

**Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
(CGIAR)**

**Annual General Meeting 2002
October 30-November 1
Manila, Philippines**

**SUMMARY RECORD
OF
PROCEEDINGS AND DECISIONS**

*CGIAR Secretariat
(A CGIAR System Office Unit)
The World Bank
Washington D.C.
December 10, 2002*

Agricultural Research Week, Philippines, 2002

President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo issued a presidential decree proclaiming the week beginning October 27 as “Agricultural Research Week” in the Philippines. October 28 and 29 were observed as Philippines Day and IRRI Day, with interactive presentations on agricultural research and development. The CGIAR Annual General Meeting 2002 (AGM02) was held at the Shangri-la Hotel, Makati, Manila, Philippines, October 30-November 1.

Vice President Teofista Guingona delivered an inaugural address, and declared AGM02 open. The meeting was held in two segments: a Stakeholder Meeting where views were exchanged on major issues, and a Business Meeting for decision making.

The main documents discussed or tabled at the meeting are listed in Annex 3 and 4 of this report. These documents, as well as the report of the Executive Council meeting held prior to AGM02, are posted on the CGIAR web site, www.cgiar.org. They may be accessed by clicking on Annual General Meeting 2002, under Highlights.

ACRONYMS USED

AARINENA	Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ARD	Agricultural Research for Development
ARI	Advanced Research Institute
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
ASB	Alternatives to Slash and Burn
CAPRI	Collective Action and Property Rights
CBC	Committee of Board Chairs
CDC	Center Directors Committee
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CODE	World Bank Committee on Development Effectiveness
CORAF/WECARD	Conseil Ouest Africain Pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricole/West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
CP	Challenge Program(s)
CSO	Civil Society Organization(s)
DFID	Department for International Development
DG	Director General
DGF	World Bank Development Grant Facility
EIARD	European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ExCo	Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum on Agricultural Research in Africa
FC	Finance Committee
FO	Farmers' Organization(s)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
IARC	International Agricultural Research Center
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ICWG-CC	Inter-center Working Group on Climate Change
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFAP	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
IOP	Integrated Operating Plan

IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
iSC	Interim Science Council
ISFM	Integrated Soil Fertility Management
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (The World Conservation Union)
MAPP	Multi-Country Agricultural Productivity Program
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MTP	Medium-term Plan(s)
NARES	National Agricultural Research and Extension System(s)
NARS	National Agricultural Research System(s)
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization(s)
NGOC	Non-Governmental Organizations Committee
NRM	Natural Resources Management
OED	World Bank Operations Evaluation Department
PC	Program Committee
PGR	Plant Genetic Resource(s)
PSC	Private Sector Committee
S & T	Science and Technology
SACCAR	Southern African Center for Cooperation in Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Training
SC	Science Council
SO	System Office
SPIA	Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SRO	Sub-regional Organization(s)
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWP	Systemwide Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNU	United Nations University
UPLB	University of the Philippines at Los Banos
WEHAB	Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture, and Biodiversity
WGSC	Working Group on the Science Council
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

International Agricultural Research Centers Supported by the CGIAR

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)

Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (World Agroforestry Centre) (ICRAF)

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)

International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)

International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)

International Water Management Institute (IWMI)

International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (The WorldFish Center) (ICLARM)

West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA)

CONTENTS

	Page
Stakeholder Meeting:	
Revised Draft Timed Agenda	1
Agenda Item 1. Opening Session.....	4
Agenda Item 2. 2002 CGIAR Awards	5
Agenda Item 3. CGIAR Reform Program	6
Agenda Item 4. Centers' Forum.....	7
Agenda Item 5: Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues	8
Agenda Item 6. CGIAR and Sustainable Development: 2002 Summits and the Way Ahead	9
Agenda Item 7. Updates.....	9
Agenda Item 8. Other Business	10
Agenda Item 9. Closing Session.....	10
Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture	10
Business Meeting:	
Revised Draft Timed Agenda	11
Agenda Item 1. Opening Session.....	14
Agenda Item 2. Progress with Implementing the CGIAR Reform Program	15
Agenda Item 3. Reports from iSC.....	23
Agenda Item 4. Evaluation.....	24
Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Financing Plans.....	31
Agenda Item 6. Perspectives from Centers	32
Agenda Item 7. Other Business	33
Agenda Item 8. Closing Session.....	37
Annexes:	
Annex 1. Challenge Programs—Regular Process (Parallel Session Reports).....	38
Annex 2. Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues (Parallel Session Reports)	44
Annex 3. Stakeholder Meeting Documents	50
Annex 4. Business Meeting Documents	52

CGIAR AGM 2002—Stakeholder Meeting
(October 30-31, 2002)

Revised Draft Timed Agenda

Wednesday, October 30

09:00 – 10:30

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

- (a) Inaugural Remarks on Behalf of the Gov. of Philippines
- (b) Chairman's Opening Remarks
- (c) Comments from Cosponsors
- (d) Welcoming New Members
- (e) Adoption of the Agenda

Agenda Item 2. 2002 CGIAR Awards

10:30 – 11:00

Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30

Agenda Item 3. CGIAR Reform Program

- (a) Challenge Programs—Pilot CPs
 - Water and Food
 - Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition
 - Discussion
- (b) Briefing on the Other “Pillars” of the Reform Program
 - Establishing a CGIAR Science Council
 - Establishing CGIAR System Office
 - Experience to-date with the Executive Council

12:30 – 14:00

Lunch Break

14:00 – 15:30

Agenda Item 3. CGIAR Reform Program (continued)

Parallel Sessions

- (c) Challenge Programs—Regular Process

Session I: Improving Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa

Session II: The Challenge of Climate Change and Desertification, Drought, Poverty and Agriculture

Session III: Making the Most of the Coast: A proposal to Reverse Degradation of Coastal Resources and Enhance Livelihoods and Forests as Resources for the Poor: The Rainforest Challenge

-- Discussion of CP Pre-Proposals

15:30 – 16:00

Coffee Break

16:00 – 18:30

Agenda Item 4. Centers' Forum

(a) Meet Your New DGs

-- Introduction by J. Vercoe, CBC Chair

-- Brief statements by the DGs of CIMMYT, IFPRI,
IITA, ILRI

(b) Panel Discussion: *Managing and Utilizing Biodiversity*

-- Overview by M. Williams, CDC Chair

-- Panel: CIMMYT, CIP, IPGRI, ISNAR, WARDA,
World Agroforestry Center, World Fish Center

-- Discussion

Thursday, October 31

08:30 – 10:30

Agenda Item 4. Centers' Forum (continued)

(c) Panel Discussion: *Improving Human Health, Halving
Hunger and Poverty by 2015*

-- Overview by A. El-Beltagy, Incoming CDC Chair

-- Panel: CIAT, CIFOR, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFPRI,
IITA, ILRI, IWMI

-- Discussion

10:30 – 11:00

Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30

Agenda Item 5. Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues
(Parallel Sessions)

Session I: Innovative Approaches to Effective Capacity
Building/Strengthening

Session II: Combating Soil Fertility Degradation in Sub-Saharan
Africa

Session III: Representation of Civil Society Institutions in the
CGIAR

12:30 – 14:00

Lunch Break

14:00 – 15:30

Agenda Item 5. Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues
(continued)

-- Brief reports from parallel sessions

**Agenda Item 6. CGIAR and Sustainable Development: 2002
Summits and the Way Ahead**

(a) Panel Discussion

- Introductory comments by Ian Johnson
- World Food Summit—Five Years Later
- WSSD Outcomes and Implications for the CGIAR
- NEPAD Program on Sustainable Agricultural
Technology Generation and Adoption Systems
- Consultative Process for An International Assessment
on the Role of Agricultural Science and Technology
in Reducing Hunger and Improving Rural
Livelihoods
- International Treaty on PGR and the Global
Conservation Trust

(b) Discussion

15:30 – 16:00

Coffee Break

16:00 – 18:00

**Agenda Item 6. CGIAR and Sustainable Development:
2002 Summits and the Way Ahead**

(b) Discussion (continued)

Agenda Item 7. Updates

(a) Regional Priority Setting (GFAR and iSC)

(b) Other updates

- GRPC
- NGOC
- PSC
- GFAR

Agenda Item 8. Other Business

Agenda Item 9. Closing Session

Chairman's Closing Remarks

Stakeholder Meeting: Summary Record

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

Over 600 stakeholders participated in the Stakeholder Meeting of the second CGIAR Annual General Meeting (AGM02), held on October 30-31, 2002.

(a) Inaugural Remarks on behalf of the Government of the Philippines.

Vice President Teofista Guingona delivered an inaugural address, welcoming the CGIAR, commending its work, and seeking its support to redress North-South imbalances, particularly in the areas of trade and subsidies. Philippines Secretary of Agriculture Leonardo Montemayor accompanied the Vice President.

The CGIAR Chairman announced the death of Mr. David MacKenzie, Chairman, CIP's Board of Trustees, and paid tribute to him for his important contribution to several Centers and to the CGIAR System. The Group observed a moment of silence in honor of Mr. MacKenzie.

(b) Chairman's Opening Remarks

CGIAR Chairman Ian Johnson in his opening statement reviewed the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead as we look to the world of 2050. He pointed out that the international community now agrees on the centrality of agriculture for the world's poor as they seek an ascent out of poverty. He urged the CGIAR to continue on the path of reform so that with its partners it could continue to make a major contribution to development, particularly through Challenge Programs.

The full text of the Chairman's statement, "The CGIAR and Sustainable Development – Global Partnerships for Local Impact," is available on the CGIAR web site, www.cgiar.org.

(c) Welcoming New Members

Israel, Malaysia, Morocco, and the Syngenta Foundation had indicated to the Chairman that they wished to join the CGIAR. In keeping with customary CGIAR practice, they were admitted to CGIAR membership by acclamation. The head of delegation of each new member spoke briefly.

(d) Comments from Cosponsors

Ms. Louise Fresco (FAO) reaffirmed FAO's unfailing support for and collaboration with the CGIAR and the international agricultural Centers. Agriculture is back on the

map, but it is a different map from ten years ago, she said. Many realities arising from this difference need to be addressed. Rapid changes in the world situation prompted by globalization continue or even deepen disparities on issues such as trade, and IPR. Public concern exists over different forms of technology, and these concerns cannot be ignored. Understanding and confronting these issues is part of the challenge that the CGIAR and its partners must face.

Mr. Rodney Cooke (IFAD) said that the AGM02 context was driven by recent summits. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's WEHAB initiative is the central focus of the post-summits agenda. Agriculture is part of WEHAB, and the concerns of the CGIAR gained greater resonance at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg. The challenge now is to approach poverty alleviation and environmental protection as twin challenges, not as competing interests. The CGIAR needs to confront the twin challenges, as it seeks to define and strengthen its contribution to meeting the MDGs.

Mr. Odin Knudsen (World Bank) noted the positive endorsement of the CGIAR by the World Bank's Board of Directors in its decision to maintain Bank funding for the CGIAR unchanged. This decision is a response to CGIAR successes, and is also an endorsement of the current Reform Program. There was much in common between the approach of the CGIAR and the Bank to the poverty alleviation/environmental protection link. The Bank's forestry strategy and water strategy are congruent with CGIAR policies and programs as well. The World Bank's rural development strategy and the central role of agriculture within the strategy signals that agriculture is back on the World Bank agenda. The agricultural science initiative launched by the World Bank and FAO at WSSD emphasized the point.

