

CGIAR

Document No: MTM/99/05
Distribution: General
Date: February 23, 1999

Mid-Term Meeting 1999 May 24 - 28 Beijing, China

<h3>The Third System Review: From Proposals to Practice</h3>

Summary Report of the Consultative Council Meeting

The CGIAR Consultative Council established at International Centers Week (ICW98) met in Brussels on January 27 and 28. Attached is a letter from the CGIAR Chairman transmitting the summary report of the meeting as well as a follow-up timetable and related documents. These documents are for consideration under Agenda Item 3 "System Review Follow-up".

CGIAR

February 22, 1999

Chairman's Letter

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to inform you that the CGIAR Consultative Council established at International Centers Week (ICW98) has completed its initial task.

A summary report of the Consultative Council's first meeting as well as a follow-up timetable are attached, together with related documents. The full set of attachments is as follows:

- Summary report of the Consultative Council meeting,
- Matrix: System Review Follow-up Responsibilities and Timetable,
- Introductory Note on submissions by CGIAR committees invited to study and report on System Review recommendations, following ICW98,
- Agenda for the Consultative Council meeting,
- List of Consultative Council members.

Creation of the Council was an important experiment by the CGIAR: an attempt to entrust a group that is fully representative of the system with the responsibility of clarifying issues, reviewing options, reaffirming fundamentals, defining specifics for action, and thereby helping to facilitate decision making by the Group as a whole.

The Council met in Brussels on January 27-28. At the end of a day-and-a-half of discussion, closure was reached on the full agenda, and action proposals had been drafted for consideration by the Group at the next Mid-Term Meeting (MTM99).

Council members brought to their task a desire to be creative and constructive; to produce results. Options were pursued and proposals were made in Brussels. Decisions rest with the Group when we meet in Beijing.

I thank all those connected with the Consultative Council exercise:

- our hosts, the European Commission,
- Council members who gave the event both time and commitment,
- CGIAR committees that worked diligently and speedily to prepare studies to support informed discussion,
- Mahendra Shah who is leading the editing of the System Review report for wide circulation,
- the Secretariat, for its efficient organization of all aspects of the Brussels meeting, and
- groups and individuals who will present their reports on "next steps" at MTM99.

Above all, I thank the CGIAR membership for launching this experiment which has moved the System Review that much closer to the stage of implementation.

I very much appreciate the crucial efforts of the third System Review. We will always owe Maurice Strong and his distinguished colleagues a debt of gratitude. The endorsement they offered us, and the challenges they posed, have inspired us to draw strength from deep within ourselves as we seek to reposition the CGIAR for the next decade and beyond.

We will have before us in Beijing a set of businesslike proposals together with a set of guidelines for their implementation. This will enable the Group to discuss the proposals and agenda for action as a package. The responsibility of using this material as the basis of effective action rests with the CGIAR itself. Our future is ours to shape. Let us do so with re-dedication to the cause of those who can benefit most from all that we attempt and achieve.

With best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Ismail Serageldin
Chairman, CGIAR

CGIAR

Summary Report of the CGIAR Consultative Council Meeting, January 27-28, 1999, Brussels (2/11/99)

1. INTRODUCTION

A Consultative Council was created at International Centers Week (ICW98) as a follow-up mechanism to deal with issues arising from recommendations of the third CGIAR System Review that required further study and elaboration. The primary responsibility of the Council was to advise the CGIAR Chairman on action-proposals for consideration at the next Mid-Term Meeting (MTM99).

Immediately after ICW98, the CGIAR Secretariat compiled a comprehensive list of System Review issues requiring action, and the Chairman divided these among various components of the CGIAR system for study and comment. Their submissions were transmitted to Council members with an Introductory Note providing them with context and cohesion. Other communicated views were also circulated. Some additional notes/documents were circulated during the discussions. This material provided the framework for discussions by the Council.

The agenda for the Council's meeting grouped issues to be considered in two categories, based on the submissions received:

1. Issues with emerging consensus on follow-up, and
2. Issues requiring further discussion.

2. DATE, VENUE, AND ATTENDANCE

The CGIAR Consultative Council met on January 27 and 28, 1999 at the Centre A. Borschette in Brussels. The meeting was hosted by the Commission of the European Community. The following attended:

