

Third CGIAR Executive Council Meeting—September 24, 2002

Establishing Science Council

Discussion:

- There is need to clarify how the Science Council would link to the other components of the CGIAR system, in particular the future relationship between the CGIAR members, Centers, and SC should be more clearly defined. The following were also suggested: a) further elaboration of the rationale for a standing panel on priorities and strategies, b) a more open debate on what constitutes science quality and its measurement in the case of relevant development work, c) broadening the scope of mobilizing global science, with more holistic approach and emphasis beyond traditional agricultural research, d) clarity on the linkage between SC's work plan with the rest of the System, and e) use of the term "international development assistance community" instead of "international agricultural research community."
- The synergy as well as the overlap with the Global Forum on Agricultural Research should be highlighted. There should also be a broader notion of science to include particularly the type that relates directly to development.
- Instead of saying that the CGIAR would "harness the best in the international scientific community" it was suggested that the CGIAR should tap counterparts in research and development in the rest of the world who might be able to contribute to implementing the CGIAR research agenda. SC's advisory role should be more focused on scientific issues relevant to the CGIAR. There was, however, support for the view that the SC should exercise leadership in world agricultural research community and address controversial global issues.
- It was also suggested that SC should assist in helping to develop performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation.
- On the proposed standing panel on impact assessment (SPIA), it was strongly suggested that the Chair and members should be appointed by the CGIAR, similar to the SC chair and members.
- Concern was expressed about the small size recommended by the WGSC and suggestions to ensure North and South balance in constituting the SC. The Cosponsors' role in the search and nomination process for SC Chair and members would also need to be clarified.

Conclusions:

- *The Exco endorsed the WGSC report and commended the WG for its excellent work. The changes suggested by the ExCo should be considered during the transition to the SC.*
- *In moving forward with the recommendations, a proposal for the search and nomination process was presented by Francisco Reifschneider and discussed. A Search and Nomination Committee (SNC) should be appointed, supported by a human resources recruitment expert and the System Office. The Cosponsors should be represented in the Committee.*

The Committee should submit to the ExCo short lists of candidates for SC Chair and members. An initial list of candidates for chair and members of the SNC have been identified. ExCo members are invited to submit additional names to the CGIAR Secretariat on or before October 11, 2002.

- *Since it is expected that the new Science Council would be constituted and become operational only in mid-2003, the ExCo would recommend to the CGIAR extension of the appointments of the current iSC members up to June 30, 2003.*

Recommendations to the CGIAR:

- *ExCo endorses the recommendations of the Working Group on the Science Council in broad terms. Adjustments to the Working Group'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.*
- *ExCo recommends CGIAR approval of the extensions of the appointments of the current iSC members until June 30, 2003.*