(e) Adoption of the Agenda

The meeting adopted without change the draft agenda circulated ahead of AGM.

Agenda Item 2. 2002 CGIAR Awards

The Chairman presented the following awards, which recognize scientific achievements by Center staff and partners and, in the case of two new science communications awards, encourage dissemination of agricultural science knowledge in the public domain:

CGIAR King Baudouin Award (ICRISAT and ICARDA).

Promising Young Scientist (Marilyn Louise Warburton, Molecular Geneticist, CIMMYT).

Outstanding Scientist (Tushaar Shah, Principal Scientist, IWMI).

Outstanding Scientific Support Team (Exploiting Biodiversity for Sustainable Pest Management Project Support Team, IRRI).

Outstanding Partnership (Collective Action, and Property Rights, CAPRI)

Outstanding Scientific Article (Jeffrey Sayer, WWF and Bruce Campbell, CIFOR).

Outstanding Journalism(Fred Pearce).

Outstanding Communication(Christopher Barr, CIFOR).

Agenda Item 3. CGIAR Reform Program

(a) Challenge Programs – Pilot CPs

Presentations were made by the proponents of the two pilot CPs that have gone through the agreed review process and been recommended for adoption by the Executive Council (ExCo), as follows:

1. “Water and Food” – **Frank Rijsberman**
2. “Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition” – **Joachim von Braun and Joachim Voss**.

The presentations covered the objectives and anticipated outputs of each CP, activities planned for the inception phase, management structure of the program, science quality, nature of partnerships involved, and funding. Both CPs were commended in the ensuing discussion. The following main issues were raised:

- Need for agreement at the AGM Business Meeting on the approval process for pilot CPs;
- Ensuring science quality;
- Ensuring effective governance and management;
- Balance between CPs and traditional work by Centers.

(b) Briefing on Other “Pillars” of the Reform Program

-- Establishing a CGIAR Science Council

-- Establishing CGIAR System Office

-- Experience to-date with the Executive Council

CGIAR Director Francisco Reifschneider briefed the meeting on progress made with the remaining reform “pillars,” i.e., ExCo, Science Council, System Office. He pointed out that steady progress was made in all three areas:

- ExCo was the most advanced and had already held three meetings.
- The Business Meeting will discuss and decide on recommendations from the Working Group set up to propose how the Science Council should be formed.
- All components of the System Office have prepared Business Plans in a common format;
- The Science Council and System Office will both be fully operational next year.

(c) Challenge Programs – Regular Process

The following five CPs in the regular process were discussed in parallel sessions:

1. “Improving Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa.”
2. “The Challenge of Climate Change.”
3. “Making the Most of the Coast: A Proposal to Reverse Degradation of Coastal Resources.”
4. “Enhance Livelihoods and Forests as Resources for the Poor: The Rainforest Challenge.”
5. “Desertification, Drought, Poverty and Agriculture.”

Discussion centered on the technical aspects of the proposed CPs, their expected outcomes, the need for partnerships that would continue to engage NARS in both planning and implementation, and funding.

There was a strong sense that:

- The CP for Sub-Saharan Africa should move through to the next phases of preparation and review;
- Clear guidelines and an agreed timetable are required for approving CPs;
- Lessons learned from CPs need to be taken into account as more CPs are proposed.

NOTE: *For a summary of discussions at the parallel sessions, see Annex 1.*

Agenda Item 4. Centers’ Forum

Background: In keeping with the innovative trend of the Reform Program, Center Directors and the System Office decided that the traditional Centers’ Forum should be held in a new format, as follows:

- New DGs given the spotlight, to make themselves and their vision known to the membership.
- Center-by-Center presentations are replaced by two Panel presentations/discussions.
- Each Panel, with its own Chair, consists of DGs from different backgrounds, who review the substance of a cross-cutting research theme of significance to the CGIAR System.

NOTE: A separate report on the Centers’ Forum will be posted on the CGIAR web site, www.cgiar.org.

(a) Meet Your New DGs

Session Chair: **Mr. Jochen de Haas**

Co-Chair: **Mr. Ximena Rueda**

The four DGs who had been appointed since the last Annual General Meeting spoke briefly, sharing their vision with stakeholders: **CIMMYT** – Mr. Masaru Iwanaga, **IFPRI** – Mr. Joachim von Braun, **IITA** – Mr. Peter Hartmann, and **ILRI** – Mr. Carlos Otto Sere. They were warmly welcomed, and their views were received with acclamation.

(b) Panel Discussion: “Managing and Utilizing Biodiversity”

The theme was introduced by CDC Chair Meryl Williams, who emphasized both the preservation and utilization aspects of biodiversity. She provided examples from across the work of the Centers to demonstrate how and to what extent they were engaged in both. Following her presentation, comments were made by the DGs of the Centers listed below on the work of their Centers in relation to the theme of the session:

CIMMYT, CIP, IPGRI, ISNAR, WARDA, World Agroforestry Center, WorldFish Center.

(c) Panel Discussion: “Improving Human Health, Halving Hunger and Poverty by 2015”

Session Chair: **Mr. Eliseo Ponce**

Co-Chair: **Mr. Peter Core**

The theme was introduced by incoming CDC Chair Adel El-Beltagy, who reviewed the work of the Centers to demonstrate how agricultural research supports human health. His presentation and the comments by the Panel of DGs were set in the context of the MDGs in which the various goals are inter-connected. Reference was also made to the fact that forestry research also contributes to health e.g., by helping to protect medicinal plant species. Following the introduction, the DGs from the following Centers added their views based on past experience and future prospects:

CIAT, CIFOR, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA, ILRI, IWMI

Discussions followed both sets of comments.

Agenda Item 5: Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues

(Parallel Sessions)

(a) Innovative Approaches to Effective Capacity Building

(b) Combating Soil Fertility Degradation in Sub-Saharan Africa

(c) Representation of Civil Society Institutions in the CGIAR

NOTE: *For a summary of discussions at the parallel sessions, see Annex 2.*

Agenda Item 6. CGIAR and Sustainable Development: 2002 Summits and the Way Ahead

(a) Panel Discussion

Introductory comments by the CGIAR Chairman

- World Food Summit—Five Years Later (Louise Fresco, FAO)*
- WSSD Outcomes and Implications for the CGIAR (Coosje Hoogendorn, CGIAR Task Force on WSSD)*
- NEPAD Program on Sustainable Agricultural Technology Generation and Adoption Systems (Monty Jones, FARA)*
- Consultative Process for An International Assessment on the Role of Agricultural Science and Technology in Reducing Hunger and Improving Rural Livelihoods (Bob Watson, World Bank)*
- International Treaty on PGR and the Global Conservation Trust (Geoff Hawtin, IPGRI).*

The “rich mosaic of commitments that has emerged from the summits of the recent past,” as described by the CGIAR Chairman in his opening statement, was revisited, with an emphasis both on the challenges ahead and the opportunities for combined action to confront them. The full engagement of the CGIAR in the WSSD, the substance of discussions and decisions at the summits, connected initiatives, some of the follow-up activities already in process, and the implications for the future directions of the CGIAR, were reviewed. The dimensions and nature of problems connected with poverty, food security, and the environment were examined and analyzed. Throughout the presentations, there was a sense of excitement about the possibilities opening up for agriculture and rural development-based sustainable development to achieve success in the fight against poverty, hunger, and environmental degradation. The need to combine the best in science and technology with the wisdom and experience of farmers was underscored. There was broad agreement that the developing situation created new opportunities for the CGIAR, acting in full and productive partnership with others including Cosponsors, NARS, ARIs and the private sector.

Agenda Item 7. Updates

(a) Regional Priority Setting

(b) Other Updates

Following the practice established at the Durban mid-term meeting of the CGIAR, brief oral reports for information were presented by:

1. **Mr. Mohamed Roozitalab (GFAR) and Mr. Emil Javier (iSC)** – Regional Priority Setting.

2. **Mr. Geoff Hawtin** – GRPC.
3. **Ms. Monica Kapiriri/ Ms. Anne Waters-Bayer** – NGOC.
4. **Mr. Sam Dryden** – PSC.
5. **Mr. Mohamed Roozitalab** – GFAR.

Agenda Item 8. Other Business

No additional items were considered.

Agenda Item 9. Closing Session

The CGIAR Chairman said farewell on behalf of the CGIAR and stakeholders to two DGs, Geoff Hawtin (IPGRI) and Stein Bie (ISNAR), who were attending a CGIAR AGM in their current capacities for the last time. He commended them for their leadership, and wished them success in their future undertakings. Mr. Hawtin and Mr. Bie responded. They received standing ovations.

The Chairman announced that meeting participants would soon receive a questionnaire seeking feedback from them on all aspects of the meeting.

Bringing the meeting to a close, the Chairman said that the Stakeholder Meeting had been two days of rich discussion. He thanked stakeholders for their interest and commitment. The substance of their discussions would feed into the CGIAR Business Meeting, the decision making segment of AGM.

Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture

Mr. Mohamed T. El-Ashry, Chairman and CEO, Global Environment Facility (GEF) delivered the 2002 Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture on October 30 on the subject “Ecological Sustainability and Food Security – Challenges and Opportunities.”

Mr. El-Ashry pointed out that healthy, intact ecosystems and thriving agriculture, which is a guarantor of food security, are inseparable. “Without agriculture there is no life, without the environment, there is no agriculture.” The world was therefore challenged, he added, to find new ways of addressing this reality. Bringing growth and environmental protection into harmony will require forsaking single-sector approaches that rely too heavily on short-term technical fixes and end up causing long-term environmental degradation. Policy and institutional issues must be addressed, including pricing of natural resources and counter-productive agricultural subsidies.

Mr. El-Ashry suggested that the CGIAR should include three priority areas in its strategic research agenda: integrated land and water management; increased attention to small farmers and marginal lands; and mitigation of agricultural impacts on climate change.

He confirmed that “GEF-CGIAR collaboration is more promising than ever, as we consider ways to mutually support and contribute to sustainable development and the global environment.”

A new CGIAR-GEF publication, “Agriculture and the Environment – Partnership for a Sustainable Future,” was released at the lecture.