Chairman -- Ismail Serageldin

Members -- Iain C. MacGillivray (Canada), H.-Jochen de Haas (Germany), Tsukusa Chiba (Japan), Teresa Fogelberg (Netherlands), Carl-Gustaf Thornstrom (Sweden), Paul Egger (Switzerland), Emmy M. Simmons (USA), Francisco J. B. Reifshneider (Brazil), Zhao Longyue (China), Juan Lucas Restrepo (Colombia), Mohammad H. Roozitalab (Iran), Eliseo R. Ponce (Philippines), Joseph K. Mukiibi (Uganda), Mervat W. El Badawi (AFESD), Uwe Werblow/Hans-Jorg Lutzeyer/Gerasimos Apostolatos (EC), Abdelmajid Slama (IFAD), Robert W. Herdt (Rockefeller Foundation), Peter Matlon (UNDP), Andrew J. Bennett (OC), Miguel A. Altieri (NGOC), Alex F. McCalla (FC), Sam Dryden (PSC), Donald Winkelmann (TAC), Walter P. Falcon (CBC), Martin Pineiro (CBC), Pedro A. Sanchez (CDC), Geoffrey C. Hawtin (CDC).

Others – Alexander von der Osten (Executive Secretary, CGIAR), Mahendra Shah (System Review), Selcuk Ozgediz, Ravi Tadvalkar, Ernest Corea (CGIAR Secretariat), Jean-Pierre Jacqmotte (CDC).

3. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

Mr. Serageldin welcomed participants, and thanked all those who had made the meeting possible. He called for a frank and open discussion that would enable the CGIAR to recommit itself to fundamentals, speak clearly with one voice, derive strength from unity, and elevate the impact of the system on human lives over any concerns of its individual components.

4. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The draft agenda was unanimously adopted.

5. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Issues in the first category of issues listed for discussion were resolved quite quickly, and the bulk of the meeting's time was devoted to issues on which further discussion and clarification were required. Discussions were frank, energetic, and in depth, and took place both on and off the floor, leading to a series of conclusions by consensus. At the end of the discussions, the Chairman presented the meeting with a verbal summary of conclusions reached.

A summary record of the main conclusions appears below. These are grouped under the four headings of the "Lucerne Declaration and Action Program" -- Science, Partnerships, Governance and Finance -- with references within brackets to the relevant System Review recommendation(s).

SCIENCE

Integrated Gene Management (IGM) (System Review Recommendation 4)

Plant Breeding Review: The use of an IGM approach at CGIAR centers was endorsed. In this context, the Council proposed that a systemwide review of plant breeding should be carried out by TAC.

Next Step: TAC to present terms of reference for the systemwide review to MTM99.

Patents and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR): The public goods oriented policies and ethical principles tabled at MTM98 were reaffirmed. The Council decided against recommending the creation of a system-level legal entity to negotiate or hold patents on behalf of the centers. The Council proposed that CGIAR centers should take the lead in deciding on appropriate mechanisms for holding patents. As this process develops, a central legal patenting entity could evolve, on a bottom-up basis. The previously agreed on center-by-center audit of patents needs to be completed expeditiously. As decided at MTM98 in Brasilia, a central IPR advisory service unit is being created, and will be located at ISNAR.

Next Step: CDC to report on developments at MTM99.

Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM) (System Review Recommendation 5)

The natural resource management perspective was endorsed, and the Council proposed that existing NRM networks should be strengthened.

Next Step: Action proposals to be drafted by CDC and reviewed by TAC for presentation to MTM99.

Global Knowledge System (System Review Recommendation 6)

The Council agreed that it would not be appropriate for the CGIAR to attempt to function as the hub of a global knowledge system on agricultural research, although CGIAR centers should be prepared to participate, as appropriate, in relevant knowledge networks. The Council proposed that the quality and availability of information from CGIAR centers should be improved and that the centers should be urged to update their data bases, present data in user-friendly formats, and increase their sharing of knowledge with NARS and other compatible agencies.

Next Step: Centers to determine appropriate action and comment at MTM99.

Policy (System Review Recommendation 7)

The Council noted that the CGIAR should strengthen its policy research and capacity building for policy research, but concluded that there is no need for an additional policy dialogue mechanism. The Council agreed, as well, that the CGIAR chairman and center representatives should articulate the views of the CGIAR at international policy discussions, particularly on genetic resources. In doing so, the CGIAR should represent the voice of the poor.

Next Step: Action proposals on strengthening policy research to be drafted by CDC and reviewed by TAC for presentation to MTM99.

Capacity Building (System Review Recommendation 8)

The Council proposed that the CGIAR should maintain its emphasis on capacity building without creating a new mechanism for this work.

Next Step: Centers to determine appropriate action and comment at MTM99.

Women in Agriculture (System Review Recommendation 9)

The Council proposed that the existing gender analysis program of the CGIAR (centered at CIAT) should be strengthened as a contribution toward empowering women in agriculture.

