators for research performance measurement as input into the PMWG process. He will also represent the SC in the PMWG meetings.

(f) Standing Panel Chair and Member Assignments

The SC Chair requested Mike Gale to chair the SPPS and Ken Fischer to chair the SPME, commencing from the end of the Inaugural Meeting and they agreed. It was agreed that the out-going chairs, Alain de Janvry (SPPS) and Dick Harwood (SPME) will continue to provide critically-needed input and continuity to the standing panels. Lisa Sennerby-Forsse and Keiji Kainuma will continue to co-chair the SPMS. The SC Chair has requested Hans Gregersen to continue as chair of the SPIA (and as ex-officio SC member) until the end of 2005 and will seek the CGIAR Chair's concurrence for that. The SC Chair has asked Jim Ryan to become a member of SPIA from 2005 with the expectation that he will assume Chairmanship when Hans Gregersen steps down at the end of 2005. SP members to the SPPS, SPME and SPMS are appointed for a two-year term beginning from 1 July 2004 and will be expected to spend about 15 days per year on panel work.

(g) SC Members Attending AGM

After indicating their interest in attending, the SC Chair indicated he will ask the CGIAR Chair and Director to invite the SC Members to attend AGM '04 in Mexico. Travel, honorarium and non-accountable expenses will be paid from the SC 2004 Budget.

(h) Time Commitment by SC Members

In response to a discussion of the workplan and time commitments, the SC Chair indicated he will seek an increase in the time required by SC members, from 30 days as presently shown up to 50 days (and up to 60 days for the SPIA Chair).

(i) SC/SP Members Participation in Other Activities (Boards) and Potential for Conflicts of Interest; Need for Disclosure

There is a need to institute use of a conflict-of-interest statement for all SC members. The key is simply disclosure ahead of time so as to avoid perceived or real conflicts of interest.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
Inaugural SC and Standing Panel Meetings
12-15 May 2004
ICARDA, Tel Hadya, Aleppo, Syria

Per Pinstrup-Andersen	SC Chair
Hans Gregersen	SC Member & Chair of SPIA
Alain de Janvry	SC Member
Richard Harwood	SC Member
Michael Gale	SC Member & Chair of SPPS
Ken Fischer	SC Member & Chair of SPME
Lisa Sennerby Forsse	SC Member & Co-Chair of SPMS
Virender Lal Chopra	SC Member & Co-Chair of SPMS
Onesmo ole-MoiYoi	SC Member
Ruben Echeverria	Member of SPIA
Hermann Waibel	Member of SPIA
Adel El Beltagy	Director General of ICARDA
Mohan Saxena	ADG (at large), ICARDA
William Erskine	ADG (Research), ICARDA
Ronald P. Cantrell	Director General of IRRI
Keijiro Otsuka	Chair BoT, IRRI
Carlos Sere	Director General of ILRI
John Vercoe	Representing the Chair, CBC
Brian Johnson	Panel Chair, Biosafety Study
Gabrielle Persley	Scientific Secretary, Biosafety Study
Richard Flavell	Panel Chair, IRRI EPMR
Fionna Douglas	CGIAR Secretariat

OBSERVERS

Luc Sas	Representative of Belgium
Jacob Thoppil	Representative of Canada
Harry Palmier	Representative of France
Marlene Diekmann	Representative of Germany
Annamaria Belli	Representative of Italy
Jonathon Wadsworth	Representative of the United Kingdom
Meredith Soule	Representative of USA

SC Secretariat

Timothy Kelley	Head of the SC Secretariat Delegation
Sirkka Immonen	Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Peter Gardiner	SC Secretariat Consultant
Colleen Boland	SC Chair's Assistant
Rosanna Corazzi	Secretary to the Executive Secretary, SC

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

**INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE SCIENCE COUNCIL
ICARDA, Tel Hadya, Aleppo, Syria
12-15 May 2004**

Agenda Item 2: IRRI EPMR

- Report of the 6th External Programme and Management Review of the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) (SDR/SC:IAR/04/02) and Response from the IRRI Board and Management

Agenda Item 3: Biosafety Study Report

- Report of the Biosafety Panel to the CGIAR Science Council on Biosafety Policy and Practices of the CGIAR Centres (SDR/SC:IAR/04/01)

Agenda Item 4: Towards System Priorities

- Towards System Priorities (SDR/SC:IAR/04/06)

Agenda Item 5: Report from SPPS

- Report of the CGIAR Priorities and Strategies for 2005-2010 (SDR/SC:IAR/04/03)
- Genomics research in the CGIAR (SDR/SC:IAR/04/04)
- Animal and fish genetic resources conservation (SDR/SC:IAR/04/05)
- A status report on: Researching Culture in Agriculture – Social Research for International Agricultural Development
- Final Results of the pre-Aleppo Consultation & Worksheet
- Relevance of Ethics for the CGIAR

Agenda Item 6: Report from SPIA

- SPIA Report to the SC (SDR/SC:IAR/04/08)

Agenda Item 7: Report from SPME

- Status of Reviews: Progress Report on External Centre Reviews/External Systemwide Programme Reviews (*to be distributed at the meeting*)
- Three Challenge Programme Annual Reports (not numbered):
 - “Generation - Cultivating Plant Diversity for the Resource-Poor”
 - “HarvestPlus - Report on Activities January, 2003 through March, 2004”
 - “Water & Food”
- Changing Monitoring and Evaluation in the CGIAR (SDR/ISC:IAR/03/04.1) (*to be distributed at the meeting*)

Agenda Item 8: Report from SPMS

- SPMS Proposal for Work Programme 2004-2006 (SDR/SC:IAR/04/09)

Agenda Item 9: Council-wide Activities

- Communications strategy (not numbered)
- Performance Measurement Working Group Report (not numbered)

Agenda Item 10: Other Business

- Science Council Consultations with CSOs (SDR/SC:IAR/04/10)
- Food Futures – Global Assessments of Strategic Investment Options in Agricultural Technologies
- Intellectual Property Policies and Practices in the Life Sciences: International Aspects and Implications
- Terms of Reference for Monitoring of the CGIAR Projects Co-Funded by the European Commission in 2003 in A.C.P., Asia, Latin America and the Mediterranean Regions
- The CGIAR Initiative for a Global Open Agriculture and Food University (GO-AFU)
- Work Programme for the Science Council and its Secretariat for Calendar Years 2004-2005