CGIAR AGM 2002—Business Meeting
(November 1, 2002)

Revised Draft Timed Agenda

09:00 – 10:30

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

- (a) Chairman's Opening Remarks
- (b) Adoption of the Agenda
- (c) WARDA Update by K. Nwanze

Agenda Item 2. Progress with Implementing the CGIAR Reform Program

- (a) Overview of Reform Program Implementation:
Activities of the ExCo
- (b) Challenge Programs
 - Overview of status
 - Discussion
- (c) Establishment of Science Council
 - Presentation by Working Group Chair M. Hassan
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Discussion

10:30 – 11:00

Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30

Agenda Item 2. Progress with Implementing the CGIAR Reform Program (continued)

- (d) Establishment of System Office
 - Update by M. Williams, Member, System Office Steering Committee
 - Discussion
- (e) GRPC Review
 - Presentation of Panel's Report by Ian Bevege
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Discussion

Agenda Item 3. Reports from iSC

- (a) Report from iSC Chair
 - Update on Social Science Conference
- (b) Report from SPIA/iSC Chair
- (c) Discussion

12:30 – 14:00

Lunch Break

14:00 – 15:30

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation

- (a) External Program and Management Review of ISNAR
 - Presentation by Panel Chair D. Spencer
 - Comments by ISNAR
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Discussion

- (b) External Program and Management Review of CIP
 - Presentation by Panel Chair E. Schuh
 - Comments by CIP
 - ExCo recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Discussion

15:30 – 16:00

Coffee Break

16:00 – 18:30

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation (continued)

- (c) Evaluation of Systemwide Programs
 - Review of the Systemwide IPM Program
 - Presentation by Panel Chair A. Gutierrez
 - Discussion
 - Review of the Systemwide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRi)
 - Presentation by C. Valdivia (Panel Member)
 - Discussion
- (d) Follow-up of CGIAR Evaluations
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Discussion

Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Financing Plans

- (a) Financing Plan for 2003
 - Report from the Secretariat
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Discussion

Agenda Item 6. Perspectives from Centers

- (a) CBC perspectives
- (b) CDC perspectives
- (c) Discussion

Agenda Item 7. Other Business

- (a) Consultation with World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (OED) on the Meta-Evaluation of the CGIAR
 - Overview of the World Bank OED Evaluation of Global Public Goods Programs by Greg Ingram
 - Presentation by Uma Lele

- Discussion
- (b) Future CGIAR Meetings

Agenda Item 8. Closing Session

Business Meeting: Summary Record

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

(a) Chairman's Opening Remarks

CGIAR Chairman Ian Johnson welcomed delegates, and declared the meeting open.

The Chairman informed the meeting that several changes of personnel were due to take place in the System.

The Group:

- Thanked the Chairs of ICRISAT (Martha Stone), ICRAF (Lucie Edwards), IWMI (Klaas Jan Beek), ICARDA (Robert Havener), and IFPRI (Geoff Miller) who would end their terms before the next AGM for their service to the System, and to the Centers concerned;
- Welcomed the incoming Chairs of IPGRI (Banchapun Shinawatra), IRRI (Angeline Kamba), ICLARM (Robert Kearney), and IITA (Mortimer Neufville);
- Commended iSC Executive Secretary Shellemiah O. Keya, who would be retiring before the next AGM, for his leadership of the TAC/iSC Secretariat, and for his strong commitment to the CGIAR System;
- Thanked outgoing NGOC Co-Chair Ann Waters-Bayer for her leadership of the committee, and welcomed the two new Co-Chairs, Monica Kapiriri and Patrick Mulvany.

Ms. Kapiriri informed the meeting that commencing 2003, the NGOC would be freezing its membership, and would not be drawing funds from the committee's budget, pending a review of how best civil society movements could engage with international agricultural research. The committee was disengaging, she said, because of concerns that the CGIAR was following a corporate-led agenda. Civil society movements felt that they should defend public goods interests, particularly in relation to the gene banks placed under the trusteeship of the FAO.

World Bank Cosponsor representative **Odin Knudsen** announced that the Bank's new Forest Strategy and Policy had been unanimously adopted by the Executive Board the previous day. Adoption of the strategy, he said, was a great day for the Centers that had been fully engaged in the consultations on which the strategy was based, and would be involved in its implementation.

(b) Adoption of the Agenda

The draft agenda was adopted with the following items added for discussion under Other Business:

- CGIAR Membership;
- Civil society representation in the CGIAR.

Some members asked that discussion of the agenda item under Other Business, “Consultation with World Bank Operations Evaluation Department on the Meta-Evaluation of the CGIAR” should be taken up ahead of other agenda items because it dealt with matters to be discussed in the course of the meeting. The Chairman agreed. (In this summary record, items are reported in the order in which they appear on the agenda.)

(c) WARDA Update

WARDA DG Kanayo Nwanze reported that movement in and out of WARDA headquarters at Bouake, Cote d’Ivoire, had been obstructed since September, due to political and military disturbances in the host country. One death had occurred as a direct result of the disturbances, and two deaths were caused by lack of medical care. More than 35 official and personal vehicles had been commandeered.

Internationally recruited staff were safely evacuated under French protection, and WARDA was operating from its liaison offices in Abidjan. Some 60 percent of staff are in Abidjan, the rest are on leave with pay. Contrary to rumors, WARDA headquarters was not taken over. Infrastructure and utilities are intact. The gene bank was operational. WARDA stations in Senegal and Nigeria were not affected. WARDA would monitor developments, and would consider relocation to a site elsewhere in West Africa only if compelled by circumstances.

The DG thanked the CGIAR and, in particular, Chairman Ian Johnson and Director Francisco Reifschneider, for strong support during a very difficult period. The Chairman recorded the support of the CGIAR to the management and staff and their families, and to the institution.

Agenda Item 2. Progress with Implementing the CGIAR Reform Program

(a) Overview of Reform Program Implementation: Activities of the ExCo

CGIAR Director Francisco Reifschneider, presenting a status report on the Reform Program, its implementation, and its impact on the CGIAR alliance, said that the program was on track, with minor adjustments to timeline and process.

He pointed out that:

- Establishment of ExCo, initiation of CPs, transformation of TAC into a Science Council, and establishment of a System Office are well underway, with ExCo activities ahead of the others;
- Agriculture and rural development are now firmly placed on the international development agenda, and were emphasized at the series of summits that were discussed during the Stakeholder Meeting;
- The CGIAR membership was strongly supportive of the Reform Program, and some members had substantially increased their contributions;
- The CGIAR continued to attract new members.

Communication was a key to the success of the Reform Program. All components of the CGIAR System were regularly kept informed of developments, through email, as well as audio and video conferences. In addition to regular communication, “targeted” communication was also undertaken, such as the recent special seminar for policymakers in Japan.

ExCo was working very well. A great deal of business was conducted in virtual mode. In addition, three short meetings were held, with sharply focused discussion, and clear decisions. The agendas were substantive, as could be seen from the recommendations that ExCo submitted to the CGIAR. ExCo had, as well, attended to its internal organization, with the establishment of a Finance Committee (FC) and Program Committee (PC).

(b) Challenge Programs

The CGIAR Director outlined progress that had been made in initial development and consideration by iSC and ExCo of Challenge Programs (CP) in the pilot process, and the iSC Chair provided information on the status of proposals in the regular process, and on the criteria used by iSC in making its determinations.

ExCo’s recommendations on CPs in the pilot process were as follows:

- ExCo endorses the “Water and Food” CP proposal and recommends its approval by the CGIAR.
- ExCo endorses the “Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition” CP proposal and recommends its approval by the CGIAR.
- ExCo does not consider the “Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource-Poor” CP proposal to be ready for approval by the CGIAR. The proponents should develop the proposal further and re-submit it to ExCo, which will follow the normal process for CP approval. The proponents should take into account the issues reported here (at AGM) as well as those identified by ExCo members.

Issues identified by ExCo members as needing further clarification in the genetic diversity CP included management of the CP, IPR issues, targets, partnerships

including the role of the private sector, and the need for a more explicit financing plan.

CPs were the subject of vigorous discussion, with 23 interventions, covering the substance of proposals, finance, the relationship between CPs and other Center activities, and the process by which CPs were assessed. Throughout the discussion, participants expressed strong support for the concept of CPs, their usefulness in relation to the global development agenda, and the need to ensure their maximum impact. The main issues raised in the discussion are summarized below:

- ExCo's recommendation that the "Water and Food" and "Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition" should be approved by the Group was fully endorsed.
- Participants also voiced support for two other proposals: "Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource Poor" and "Improving Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa."
- Information is required about the criteria used by ExCo in its assessments, particularly because it had differed from iSC in its appraisal of the "unlocking genetic diversity" proposal.
- Greater attention needs to be paid to nurturing partnerships, in their fullest sense, through the development and implementation of CPs.
- The private sector has vast expertise in the field of genomics. This experience, as well as investment, could be tapped for the "unlocking genetic diversity" CP, if the proposal is better designed, with a tighter focus in terms of crops and traits, and with more specifics on implementation.
- The initial understanding was that CPs would be financed with "new" money. That is not the case with the current CPs. This is an important issue that should be addressed, particularly because of the decrease in unrestricted funding. Will future funds for CPs be diverted from core activities?
- Too much attention has been paid to risks, and not enough to the opportunities provided by CPs. There are many strategic opportunities in CPs, and strategic planning can be incorporated into the CP process.
- Should the process be slowed down until the System is able to learn from experience? There are significant lessons to be drawn from Systemwide Programs as well.
- This is a good time to look at the process as a whole, and not piecemeal. Questions still surround CPs in terms of overall goals, structure, funding, future of CPs, etc. These should be addressed.

- At a time of increasingly crowded research and development initiatives, it is necessary to ensure clarity in the strategic direction of CPs, and in how they will add to the development agenda. These questions involve the substance of research, as well as funding.
- CPs will shape the strategic direction of the CGIAR. Planning for CPs requires a clear set of strategic priorities, with a strategic niche for CPs identified.
- The CGIAR does not have a clear strategic framework for evaluating CPs. The “Seven Planks” of the Vision Paper do not constitute a strategy. The CGIAR should not continue appraising the CPs in sequence, without a clear strategic framework.
- The CGIAR needs to be pragmatic about the road ahead, and the next steps to be taken.
- The CGIAR should proceed with CPs. It is unwise to halt a component of reform when the Reform Program is still being implemented. However, it is necessary to learn more about CPs as experience accumulates.
- The iSC is to be commended for its role in the CP process.
- New members need more information about the concept of and the selection process of CPs.

The CGIAR Director said that the System was going through a learning process in the development of CPs, and that discussions at the AGM02 Business Meeting were part of that process. SWPs have provided excellent platforms to evaluate some of the CPs. He noted, however, that not every SWP should become a CP.

The Group has made clear its desire for strategic priorities, and CPs can contribute positively to the evolution of a new strategic approach. CPs should not be viewed only in relation to additional financial resources they bring to the CGIAR, but also in terms of contributions of human resources and proprietary technology. CPs will have a positive impact on a broad range of partnerships.

The Director emphasized that the System Office stood ready to assist members gain a clearer understanding of the CP process.

In summing up the discussion, the CGIAR Chairman said that CPs seek to scale up impacts, improve partnerships (internal and external), identify important issues, and build platforms that can mobilize additional funds. He said he sensed a consensus of support for CPs as a concept, willingness to approve the two pilots endorsed by ExCo, a desire for prudence in going forward in terms of priorities within a strategic framework, and concerns about cannibalizing funding.

The Group decided as follows:

1. “Water and Food”— approved.
2. “Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition”— approved.
3. Interim Science Council (iSC) to prepare a note outlining a strategic framework for CP development, for review by ExCo.

(c) Establishment of Science Council

Mr. Mohamed Hassan, Chair of the seven-member Working Group (WGSC) established by ExCo to report on the transition from TAC to a Science Council (SC) presented the working group’s major findings. The WGSC report was comprehensive and covered both the conceptual and working aspects of SC. Detailed proposals were made for nominations to the SC, for measures to secure its independence, and for setting up a strong Secretariat headquartered at FAO.