Next Step: Action proposal to be drafted by CDC and reviewed by TAC for presentation to MTM99.

Focus on Africa (System Review Recommendation 10)

The Council agreed that much more can be done to enhance the impact of CGIAR research programs in Africa. The Council urged that obstacles to effectiveness should be removed, and inter-center collaboration improved.

The Council proposed the following specific measures:

- determine the most useful niche for the CGIAR,
- identify appropriate partners, and the best ways of working with them,
- increase African membership and involvement in the CGIAR, and
- dampen donor competition.

Next Step: CDC to take lead role and report on progress at MTM99.

PARTNERSHIPS

Strengthening partnerships (System Review Recommendations 11, 18)

Partnership Committees: The Council endorsed the partnership approach adopted by the CGIAR, and agreed that the involvement of existing partnership committees in CGIAR decision making should be enhanced. The Council proposed that in order to make partnerships more effective the CGIAR should reach out to the international science community (through the mechanism of a partnership committee) but emphasized that in doing so the combined number of members of partnership committees should not exceed the current total (24). The Council noted that it would be appropriate for TAC to conduct an analytic review on “Partnerships and Research: Lessons for the CGIAR,” by 2000 or 2001.

Next Steps: At MTM99 -- the Chairman to submit a proposal for establishing a science committee; NGOC and PSC to submit proposals for restructuring committee membership; and TAC Chair to present terms of reference for the analytic review.

Meeting with Private Sector CEOs: The Council endorsed the proposal for a high-level meeting of senior CGIAR representatives with the CEOs of selected private sector companies engaged in agriculture and agricultural research.

Next Step: Chairman to take the lead role in convening such a meeting, and report on progress at MTM99.

System-level Public Affairs Unit (System Review Recommendation 11)

The Council noted the importance of public awareness activities, and commended the excellent contributions made by the centers, the PAA, PARC, Future Harvest, and the Secretariat. The Council agreed that public awareness programs could benefit from being well planned and co-ordinated. However, further discussion on the most appropriate structure for planning and coordinating public awareness activities was deferred pending the development by the FC Chairman of a fund raising strategy and of proposals for a public awareness mechanism (see “Contributions from the Private Sector “ below).

GOVERNANCE

Conditions of CGIAR Membership (Recommendation 16)

The Council agreed on the need to increase investment and membership in the CGIAR, while recognizing the enormous differential in contributions (based on domestic economic considerations), and the need to maintain the voluntary nature of contributions. Consequently, the Council proposed that conditions of CGIAR membership should remain unchanged for the present.

Next Step: FC to keep situation under review and report to the Group.

Chairman of the CGIAR (System Review Recommendation 17)

The Council emphasized the importance of World Bank leadership. Accordingly, the Council proposed that the CGIAR Chairman should continue to be a Vice President of the World Bank appointed by the Bank President in consultation with the CGIAR. The Council proposed that the CGIAR should discuss with the Bank President the desirability of the Chairman devoting at least 50 percent of his working time and effort to the CGIAR.

Next Step: Discussion of proposal at MTM99.

Role of Cosponsors (System Review Recommendation 19)

The Council proposed that the role and status of cosponsors should remain unchanged. The Council noted the need for greater transparency in the work of the cosponsors, and proposed

that in carrying out their functions, particularly in the case of system appointments, cosponsors should engage in much greater consultation with members at all stages of the selection process.

Next Step: Bank Cosponsor representative (Alex McCalla) to review the specific concerns of members with cosponsors.

Regional Representation (System Review Recommendation 16)

The Council proposed that the system of regional representation at the CGIAR (by election through the FAO mechanism) should be phased out, in consultation with FAO.

Next Step: Chairman to communicate with FAO following MTM99.

CGIAR Decision-Making Process (System Review Recommendation 13)

The Council proposed that the informal style of decision-making by consensus be maintained, and rejected the recommendation that the CGIAR be reconstituted as a legal entity.

Next Step: Discussion of proposal at MTM99.

CGIAR Decision-Making Structure (System Review Recommendation 15)

The Council proposed that a body akin to the current Consultative Council, chaired by the CGIAR Chairman, be established as a permanent feature of the CGIAR decision-making structure.

The proposed Council would:

- reflect the membership of the entire system, with provision for the principle of self-selection and for periodic rotation of membership,
- engage in consultations and facilitation, not in decision making,
- craft propositions for discussion and decision by the Group,
- sharpen the functioning of CGIAR committees,
- meet when required, e.g. immediately before MTM or ICW or at other times.

