

**ICW 1998  
SYSTEM REVIEW  
WORKING GROUP III - GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE  
Report on progress 27 th October**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The WG decided to continue where it left off on 26 th October by working through recommendations #16 to 29. However it recognised that in doing so it had not addressed fully or resolved the issues in #15 on the proposal to establish a central board.

It was accepted that this would inevitably restrict discussion and inhibit final conclusions to be reached. But it was agreed that sufficient time would be left at the end of the session to discuss ideas on the composition, mandate and terms of reference for the group charged with the responsibility for following up the conclusions of ICW 1998 and for preparing proposals for decision at MTM 1999.

The format followed was the same as used at the previous session.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

**The WG concluded:**

**#16 Wider Membership. Yes - but this raised a dilemma -**

- Wider membership was welcomed to increase ownership and to help in agenda setting, but there was a need to avoid the CGIAR becoming a mini-United Nations.
- Commitment to the poverty and food security goals of the CGIAR was essential, supported by some contribution of resources. A minimum contribution in cash and/or in kind had worked well in the past. However there was nervousness and resistance to agreeing the proposals in the Review or to revisions to the current formulation.
- It was recognised that decision making would be more difficult in a larger group. This pointed to some means by which decisions could be prepared and ratified by the CGIAR as a whole.

**#17 World Bank Leadership. Agreed - but this did not extend to the proposal to have a Chief Executive Officer.**

- World Bank commitment and leadership had served the CGIAR well. A Vice-President ensured vital influence in the Bank and elsewhere. The Bank had always consulted with the membership before making an appointment. Was there any need or value in change?
- Proposal to have a full-time CEO was not accepted.

**#18 Streamlining Committees. Need to improve efficiency and coherence in decision making; however -**

- Functions of the OC, FC, TAC, IAEG, PARC, GRPC, NGOC, PSC, CBC and CDC remain important to transparency and equity in the workings of the CGIAR, but they need not necessarily be carried out by separate committees.
- There is a pressing need to improve timeliness and consistency/coherence in messages and policy.
- Not convinced that a single central body could carry out the functions of OC and FC.
- Composition and mode of working of TAC should be reviewed. A smaller TAC might work better if greater use is made of subsidiary TACs on specific subjects or covering different regions.
- Noted that IAEG had produced useful proposals for closer working with TAC, while maintaining strong links with the Centres.
- Noted that the Centres had already made provision for and taken strong ownership of PARC and the 'Future Harvests' campaign.

- Noted and endorsed the recommendation in the SGRP Review that GRPC should become the governance of the SGRP.
- Further thought should be given to the merger of NGOC and PSC, or the creation of a civil society committee.
- CDC and CBC were essential to the efficient working of the CGIAR and should be drawn on more frequently. Better coordination is needed, but a central body may not be the answer.

#19 to 24. To give adequate time for the discussion of the follow-up mechanism it was agreed not to devote too much time to these recommendations, but only to highlight major issues.

- #21. ICWs would continue and for the next two years there would be MTMs.
- #20. Global Forum/GFAR was being discussed in WG2.
- #22, 23, 24. Noted that the CDC had considered and commented on these issues. High quality human resources were essential to the future of the IARCs. The Centres were taking action to share information on the identification, recruitment and retention of good staff; however some central help would be welcome. More use could be made of Internet and other electronic systems. These ideas required further discussion amongst the Centres, and proposals made to the CGIAR.
- #23. The follow up process was discussed later.

#25 to 29. The Finance Committee had considered these recommendations and would be reporting to the CGIAR later this week.

- The chairman of the FC outlined the conclusions of the FC; there were no strategic problems, but some practical ones.
- WG decided to defer discussion of these items to the plenary discussion of the FC report.

## THE FOLLOW UP PROCESS

The WG revisited and discussed the nature of the follow up process. The composition, size, mode of working and terms of reference of an **consultative or advisory council or task force** were discussed.

The work of the group was aided by proposals circulated by the European Group-EIARD- and ideas contributed by several members. There were many ideas.

Some principles emerged. The follow-up group should be advisory, representative of donor/investors, regional constituencies, Boards and Centres, Sponsors and groups directly responsible for the CGIAR. It should not be too large, but large enough to be able to work in representative sub-groups. Its existence should be time bound -6 to 12 months.

It would report to the Chairman of the CGIAR, who might appoint a coordinator to lead and coordinate the group, until it reports its findings and recommendations to the CGIAR at MTM.

The options suggested were:

- Southern donors/investors/NARS, including Global/regional fora - 4, 5 or 6
- Northern bilateral and multilateral donors -4 or 5
- CBC/CDC —2 to 5

The need to ensure adequate Centre involvement was made - and accepted.

The WG identified the following key issues for follow-up:

- System strategy and better inter-centre working
- IGM

- INRM
- Africa
- Better partnerships
- Knowledge systems
- TAC and Evaluation/impact/IAEG
- Decision making structure- council?

The main functions of any follow-up mechanism would be:

- To implement agreed actions and to report to MTM.
- To review, reformulate and regroup the SIR recommendations into those requiring action by the Board and management of the IARCs, TAC and those that should be handled at System level.

A consensus began to emerge that there was a need to:

- Identify those recommendations where actions had been agreed and who might be responsible to carry them forward at IARC and System levels. Those responsible would report on progress at MTM.
- Group the outstanding issues into those that might be worked on further by the IARCs and at System level, and whether any of them might be addressed by existing committees eg FC.
- Give further consideration to the size and composition of the **advisory council or task force** to coordinate the follow-up work. The CC/AC/TF should meet for the first time with the Chairman before the end of ICW.

Two models of working were discussed:

- One based on tasking existing committees to work on specific issues within their mandates and competence drawing on other constituencies to ensure a broader perspectives. They would have first pass through the issues with their work being considered and synthesised by the TF/CC/AC.
- The other would involve the continuation of the ICW'98 working groups to work on the issues of governance, science and partnerships. These cross-constituency groups would be sub-groups of the main follow-up mechanism

We would welcome the views of the plenary on these basic models, so that a small working group can refine the ideas and come back to the CGIAR later this week.

The agenda before WG3 was too long and too complicated to complete. Members of the group may wish to add further ideas and comments.

Ab 28/10/98