WGSC envisages the CGIAR SC as a major new institutional innovation for international agricultural science and sustainable development. Although it is being established within the context of the CGIAR System, it should engage with and be relevant to the wider international agricultural and science community.

He said that the mission of the proposed SC should be:

“to enhance and promote the quality, relevance and impact of science in the CGIAR, to advise the Group on strategic scientific issues of importance to its goals, and to mobilize and harness the best of international science for addressing the goals of the international agricultural research community.”

Its specific objectives would be to:

- Ensure that science in the CGIAR is of high quality and is relevant to the development goals of the System;
- Provide science policy guidance to the CGIAR on issues of strategic importance;
- Provide independent, credible and authoritative advice and opinion on scientific issues relevant to the international agricultural research system; and
- Develop partnerships with the wider scientific community for the benefit of an international agricultural research agenda.

The SC should consist of six members and a Chair. The Council should normally hold two short (2-3 day) meetings a year, supplemented with additional meetings in virtual mode. It should carry out much of its work through four Standing Panels covering four functional areas, i.e. **Strategies and Priorities, Monitoring and Evaluation, Impact Assessment (SPIA), and Mobilizing Science**. Each Standing Panel should be chaired by an SC member (except for SPIA) and include two additional, external members. The Chair of SPIA should be appointed by the SC, in

consultation with ExCo, but should not be an SC member. SPIA members should be appointed by the SC, in consultation with the SPIA Chair.

To help ensure a smooth transition from iSC to SC, two members from the current iSC should be invited to join the SC as members, for one year i.e. in addition to the six new SC members.

ExCo discussed the WGSC report and endorsed it in broad terms, subject to adjustments following the report's discussion at AGM02, and taking into account comments made by ExCo members. ExCo recommended CGIAR approval of the extensions of the appointments of the current iSC members until June 30, 2003.

The Group broadly supported the thrust of the report, while commenting on some of the details in the recommendations. The main issues raised included the following:

- The SC as proposed could be too small to deal with the range of issues it will need to address;
- Geographical balance of SC membership should be ensured;
- There should be no time slippage in establishing SC – no later than June 30, 2003;
- SC should be strong and play the role of watchdog;
- Persons selected for the SC should be able to link CGIAR science with global science;
- Congruence and linkages between SC and other System mechanisms should be ensured;
- GFAR's proposal for a GFAR-SC link should be pursued;
- SC must provide an “authorizing environment” for the quality and relevance of science at the Centers;
- To be fully effective, SC's responsibilities should include resource allocation;
- Some of the proposed arrangements for the SC Secretariat conflict with FAO's legal obligations;
- A detailed operational budget for SC should be formulated for discussion.

The Group:

- Endorsed the WGSC report;
- Agreed that Cosponsors should meet to review funding and SC Secretariat staffing;
- Decided that ExCo should establish a Search and Nomination Committee which would submit to ExCo a short list of candidates for potential appointment as SC members; and
- Extended the appointment of the current iSC to June 30, 2003.

(d) Establishment of System Office

CDC Chair Meryl Williams, a member of the System Office (S.O.) Steering Committee, presented an update on the establishment of the S.O.

The rationale for creating the S.O. is that existing units act in isolation from each other, resulting in service gaps as well as overlaps. There is a need for increased transparency, a performance focus, and simplicity. Cohesion among units that form the S.O. could bring about economies of scale, greater collaboration across the System, and the development of joint services.

Currently, the S.O. consists of ten units: CGIAR Secretariat, iSC Secretariat, Future Harvest Foundation, Association of International Agricultural Research Centers, Gender and Diversity Program, Internal Auditing Unit, Central Advisory Service for Intellectual Property Rights, CDC Executive Secretariat, Chief Information Officer, and Strategic Advisory Service on Human Resources.

The basic instrument for developing the S.O. is an Integrated Business Plan consisting of the Business Case (completed) and the Integrated Operating Plan (IOP). Most units have submitted drafts of their 2003 business plans in a common format, with detailed service objectives, and budget requirements. The estimated total budget is \$9-10 million.

The next steps will be to deal with governance issues, budget/financing issues, and performance matrices; and to complete preparation of the IOP, and launch its implementation.

Discussion centered on the long term approach of the S.O. – pragmatic or optimum? – cost-efficiency and value for money, and the need to ensure that efficiency gains will lead to a reduction of expenditure. The CDC Chair explained that the S.O. would move from pragmatic, in the short term, to optimum in the medium term, and agreed with the need to examine cost implications closely.

The CGIAR Chairman thanked the CDC Chair for the information presented. He pointed out that costs had been looked at for the first time, and said that this was a positive development.

(e) GRPC Review

In May 2002, ExCo set up a Panel consisting of **Mr. Ian Bevege** and **Mr. Carlos Correa** to review the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee in the context of the new governance structure in the CGIAR. The Panel's overall conclusion was that:

“...the GRPC has fulfilled its mission in a very satisfactory manner, and that there is a need to retain such an independent mechanism within CGIAR.

However, some adjustments could be made to the Committee's scope and composition in order to enhance its advisory role, particularly in relation to developments at the national level, individual Center's needs in the field of genetic resources policies, and emerging issues in conservation and management of genetic resources relevant to CGIAR."

The CGIAR Director summarized the Panel's main recommendations that dealt with the size and composition of GRPC, criteria for selecting members, the necessity for AGM to adopt GRPC's recommendations through formal decisions, engagement of the SC in GRPC, the working relationship between GRPC and FAO, the role of IPGRI in relation to GRPC, and the need to enhance the monitoring of national developments by GRPC.

ExCo recommended as follows to the CGIAR:

- ExCo endorses the recommendations of the GRPC Review Panel in broad terms.
- Adjustments to the Panel's recommendations should be made following the report's discussion by the CGIAR at the AGM and taking into account comments made by ExCo members.

The following suggestions for strengthening GRPC operations were made at AGM:

1. CGIAR should consider the option of reducing the size of GRPC, and emphasizing policy advice in its remit. The expertise of stakeholders should be tapped.
2. GRPC's policy advice should be in line with the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.
3. GRPC should expand its activities to include coverage of (a) minor crops not covered by the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, and (b) animal genetic resources.

The Group:

- Endorsed the report of the review Panel and ExCo recommendations, with the suggestions from members at AGM to be incorporated;
- Agreed that GRPC should continue as a multi-stakeholder, independent advisory body;
- Recommended that ExCo's suggestions, particularly on links with the SC, IPGRI, and on size, should be considered; and
- Decided that GRPC should be allocated a modest budget.

Agenda Item 3. Reports from iSC

(a) Report from iSC Chair

-- Update on Social Science Conference

(b) Report from SPIA/iSC Chair

iSC Chair Emil Javier reported on the activities and accomplishments of the Interim Science Council since AGM01, under five broad themes:

- Assuring the Relevance and Quality of Science;
- Developing Policy, Priorities and Strategy;
- Commenting on Center MTPs and 2003 Financing Plans;
- Ensuring Assessment of CGIAR Impact;
- Evaluation of Challenge Programs.

Additionally, the iSC Chair outlined steps that were taken, and would continue, to ensure a smooth transition to the new SC. These included the production of "Guardian Papers," the inclusion of two iSC members in the first Science Council, and the continuation of initiatives undertaken with FAO, CDC, the Centers, GFAR, and regional organizations.

CIAT DG Joachim Voss reported on a Social Science Conference held at CIAT. The conference analyzed the importance and relevance of social science research which enhanced other research activities in the CGIAR System. New and increasing demands were made on social scientists in the CGIAR, and members were challenged to provide resources for the recruitment of bright, young social scientists from developing countries.

iSC/SPIA Chair Hans Gregersen presented an update on the work of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment. He reviewed the mandate and composition of SPIA, the current status of SPIA activities, and the future of impact assessment in the CGIAR. The SPIA report acknowledged the contribution made by a paper on Impact Assessment from EIARD.

Mr. Gregersen said that activities in the pipeline included an assessment of the impacts of the CGIAR on poverty, and a follow-up study on impacts in Africa. He emphasized the fact that impact assessment, now firmly established in the CGIAR System, will be a central function of the new SC, as foreseen by WGSC.

The Group welcomed the reports, and commended the range of activities undertaken. Particular mention was made of the importance of poverty-related impact assessment. This is important *per se*, and demonstrates that CGIAR takes poverty reduction seriously, an important issue for most donors.

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation

(a) External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of ISNAR

Panel Chair Dunstan Spencer, summarizing the EPMR, stressed that the Panel's report was a team effort. After a thorough review, the Panel concluded that ISNAR had several achievements to its credit but faced problems and challenges as well.

The Panel commended ISNAR for its work on biotechnology decision tools, for developing research management tools and processes, for its participatory, network-based approach to knowledge sharing and problem solving, and for some of its training efforts.

The Panel found, however, that the Center had many serious weaknesses and, overall, the impact of ISNAR's work was modest. This assessment was shared by ISNAR's own impact assessment study. ISNAR's services had strengthened national research capacity in only a handful of developing countries. The Center was performing below required standards in peer-reviewed research outputs, and has had difficulty in defining the international public goods nature of its work. The Center needed a new "road map" for the future and, clearly, "business as usual" is not a sustainable option for ISNAR.

Accordingly, the Panel set out nine clusters of recommendations, and posed three options for the future:

1. A rejuvenated research and service-oriented ISNAR, re-tooled and re-staffed, and headquartered in the Hague.
2. A decentralized, service oriented ISNAR.
3. An immediate phasing out of ISNAR, with most of its relevant activities passed on to other Centers.

The Panel considers Option 2 the most attractive and least risky option. Under this option, ISNAR would transfer its policy research to IFPRI, and decentralize its research activities. It would build capacity in the regional and sub-regional organizations so that they could take over its functions in five years. The Panel recommended that the CGIAR should carefully consider Option 2.

ISNAR Board Chair Moise Mensah said that the Board was eager to ensure that ISNAR should continue its role effectively. However, it viewed the EPMR with some perplexity, as it was able to accept some recommendations, but not others. ISNAR welcomes a Change Team to advise its Board and management.

ISNAR DG Stein Bie said that he could agree with many EPMR recommendations such as the proposed decentralization of ISNAR's activities, the need to update training manuals, changes in Board composition, ISNAR's skill mix, and financial

reporting arrangements. He disagreed, however, with several EPMR and ExCo recommendations:

- ISNAR's scientific publication rates were actually twice as high as reported by the EPMR;
- ISNAR was disseminating knowledge through the worldwide web, not only through printed material;
- Policy research is an integral part of ISNAR's mandate, and cannot be carried out effectively by transferring it to IFPRI;
- Pre-determined budget ceilings should not be applied to ISNAR;
- Recruitment of the new DG should continue.

Commenting on the EPMR process, the DG took exception to the composition of the Panel. Some relevant areas of expertise were not included. The Panel had refused to meet the DG. The last one-and-a-half pages of the Panel's ToR were not known to ISNAR until after the review was completed. A Panel member had pre-released the EPMR, he added.

The DG welcomed proposals to set up a "Change Team." He said that ISNAR should be characterized as a Center of Excellence, carrying out high quality research within a niche defined by its comparative advantage, and functioning in a decentralized mode.

ExCo considered the EPMR at its September 24 meeting, and recommended as follows:

1. ExCo agrees with the Panel and iSC that "business as usual" is not acceptable.
2. The ISNAR Board should slow down the DG recruitment process until there is greater clarity on ISNAR's future.
3. CGIAR members should avoid major changes in ISNAR's funding until the institutional options are clarified. A major increase in funding for 2003 (planned as indicated in the 2003 financing plan to be at up to 40 percent over the 2001 level) is not tenable at this time.
4. Alternative institutional arrangements should be sought to have the priority functions of ISNAR carried out in a more decentralized, networking mode. Of the two major options: (a) re-building and strengthening the current ISNAR; and (b) scaling down and operating in a decentralized, networking mode, the latter should be the direction the CGIAR should move.
5. A plan for restructuring ISNAR should be developed, looking at all innovative scaling down options, including operating as a virtual network, or transferring ISNAR's functions and programs to other institutions.

6. The CGIAR should appoint a small restructuring team made up of key stakeholders of ISNAR (e.g., donors, clients, the Board) to recommend a restructuring plan over a short period.

The CGIAR Chairman called on the Netherlands delegate to speak first, so that the Group might be familiar with the views of the host country. He suggested, as well, that the view of non-ExCo members of the Group should receive priority, as ExCo had already discussed the EPMR and formulated its recommendations.

The Netherlands delegate said that ISNAR's host country valued the Center's mandate. He supported decentralization, but felt that transferring some functions to other Centers was not practical. Without sufficient capacity and expertise to implement ISNAR's functions, these functions will not be carried out. A small Change Team, whose members had the required expertise, should be established with a clear mandate, including a review of cost options, and with the requirement that it should complete its work in a short time. He appreciated a critical EPMR, but said that the same approach should be used in all EPMRs.

iSC Chair Emil Javier said that the integrity of the EPMR process could not be faulted. The selection of Panel members was the prerogative of iSC, and ISNAR had cleared the names of Panel members. The Panel's ToR were standard. Premature release of the report on a web site was accidental. The real issues were:

- Do the CGIAR and its partners need ISNAR's service and functions? The answer is "yes."
- What has been the Center's performance? A mixed bag.

He agreed that "business as usual" was unacceptable, and urged that a "change team" be appointed as soon as possible.

The following main points emerged in the ensuing discussion:

- The Panel was commended for a frank and thorough EPMR;
- The Center was commended for its willingness to undertake change;
- The principle of "business as usual" not being sustainable was endorsed;
- Reforms were considered urgently necessary;
- ISNAR should not be phased out;
- ISNAR's mandate was strongly supported;
- Opinion was repeatedly expressed that the System needs an "ISNAR-type organization;"
- Transfer of ISNAR's functions to other Centers was rejected;
- ISNAR's funding should not be curtailed;
- The DG recruitment process should continue.

In light of these comments, the Group, using ExCo recommendations as a point of departure, decided as follows:

1. “Business as usual” at ISNAR is not acceptable.
2. The recruitment process for selecting a new DG will move ahead, and the new DG should be in contact with the Restructuring Team, to ensure full implementation of the team’s proposals.
3. Precipitate increases/decreases in funding for ISNAR should not be made.
4. A restructuring plan should be developed for ISNAR, considering all innovative options, with the exception of phasing out ISNAR. Development of the plan should involve all stakeholders.
5. A CGIAR Restructuring Team should be established, with a mandate to conclude its activities by the end of April 2003.

The CGIAR Director proposed a procedure for the restructuring team. Following discussion, the Group agreed that the Change Team’s ToR, composition, and work schedule should be as follows:

Terms of Reference

1. Develop a restructuring plan for ISNAR, as follow-up to the CGIAR decisions taken at AGM02. The team should examine all innovative options, including operating as a virtual network. The option of phasing out ISNAR will not be considered. The restructuring team should interact with ISNAR’s stakeholders and others as necessary.
2. Report its recommendations to the CGIAR, through the Executive Council.

Composition

A nine-person team, supported by the System Office and specialists as necessary.

Members would be recruited from the following stakeholder groups:

Chair: An independent, respected individual knowledgeable with the CGIAR and with issues of institutional development

Members: 3 CGIAR members (current investors in ISNAR)
 2 partners/clients from developing countries
 2 members of the ISNAR Board
 1 individual representing the CGIAR System, nominated by the CGIAR Chairman

Selection Process and Tentative Timetable

CGIAR Members nominate individuals for the team November 2002

CGIAR Director proposes slate from among nominees to ExCo for approval November 2002

ExCo selection/approval	December 2002
Team holds first meeting, plans its work	December 2002
Team completes and submits recommendations to ExCo	March 2003
ExCo proposes action plan to the CGIAR for approval	April 2003
CGIAR decides on next steps	May 2003
Implementation of restructuring actions starts	June 2003

(b) External Program and Management Review of CIP

Panel Chair Ed Schuh said the review Panel worked effectively in a collegial manner. The Panel appreciated the collaboration received from CIP's leadership and staff.

Summarizing the EPMR, Mr. Schuh said that the Center, which addresses the problems of a commodity that is important to the poor, had developed and sustained a quality research and outreach program in each of its main areas of interest.

The Center had:

- mobilized vast genetic resources for its mandate crops;
- successfully integrated social science work with biological and natural science research; and
- worked effectively to maintain pure lines, and sustained an effective breeding program.

He commended the Center for the humane way in which it had scaled down staff and programs in the face of significant budget reductions.

The EPMR highlighted the following of its recommendations:

1. Coalesce potato improvement activities into a single project.
2. Introduce more potato improvement activities in NRM work.
3. Make a stronger case with the CGIAR community about the significant differences between vegetatively propagated crops and cereals in crop improvement activities.
4. Focus social science research more directly on science and technology policy issues.
5. Develop a vision statement for the Center, pointing it more effectively to the future.

The review Panel felt that CIP should receive more “core funding” to support the maintenance research and the costly maintenance of vegetatively propagated gene bank holdings.

Introducing CIP’s response, **Board Vice Chair K. K. Kim** assured the Group that CIP’s Board would be vigilant about the appropriate implementation of EPMR recommendations. He thanked the Panel for its valuable suggestions and recommendations. CIP had already distributed a document setting out how the recommendations were being implemented.

CIP DG Hubert Zandstra welcomed the commendations received from the EPMR, recommendations for strengthening the Center’s effectiveness, and iSC’s supportive commentary. CIP had already responded to the recommendations of the previous EPMR, for instance, by upgrading its biodiversity facility. He pointed out that CIP had reduced its 2002 deficit by \$40,000, and prepared a conservative, balanced budget for 2003. However, he said, both the EPMR and iSC agree that CIP is “under funded.”

Mr. Zandstra outlined the technical details of CIP’s research, indicated what the Center’s research targets were, and said that rapid expansion of roots and tubers in Africa and Asia showed continued promise for improving health and raising income. He emphasized the fact roots and tubers were particularly significant in the fight against poverty. They were grown by the poorest farmers, were mostly rain-fed, absorbed more labor in production, and offered greater processing opportunities to producer communities. Women’s participation was high in both production and post-harvest activity.

In response to the urging of the EPMR, CIP is launching a participatory visioning exercise to develop a road map for its future.

iSC Chair Emil Javier broadly supported the EPMR, and commended CIP for its positive response.

ExCo recommended that the CGIAR should endorse the recommendations of the EPMR, with the adjustments made by ExCo. The Group agreed.

(c) Evaluation of Systemwide Programs

- Review of the Systemwide IPM Program
- Review of the Systemwide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights

iSC Chair Emil Javier presented the main points of the **Systemwide-IPM Program** (SP-IPM) review. The Panel endorsed the effectiveness of a coordinated, systemwide approach to IPM, because constraints and challenges faced on a regional and global scale cannot be met by individual researchers or by individual

Centers. The Panel urged the continuance of the program, and made several recommendations to strengthen the impact of SP-IPM. The recommendations included calls for SP-IPM to:

- Take a more outward-looking approach in seeking international assistance and co-operation;
- More thoroughly analyze its taskforces to expand their potential global relevance;
- Explore the complementarity among other Systemwide programs and Centers not included in SP-IPM as well as outside research institutes including NARS and ARIs; and
- Add socio-economic and policy research as a major component of its program.

The review urged the CGIAR to upgrade the status of SP-IPM, so that the program might function as a “virtual Center.”

Review Panel member **C. Valdivia**, presenting the main findings of the review of the Systemwide Program on **Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRi)**, pointed out that CA and PR influence the efficiency and sustainability of natural resource use.

The Panel noted that CAPRi had developed public goods to increase awareness of CA and PR; carried out a competitive grants research program; promoted CA/PR in 400 institutions (NARS and CGIAR) on 110 projects; and maintained cost-effectiveness.

The Panel’s programmatic recommendations included the following:

- Expound systematically the relationships between CA/PR and poverty alleviation;
- Develop a storing portfolio on CA;
- Develop a more purposeful program on gender, targeting impacts;
- Enhance capacity building for NARS;
- Mainstream excellent CAPR-developed Best Practices on Research Planning for Policy Impact.

The Panel stressed the importance of the program, and the need for it to be strongly supported, particularly as it could feed into CPs. The Panel urged that the program should be provided with an annual “core budget” of \$2 million.

The Group broadly endorsed the findings of both reviews, and supported the continuance of both Systemwide programs.

(d) Follow-up of CGIAR Evaluations

The Group endorsed the ExCo's suggestions on the need for a follow-up mechanism to ensure systematic implementation of recommendations by external reviews. EIARD's willingness to assist with the development of a follow-up mechanism was noted with appreciation. The point was made that management issues continue to be important, and that it is not a good idea to separate program and management reviews.

The Group:

- Directed the System Office to develop a reporting system enabling each Center to report periodically on implementation of its most recent external review; and
- Requested ExCo to examine these reports and determine the need for CGIAR action.

Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Financing Plans

(a) Financing Plan for 2003

Senior Finance Officer Shey Tata of the System Office (CGIAR Secretariat) presented the System's 2003 Financing Plan, calling for an investment of \$376 million to be financed by \$358 million in investor grants, and \$18 million in other resources from Centers. The 2003 Plan was summarized by ICRAF, ILRI, and the System Office. It was discussed by the ExCo's FC and by the ExCo itself. ExCo endorsed the Financing Plan and recommended its approval by the CGIAR.

The impact of devaluation on member contributions and funding levels, the contribution of the World Bank to the Centers' germplasm work, and the impact of CP funding on the System's strategic priorities were among the issues raised during the discussion that followed Mr. Tata's presentation.

He explained that:

- Center proposals take into account the effect of exchange rate changes on revenue;
- Revenue is recognized on the basis of standard accounting practices for unrestricted and restricted grants;
- CPs are still in an early stage and are being discussed at AGM, so the Financing Plan before the Group covered only the current CGIAR portfolio, not CPs;
- World Bank funds are not allocated to specific line items.

The Group approved the 2003 Financing Plan.

Agenda Item 6. Perspectives from Centers

(a) CBC Perspectives

CBC Chair John Vercoe (Chair, ILRI Board of Trustees) presented a CBC Position Statement in which he stressed that Board Chairs took seriously their role as trustees of the System's assets. Trustees, he added, were the instruments through whom reform could be hastened and goals achieved.

Among the issues covered in the Position Statement were:

- Responsibilities of trusteeship;
- Board performance;
- Performance indicators for Centers;
- Human Resources policies;
- Guidelines for inter-Center and inter-organizational cooperation (in the context of CPs);
- Interaction between Boards and the rest of the CGIAR System.

The CBC was improving its way of doing business and plans to continue on this path, in conjunction with reform of the System.

(b) CDC Perspectives

CDC Chair Meryl Williams (DG, WorldFish Center) presented a statement on behalf of Center Directors, outlining efforts made by the CDC to improve its efficiency and effectiveness, and highlighting issues of major concern and interest to DGs. These included:

- Strategic approaches to fulfill the CGIAR vision and goals;
- CGIAR Reform Program;
- Partnerships, finance, and structural issues;
- Resource mobilization and public awareness;
- World Bank support and the meta-evaluation;
- Systemwide and ecoregional programs;
- Appropriate and safe biotechnology;
- Intellectual property rights;
- Global public goods;
- The CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program;
- Human resources and administration at Centers.

The CBC and CDC Chairs reported that the two committees had previously met together, and would continue their consultations. Each committee, meanwhile, would conduct regular retreats at which they would deal with major issues of continuing interest.

The reports were received with acclaim.

Agenda Item 7. Other Business

(a) Consultation with World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (OED) on the Meta-Evaluation of the CGIAR

The Group received summary presentations by **Mr. Greg Ingram, Director General, OED**, the **World Bank**, and **Ms. Uma Lele, Senior Adviser, OED**, and a former TAC member, on a meta-evaluation of the CGIAR conducted by OED. The Bank's internal practices prevent the text of such a report from being disseminated before it has been reviewed by the World Bank's Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE).

Mr. Ingram explained that OED focuses on World Bank activities and reports to the Board. It does not report to World Bank management but rather engages with it.

Laying out an overview of OED's recent review of Global Public Goods Programs, he noted that:

- Phase I of the review took an overall look at all World Bank-sponsored programs.
- Phase II involved case studies of individual programs, including the CGIAR.
- Constraints on time and funds led to the decision to conduct a meta-evaluation: a study of reviews that have already been undertaken.
- The final report is expected to go to CODE at the end of November 2002.
- After discussions with CODE in December, the report will be made public.

Meta-evaluation Findings

Ms. Uma Lele, who headed the meta-evaluation, provided the context in which the evaluation was set. This includes: growth in private agricultural expenditures but mainly in developed countries; a sharp decline in World Bank investment in agriculture; changes in the funding regime of the CGIAR; the founding principles of the CGIAR; and the multiples roles of the World Bank in relation to the CGIAR.

The overall conclusion of the meta-evaluation was that the CGIAR's productivity research has well-documented positive impacts, and that, as an international research network, it remains vital to agricultural development and poverty reduction. However, the meta-evaluation found that:

- CGIAR expenditures on productivity enhancing research has declined;
- The top ten donors still provide two-thirds of CGIAR funding;
- Restricted funding has increased;
- The founding principles of the CGIAR are under strain;

- The Bank plays multiple roles (as convener, donor, and lender);
- Current CGIAR reforms are creditable but modest relative to the changes needed;
- Challenge Programs may need to be re-visited and are not sufficient to reform the System;
- TAC's role has eroded, but needs to be re-instated in the Science Council;
- More unrestricted funding is necessary for priority-setting;
- Priority setting needs to be re-linked with resource allocation, monitoring, and evaluation;
- Consolidation of Centers is needed but resisted;
- The role of NARS is crucial but underestimated.

She outlined a number of recommendations concerning research, governance, and the Bank's relationship with the CGIAR.

Broad interest in the report was expressed, with several members inquiring what the next steps would be, particularly after the final report was "cleared" for publication.

The Bank's Cosponsor representative said that Bank management, as its contribution to CODE's consideration of the meta-evaluation, would comment on a number of issues including:

- Competition for funding within the DGF;
- Decentralization in the CGIAR System;
- Restricted vs. unrestricted funding;
- Policy research and NRM/germplasm improvement;
- Implications of freezing funds for CPs;
- Perceived conflict of interest by the Bank in relation to the CGIAR.

The **CDC Chair** said that Center DGs were privileged to see a draft of the meta-evaluation report, and make technical comments. The CDC found the basic findings of the report adequate but felt that more than a "meta-evaluation" was required. The "meta" process short-changed the current reform process. Reform was going in the right direction, and the Change Design and Management Team did not get the credit it deserved in OED's analysis. DGs do not agree that, as stated by the report, the CGIAR has lost its strategic focus. They agree that the CGIAR System should define its core competencies, but the report defines these too narrowly. Policy research and NRM research are as essential as germplasm improvement. The Centers have developed considerable capacity in these areas. DGs share the report's views on NARS. However, diversity among NARS should be taken into account. Many NARS need capacity building. The report's comments on the founding principles of the CGIAR need clarification. The "matching funds" formula for allocating Bank funds could be re-examined but should not be discarded.

The **CBC Chair** said that the meta-evaluation had identified the correct issues. The CBC broadly agreed with the views of the CDC. He stressed that the current reform process has not gone on for long enough to be assessed.

Other highlights from the discussion:

- The report's conclusion on the importance of the CGIAR is appreciated;
- Recommendations on strategic priorities and consolidation should be followed up;
- Transparency of the report is appreciated;
- Issues discussed by the report have been discussed for the past seven years;
- The report has not addressed a number of key issues relating to the CGIAR vision and strategy;
- OED finds the current reforms modest and CPs not sufficient; is it a case of the reforms being too modest or the meta-evaluation coming too soon?;
- The Bank and other international organizations should mainstream agricultural research into their development agenda;
- CGIAR needs to know the Bank's response to the report, and the implications of that response to the future of the CGIAR;
- Plant breeding is critically important;
- NRM research should not be neglected;
- The CP process should not be halted;
- It would be unrealistic to review CPs until the first four are launched;
- CPs must not divert attention from other possibilities;
- The nature of partnerships through CPs needs more attention;
- NARS should be more actively engaged in CPs. Financial issues, including restricted funding, and arrangements for the use of the Bank contribution should be re-visited;
- Proposals on restricted/unrestricted funding should be based on reality, not on dreams; members need creative ideas;
- Unrestricted funding cannot be provided by all members, due to legal obstacles and the internal practices of donor agencies;
- As Bank investment in agriculture has declined, developing regions need qualified NARS to help smaller and weaker NARS;
- CGIAR should harness the efforts of NARS, NARES, and regional organizations.

The CGIAR Chairman summarized the main points made during the discussion. As several members had sought a clearer understanding of the Bank's response to the report, he suggested that when the report was a public document, ExCo could decide the appropriate arrangement for its discussion by the CGIAR. Members agreed that ExCo could reach this decision in a virtual mode.

(b) Future CGIAR Meetings

The Group confirmed October 27-31, 2003 as the dates for the next AGM. Members interested in hosting AGMs were invited to contact the CGIAR Director.

(c) CGIAR Membership

The Iranian delegate said that while decisions are reached by consensus in the CGIAR, there was no information, discussion, or consensus, concerning the admission of Israel as a CGIAR member. He said that the delegations of Syria and Oman, the NGOC, and others had signed a letter associating themselves with the point he raised. In the discussion that followed, any attempt to politicize the CGIAR was decried as a dangerous path that should be avoided. The need for criteria governing CGIAR membership was acknowledged, and the point was made that written procedures would be important as the CGIAR increased in size.

The CGIAR Chairman noted that there were no rules of procedure for admitting new members. Up to now, members were admitted by acclamation, without discussion. He undertook to request ExCo to draw up rules of procedure for the future. These would be submitted for review and decision by the Group.

The Iranian delegate requested that his strong opposition to Israel's admission be recorded.

(d) Civil Society Representation

The delegate from Norway raised the question of NGO and civil society representation in the CGIAR, in the context of the NGOC decision to disengage while reviewing its relationship with the CGIAR, and in light of an earlier decision that farmers' organizations should be represented in the CGIAR. There was general agreement on the need for definitive decisions on these issues.

The Chairman announced that ExCo would examine how the CGIAR could best relate to NGOs and farmers' organizations. Such an evaluation, he said, would be a useful complement to NGOC's evaluation exercise. In addition, it may be timely to conduct a review of the CGIAR's existing mechanisms for interacting with all partners, including those from the private sector. The Group agreed.

(e) Meeting Arrangements

Several members said that too many items had been squeezed into a one-day Business Meeting, and suggested that the current arrangements should be changed. The possibility of alternate arrangements, such as regional meetings and video-conferencing, was raised.

The Chairman responded that a planned post-AGM survey would provide all members with the opportunity to comment on how they would want future AGMs structured. He encouraged members to be frank and forthcoming in expressing their views, and suggesting options, as this would facilitate debate and decisions.

Agenda Item 8. Closing Session

The Chairman closed the meeting with special thanks to co-hosts, the Philippines Government and IRRI, to Secretary of Agriculture Leonardo Montemayor for his strong support, Eliseo Ponce for his indefatigable efforts, Ron Cantrell and IRRI staff for their major contribution, the CGIAR and iSC Secretariats, and the interpreters. He wished all members safe journeys home.

Challenge Programs—Regular Process (Agenda Item 3.c)
(Parallel Session Reports)

Parallel Session I: Improving Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa

Chair: **Philippe Viallate (EU)**

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: **Aklilu Afework (AfDB)**

Secretary: **Manuel Lantin (CGIAR System Office)**

The Chair clarified the main purpose of the session, i.e., to provide an opportunity for the proponents of the challenge program to present their proposal and receive comments and suggestions from the stakeholders. He further noted that the pre-proposal has been recommended by the interim Science Council (iSC) to the CGIAR Executive Council (ExCo) for full proposal development.

The pre-proposal was presented by **Monty Jones, Executive Secretary, Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA)** after a brief introduction by Joseph Mukiibi, Chairman, FARA. After the presentation, Emil Javier (Chair, iSC), Kanayo Nwanze (Chair, Center Directors Subcommittee on Sub-Saharan Africa), and representatives of sub-regional organizations (SROs) were invited to give brief commentaries. The session was then opened for discussion of the pre-proposal. The session was attended by over 150 participants, indicating high interest in the topic.

The following is a summary of the issues and comments raised during the discussion:

- While the objectives of the proposed program are focused on the integration of knowledge to have impact on the ground, the question of scaling up is hardly discussed. It was noted that many of the hypotheses have been tested and conclusions have been drawn from previous work or existing small-scale projects. A key question is how to scale up successful interventions which have proven their worth at the level of communities.
- The presentation of the areas of research is reductionist in approach and not focused on integration of knowledge for action and impact. There is a need to focus on synergy and complementarity among the identified areas of research in bringing about impact.
- The importance of the participation of the grass-root organizations – farmers organizations, NGOs – was emphasized in building the proposal further.
- The program would benefit greatly from the involvement of African universities, particularly in the area of capacity building. Its relationship with the agricultural component of NEPAD's S&T program should likewise be addressed.

- Clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should be included. Progress indicators have to be identified.
- The proposal should clarify its added value. There is a need to point out clearly the differences between the component activities of the proposal and the core programs/activities of the African NARS, CGIAR Centers, and other international institutions/organizations.
- The proposal should define more clearly what the program brings in terms of the linkages at the level of NARS and IARCs.
- Opportunities for South-South cooperation (involving institutions in other regions, e.g. in Latin America and Asia) in the formulation and implementation of the program should also be explored.
- The program should also benefit from external perspectives.
- Allocation of 10 percent of the program's financial resources for Africa-wide activities should be revisited, given the previous suggestion to consider more scaling-up activities.
- More attention should be given to linking research to trade, market and related policy issues.
- The importance of putting in place a program information management system and a regular forum for communication was highlighted.

The proponents/presenters acknowledged and thanked the participants for their comments and suggestions. They indicated that the various issues raised would be helpful in advancing the proposal to the next stage.

Parallel Session II: The Challenge of Climate Change; and Desertification, Drought, Poverty and Agriculture

Chair: **Mohammad Hassan Rozitalab (GFAR-AARINENA)**

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: **Michael J. Wilson (UK)**

Secretary: **Amir Kassam (CGIAR System Office)**

The Challenge of Climate Change

Dr. Dennis Garrity (Chair, ICWG-CC) presented the Challenge Proposal (CP). Its goals are to generate knowledge to enable the adaptation of agricultural systems so as to reduce their vulnerability to Climate Change, mitigate further climate change, and improve rural livelihoods. The role of the CGIAR would be to provide global leadership, forge a global constituency of partners, and enhance the capacity of NARS, Civil Society, and Government. There are three components to the CP: 1) understanding the range and depth of impacts to be expected, 2) adaptation, and 3) mitigation; both a globally and in vulnerable regions. The iSC found it a strong proposal but asked for more information on funding sources, a greater synthesis of the best payoffs and the highest risk populations, and a better analysis of the work already going on in the CGIAR System.

Discussion on the Challenge of Climate Change CP centered on:

- Include work to reduce CH₄ and N₂O emissions from rice;
- Include rubber as an effective converter of CO₂;
- Attention to shorter term shocks as well as the long term trend of global warming;
- Examine the mal-adaptation cum over-sensitivity to Climate Change of existing farming systems;
- Attend to resilience and adaptability in partner institutions;
- Rainfed areas were also deemed likely to be dominant in the impact analysis;
- The comparative advantage in leadership of CGIAR was based on its intimate understanding of agricultural systems.

Desertification, Drought, Poverty and Agriculture

Drs. Erskine (ICARDA) and Shapiro (ICRISAT) presented the Challenge Proposal which has an Asia and Africa focus, builds on the momentum of the UN Convention on Desertification, the Desert Margins Program and ICARDA's activities in West Asia, puts agriculture into an Eco-system context, and seeks to build livelihoods. The CP has six component themes:

1. Understanding the issues;
2. Generating income from system diversification;
3. Provision of Eco-system goods and Services;
4. Policy and institutional options;
5. Harnessing genetic resources; and
6. Knowledge transfer, including 'Bridging the Digital Divide.'

The iSC found the proposal to be strong on physical sciences but weak on the social sciences. It also noted that the CP needs to reflect more on recent changes in the rural economy and social changes in the arid areas, look to solutions outside agriculture, contain a stronger livestock component, and co-ordinate with the Sub-Saharan Africa CP.

Discussion on the Desertification, Drought, Poverty and Agriculture CP included:

- A plea to include the saline aspects of irrigated agriculture;
- A number of points which were shared with the Climate Change CP viz – a need to:
 - Engender quick impact by putting into practice what we already know;
 - Phase and regularly review progress and component activities;
 - Put at the forefront that 'People are the reason for the CPs';
 - Undertake a close analysis of the nature and depth and manageability of partnerships, particularly with NARS.

There was no major dissent from the Stakeholders and the proposals were deemed to be in the spirit of CPs, namely they:

- Are genuine challenges;
- Are intimately concerned with ‘joining-up’ amongst CGIAR Centers, with NARES and other Research and Development partners;
- Made links to policy; and
- Linked science with development impact.

The multiple overlaps of all eight CPs (pilot and regular process) required:

- Consideration of all as a whole, and not, as had been the case to date, in a piece meal approach;
- Renewed consideration of where the money would come—incremental funds or a mix of existing and new; and
- Consideration of how they related to the core business of the CGIAR.

Parallel Session III: Making the Most of the Coast: A proposal to Reverse Degradation of Coastal Resources; and Enhance Livelihoods and Forests as Resources for the Poor: The Rainforest Challenge

Chair: **Eva Ohlson (Sweden)**

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: **Jesus Moncada de la Fuente (Mexico)**

Secretary: **Sirkka Immonen (CGIAR System Office)**

The CP pre-proposal was presented by **Meryl Williams from the WorldFish Centre**. The proposal is characterized by two major issues: the complexity of the land-sea interface and the large number of people living in close proximity to a coast. The issues related to these are cross-cutting and multi-sectoral, multi-institutional and multi-disciplinary by nature. The major problems include growing population pressure and degradation, including both land and mountain degradation influencing coastal zones and over-fishing. These are inter-connected multi-source problems. The two themes of the program are a) coastal zone degradation and b) enhancing livelihoods of coastal people, which will be addressed in three sub-sets of terrestrial ecosystems. The research sites would be mostly in the Asia-Pacific region.

Some of the issues requiring attention that were brought up by the audience, including short comments from the iSC by Hans Gregersen, were:

- There is need to differentiate between two kinds of causes of degradation: agriculture and forestry vs. urbanization and industries, the latter becoming a major cause of pollution and degradation.
- The proposal would benefit from expertise on sea and land tenure issues, which are complex and important for dealing with the problems.

- Profitability of fisheries and feasibility of exporting possibilities, as well as alternative ways of developing products need to be addressed when margins are getting thinner.
- The proponents need to learn from previous experiences, particularly by IAACP and what the pros and cons of similar research efforts have been.
- The initiative needs strengthening in gender analysis and socio-economic issues in order to reach its objective, enhancing livelihoods. Women, poor and disadvantaged need to be up front in the program. The crucial questions are: who will benefit from the work and how.
- The program's position in the research-development continuum is important. Regarding the selection of research sites, both research and funding considerations are important.

Meryl Williams briefly responded to the issues raised and emphasized the unique nature of the proposal which looks at land, not only water. She appreciated all the comments made.

Forests as Resources for the Poor: The Rainforest Challenge

David Kaimowitz, Director General of CIFOR, introduced the pre-proposal. The core issues of the challenge program are that while forests disappear at a fast rate, increasing the area of protected areas is not an option because large numbers of people depend on forests in the humid tropics. The question is how to deal with the non-protected areas. Previous efforts have not been successful. The reason why this program should have better chances of success is that its partnership is unique. It involves two major global organizations, IUCN and WWF, with experience in field work, communications and policy; the CGIAR Centers, with expertise in scientific research and learning from experience and the consortium and social capacity building by the Systemwide Program on Alternatives to Slash and Burn (ASB) consisting of 50 NARS. Poverty is at the center of the integrated approach. The program addresses trade-offs, it is based on landscape ecology and involves multiple scales.

Some of the issues requiring attention that were brought up by the audience, including short comments from the iSC by Hans Gregersen, were as follows:

- There is need to clarify the operational role of the CGIAR Centers, particularly the ASB, thus removing the risk of the CGIAR becoming marginalized.
- Also regional and local involvement in the activities would need clarification and strengthening. National governments and research organizations have experience in the relevant themes.
- It is vitally important to involve the poor who are part of the ecosystem.
- In reforestation, use of native instead of exotic species is important, but what are the possibilities of global organizations to influence local governments?
- Property rights issues are at the heart of the dilemma. Local governance structures may conflict with national governance.

- Environmental services addressed and enhanced by the proposed initiative need to be specified. Putting value through e.g. certification schemes has not been easy and the feasibility of paying for such services is questionable.
- Dealing with the trade-offs between biodiversity protection and peoples' livelihoods is an important issue.

David Kaimowitz responded to the questions raised, which were very much at the core of the challenge of this initiative. Trade-offs will be seriously addressed, but the degree of conflict between different objectives depends on the region and location. Environmental services are at a very early stage of development. He emphasized that without having clarity about the future of this CP pre-proposal, it was impossible to confirm partnerships and expect commitments.

Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues (Agenda Item 5)
(Parallel Session Reports)

CGIAR stakeholders interacted on three key issues, at parallel sessions held during AGM02. Summary reports of the discussions appear below. Documents connected with the topics are posted on the CGIAR web site.

Parallel Session I: Innovative Approaches to Effective Capacity Building

Chair: **Leen Boer (Netherlands)**

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: **Panjab Singh (India)**

Secretary: **Sirkka Immonen (CGIAR System Office/iSC Secretariat)**

Presentations: **Virgilio Villancio (UPLB)**, “CGIAR Capacity Building – The National/Regional Perspectives”
Gigi Manicad (ISNAR), “CGIAR Capacity Building – Past and Present”
August Temu (ICRAF), “CGIAR Capacity Building – Innovations and Future Directions.”

Objectives:

- Highlight and analyze capacity building approaches by CGIAR Centers;
- Present new and innovative approaches that address needs identified by partners;
- Identify areas and incentives for possible inter-Center and NARS collaboration, and donor interest;
- Discuss the impact of CGIAR-supported capacity building on sustainable agricultural production, and integrated natural resources management.

The Chair introduced the theme, and the Co-Chair outlined the objectives and agenda of the session.

Mr. Villancio, presenting the NARS perspective, said that variability in capacity among and within countries requires the CGIAR to undertake multiple roles as a provider, catalyst or collaborator, depending on the existing capacity. NARS have strengths to offer for capacity building and weaknesses that need addressing. They themselves are the breeding ground for capacity.

To strengthen collaboration with its partners, the CGIAR needs to nurture the development and use of innovative approaches for capacity building, promote

partnerships and networking, and build on existing capacity. For the sustainability of NARS, policy support is vital. The three dimensions of successful capacity building are institutions, programs, and people. Institutions whose capacity has already been enhanced, are already serving as providers of capacity building themselves.

In their presentations, representatives of the CGIAR Centers said that the most important reasons for the CGIAR to support a strong capacity building agenda in the CGIAR are:

1. Variable strengths of institutions and human resources;
2. Increasing number of institutions in need;
3. Changing biophysical, socio-cultural and policy environments;
4. Rapid advances in science and technology;
5. Increasing knowledge gap and the digital divide.

Some of the key characteristics of current capacity building in the CGIAR are that it is needs-based and, through networking and partnerships with a multitude of partners, involves collaborative research as well as sharing of information and knowledge. Most Centers apply an experimental learning cycle based on adult education principles in training. The Centers aim at multiplier effects through training of trainers and broad dissemination of training and materials.

Innovations that are evolving in the Centers' capacity building programs include: Farmers for the Future approach, increased South-South collaboration, tripartite links for capacity building at institutions of learning and open and distance learning capturing new opportunities and ICT. Capacity building underpins the advances of science, creates potential to innovate and captures the promise of innovations. Creation of knowledge banks makes capacity building more effective and more accessible.

Participants strongly supported the role of the CGIAR in capacity building, and thanked the organizers for holding a discrete session on capacity building for the first time.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- There is a need for better performance indicators and the CGIAR should take a lead in developing them.
- Strategic collaboration between Centers is needed to remove overlap and sharpen the focus of Centers on themes that are closest to their mandate and expertise.
- The CGIAR's role is changing from a research and training focus to service as a catalyst, initiator, facilitator, mobilizer and knowledge broker.

- National brain drain is a risk which could be reduced by broadening the selection of trainees, and reaching more people.
- In terms of the sectors to be targeted for capacity building, the needs of farmers, as well as those of NARS, must be addressed. Training should go all the way to the farmers, providing them with access to the use of new technologies, and information and communications technology.
- The CGIAR needs to train leaders who will mobilize capacity in their institutions. Ministries and extension staff need to be reached.
- Inadequate capacity in new and frontier areas, such as modern biotechnology, IPR, biosafety, ICT etc., was seen as a bottleneck in both national research institutions and universities.

The Chair and Co-Chair closed the session by summarizing the main messages of the discussion.

Parallel Session II.: Combating Soil Fertility Degradation in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)

Chair: **Peter Matlon (Rockefeller Foundation)**

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: **Romano Kiome (KARI)**

Secretary: **Timothy Kelly (CGIAR System Office/iSC Secretariat)**

Presentations: **Nteranya Sanginga (IITA), Monty Jones (FARA)**

Discussants: **Representatives from ASARECA, SACCAR, CORAF/WECARD, Uzo Mokwunye (UNU), Mochtar Toure (World Bank), John Lynam (Rockefeller Foundation), Michale Wilson (DFID)**

Objectives:

- To review the continuing problem of soil fertility degradation and its; multiple impacts on the livelihoods of different sectors of African society
- To assess progress towards combating the problem;
- To identify priorities for research, development and institutional actions that will bring returns from investments to combat soil fertility degradation.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- Low soil fertility (due to nutrient deficiency, low soil organic matter, moisture stress, high erodibility) and nutrient mining/inadequate management leading to

low agricultural production, results in low incomes, poor nutrition, low consumption, poor education, poor health, vulnerability to risks and lack of empowerment

- Problems associated with soil degradation vary across agro-ecosystems and production systems, but generally include reduced vegetative cover, increased conversion of natural habitats, decreased water quality, increased risk from pests and diseases and increased risk of catastrophic events such as landslides and floods.
- Soil fertility problems remain intractable because they are not addressed in a sufficiently holistic and long-term manner that combines a disciplinary perspective, an institutional perspective, a macro-level perspective, a sectoral perspective, and a historical perspective.
- Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) approaches are increasingly used by national and international R&D organizations, networks, NGOs in SSA, with significant adoption of a range of ISFM based technologies across a number of countries (e.g., integrated nutrient management, micro-dose use of fertilizers, improved manure practices, integration of multipurpose legumes, improved fallows)
- Other methodological innovations developed and applied include: pro-poor participatory approaches, tools for scaling up (GIS), tools and approaches to integrate processes, remote sensing, molecular tools to study biodiversity and pest populations.

Discussants urged that the needs of and priorities for research, development and institutional actions should be assessed. These would include increasing the knowledge base, widening the range of options available for managing poor soils, defining a future program of work building on methods that have already proved successful, broadening research and development alliances, and creating an enabling policy environment for the agricultural sector to facilitate farmer adoption of sustainable management practices.

Finally, discussants hoped that their observations and recommendations would serve as critical inputs into the development of the full proposal CP on SSA, and, conversely, that the CP could provide a framework and process to achieve soil management goals.

Parallel Session III: Representation of Civil Society Institutions in the CGIAR

Chair: **Rodney Cooke (IFAD)**

Co-Chair/Rapporteur: **Hamid Narjisse (INRA-Morocco)**

Secretary: **Sarwat Hussein (CGIAR System Office/CGIAR Secretariat)**

Presentations: **Oliver Oliveros (GFAR), Monica Kapiriri (NGOC), Esta Kiwazi, Kulika (Charitable Trust, Uganda), and Chebet Maikut, (IFAP)**

Objectives:

- To examine options for ensuring broader representation of civil society perspectives, including farming perspectives, in CGIAR deliberations;
- To review opportunities for greater involvement of farmers organizations and NGOs in global agricultural research for development.

The Chair introduced the theme by giving an overview of issues relating to stakeholder participation in the CGIAR, GFAR's efforts in strengthening the participation of farmer organizations in global agricultural research-for-development (ARD) and the recent priority-setting exercises.

Mr. Oliver Oliveros' presentation focused on GFAR's efforts to promote constituency- and capacity-building in farmers organizations (FOs) and NGOs, and improve communication. GFAR is launching an in-depth regional study of FOs/NGOs for supporting constituency development.

Ms. Monica Kapiriri, Co-Chair, NGOC, spoke about the importance of bringing in differing perspectives on ARD, noting that NGOC efforts were focused on giving voice to small farmers in the setting of ARD priorities. She noted the need for creating space so that farmers can speak for themselves, rather than through NGOs.

Mr. Esta Kiwazi reported on the "Small Farmers Convergence" workshop held in Johannesburg at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. More than 300 participants from 19 countries, a majority of whom were farmers, participated in a farmers caravan. The workshop celebrated farming as a way of life, created a forum for small farmers, pastoralists, and fisherfolk and highlighted farmers' own research. The presentation concluded by highlighting the need for integration and cooperation among all actors in ARD – akin to five fingers in a hand.

Mr. Chebet Maikut, Chairman of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) Committee on Science and Technology noted that the NGOC played an important role of a 'parent' to the farmers, providing the much-needed bridge between farmers and the CGIAR system.

He called for the creation of a Farmers Committee alongside the two other partnership committees (NGOs and Private Sector) asking that representation of farmers be included in the management and governance structures of CGIAR, including the Executive Council. In the interim, he proposed that representation on the Executive Council be alternated between a farmer and NGO representative, and that observer status be allowed for Via Campesina and IFAP at Executive Council meetings.

Points raised during the discussion following the presentations included:

The main points raised in the ensuing discussion included the following:

- Whether the initiation of engagement come from governments or from the farmers themselves;
- Farmers and NGOs are separate constituencies, each of whom should be empowered to speak for themselves.
- The process of selecting representatives has to be acceptable to all sides, and there is a need for assessing relationships between CSOs and CGIAR and beyond.
- Many CSOs feel that the CGIAR is not responsive to key demands, especially with respect to genetically modified organisms.
- CGIAR Center Directors and the PSC Chair expressed strong support for farmer participation.

The Chairman concluded the session by noting the strong interest by some FOs for greater engagement with the CGIAR. He pointed out that NGOs are reassessing the relationship with CGIAR, and noted that better mechanisms are needed for facilitating and improving dialogue between primary stakeholders and ARD.

AGM 02 Stakeholder Meeting Documents

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

- Draft Timed Agenda

Agenda Item 2. 2002 CGIAR Awards

- List of Awards

Agenda Item 3. CGIAR Reform Program

- (a) Challenge Programs—Pilot CPs
 - Water and Food Challenge Program
 - Biofortified Crops for Improved Human Nutrition
- (c) Challenge Programs—Regular Process
 - Improving Livelihoods and Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa
 - The Challenge of Climate Change
 - Desertification, Drought, Poverty and Agriculture
 - Making the Most of the Coast: A Proposal to Reverse Degradation of Coastal Resources and Enhance Livelihoods
 - Forests as Resources for the Poor: The Rainforest Challenge

Agenda Item 4. Centers' Forum

- (a) Meet Your New DGs
 - Biographies of New DGs

Agenda Item 5. Stakeholder Interaction on Key Issues (Parallel Sessions)

Session I: Capacity Building/Strengthening Education

- Background documents on Innovative Approaches to Effective Capacity Building/Strengthening

Session II: Combating Soil Degradation

- Combating Soil Fertility Degradation in Africa

Session III: Representation of Civil Society Institutions in the CGIAR

- Strengthening the Participation of Farmers' Organizations and of NGOs in Global Agricultural Research for Development (ARD)

Agenda Item 6. CGIAR and Sustainable Development 2002 Summits and the Way Ahead

(a) Panel Discussion

World Food Summit—Five Years Later

- World Food Summit: Five Years Later Reaffirms Pledge to Reduce Hunger

WSSD Outcomes and Implications for the CGIAR

- Background documents: WSSD Outcomes and Implications for the CGIAR

NEPAD Program on Sustainable Agricultural Technology Generation and Adoption Systems

- A Multi-Country Agricultural Productivity Program (MAPP) for Africa

Consultative Process for an International Assessment on the Role of Agricultural Science and Technology in Reducing Hunger and Improving Rural Livelihoods

- An International Assessment on the Future Role of Agricultural Science and Technology in Reducing Hunger and Improving Rural Livelihoods

International Treaty on PGR and the Global Conservation Trust

- The Global Conservation Trust

Agenda Item 7. Updates

(a) Regional Priority Setting (GFAR and iSC)

- Progress Report on Regional Approach to Research
- Regional Priority Setting: What Happens Next?

CGIAR AGM 2002—Business Meeting Documents

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

- Draft Timed Agenda
- ExCo 3 Summary Record of Proceedings

Agenda Item 2. Progress with Implementing the CGIAR Reform Program

- (a) Overview of Reform Program Implementation: Activities of ExCo
 - No documents for this agenda item.
- (b) Challenge Programs
 - CGIAR Timetable
- (c) Establishment of Science Council
 - Report of the Executive Council's Working Group on the Establishment of a CGIAR Science Council
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Additional Comments on the Report of the WGSC
- (d) Establishment of System Office
 - Draft CGIAR System Office Integrated Business Plan for 2003
- (e) GRPC Review
 - Report of the Review of GRPC
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

Agenda Item 3. Reports from iSC

- (b) Report from iSC Chair
 - Report from the iSC Chair
- (b) Report from SPIA/iSC Chair
 - Report to the Annual General Meeting of the CGIAR from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) of the Interim Science Council

Agenda Item 4. Evaluation

- (a) External Program and Management Review of ISNAR
 - ISNAR EPMR Report excerpts
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Additional Commentary by ISNAR on EPMR follow-up

- (b) External Program and Management Review of CIP
 - CIP EPMR Report excerpts
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR
 - Constructing a New Vision for the International Potato Center: CIP's Progress on the EPMR2002 Recommendations
- (c) Evaluation of Systemwide Programs
 - External Review of the IPM Program
 - External Review of the CAPRi Program
- (d) Follow-up of CGIAR Evaluations
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

Agenda Item 5. CGIAR Financing Plans

- (a) Financing Plan for 2003
 - 2003 Proposed Financing Plan
 - iSC Comments on the Center 2003-2005 Medium Term Plans and 2003 Plans
 - ExCo Recommendations to the CGIAR

Agenda Item 6. Perspectives from Centers

- CBC Report to AGM: A Position Statement
- Center Directors Committee Statement to CGIAR AGM Business Meeting, 2002

Agenda Item 7. Other Business

- (a) Consultation with World Bank Operations Evaluation Department on the Meta-Evaluation of the CGIAR
 - CGIAR Meta Evaluation Fact Sheet
 - The CGIAR at 31: A Meta Evaluation
- (b) Future CGIAR Meetings
 - No documents for this agenda item