Next Step: Chairman to propose the Council's composition and terms of reference, for discussion at MTM99.

CGIAR Meetings (System Review Recommendation 21)

The Council proposed that the Mid-Term Meeting be retained for the next two years, and that its future and format be then re-examined.

Role of CGIAR Centers in Decision-Making (System Review Recommendation 24)

The Council endorsed the need for the system to make better use of the pool of talent at the centers as well as on center boards in its decision-making, and noted that the composition of the proposed Consultative Council would make this possible.

Human Resource Services (System Review Recommendation 22)

The Council proposed that the system should commit itself to seeking the best talent for all openings, and urged that the search for suitable talent be widened and deepened.

Organization of TAC (System Review Recommendation 18)

The Council reaffirmed the need for TAC to consist of scientists of the highest quality, representing clusters of skills, and that the size of TAC should be between 10 and 14 members including the IAEG Chair. The need to reach out widely for the best talent, and to ensure peak effectiveness in TAC's functioning, was emphasized. The Council proposed that the TAC Chair in association with TAC members should review the committee's future composition, role, working arrangements, and effectiveness, and report to the Group.

Next Step: TAC Chair to present MTM99 with draft terms of reference for the proposed self-review of TAC's future composition, role, working arrangements, and effectiveness.

IAEG linkage with TAC (System Review Recommendation 14)

The Council proposed that IAEG should be integrated with TAC. The IAEG Chair will be an *ex officio* member of TAC, and IAEG will function as a specialized panel of TAC. This arrangement does not pre-judge the future development of TAC or IAEG.

Next Step: TAC and IAEG Chairs to work out integration arrangements. TAC Chair to report progress at MTM99.

Evaluation Processes (System Review Recommendation 14)

The Council agreed that evaluation processes should be streamlined, with the emphasis on impact assessment, and with reduced paperwork. The Council proposed that TAC should take the lead in examining the context and added value of all forms of evaluation.

Next Step: TAC Chair to present MTM99 with outline of proposed action.

Genetic Resources Policy Committee (System Review Recommendation 18)

The Council proposed that the committee should continue to function as a policy resource, generally reporting directly to the Group, but reporting through TAC on the financial aspects of its recommendations. The Council proposed, further, that the committee's composition and terms of reference should be reviewed by the Director General, IPGRI in consultation with the Chair and other members of GRPC.

Next Step: Director General, IPGRI to present proposals for discussion at MTM99.

Global Forum (System Review Recommendation 20)

The Council reaffirmed the importance of the Global Forum for Agricultural Research and proposed that the CGIAR should continue to provide the GFAR with non-financial support. The CGIAR-GFAR relationship should be reviewed by the CGIAR after the next Global Forum scheduled for the year 2000 in Dresden.

FINANCE

Reverse ODA Decline (System Review Recommendation 26)

The Council proposed that the Group should endorse the long-term financing strategy outlined by the FC.

Next Step: Discussion and endorsement of FC proposals at MTM99.

Role of the World Bank (System Review Recommendation 29)

The Consultative Council reaffirmed the critical importance of World Bank support and proposed that every effort be made to maintain and enhance CGIAR-Bank linkages at all levels.

Funding and Management of Systemwide Programs (System Review Recommendation 25)

The Consultative Council noted that the issue had to be approached from both a financial and management perspective. The Council proposed that the responsibilities of all concerned, the design of programs, and their implementation, should be re-examined by CBC in association with TAC and FC in an effort to resolve outstanding problems.

Next Step: CBC Chair to present initial findings at MTM99.

Contributions from Private Sector (System Review Recommendation 27)

The Council noted that the system needs a carefully thought out fund raising strategy, including all aspects of philanthropy, which will take into account the overlap between public awareness and fund raising. FC Chairman Alex McCalla was invited to lead the effort to design a fund raising strategy for the system, and develop proposals for a mechanism to plan and coordinate all public awareness activities. Decisions on fund raising structures and a mechanism for coordinating public awareness activities should be deferred until the new proposals are discussed.

Next Step: Preliminary comments by FC Chairman at MTM99.

Financing Issues (System Review Recommendation 28)

The Council proposed that members should reaffirm their commitment to financing propositions prepared by the FC, and make a greater effort to implement them.

Next Step: Review and reaffirm FC propositions at MTM99.

System Review Follow-up Responsibilities and Timetable

Action Proposals of the Consultative Council

System Review Recommendation	Issue to be Followed-up	Next Step	Responsibility	Completion/Progress Report Date
1. CGIAR Mission	Amendment of center mission statements	Each center board to amend the center's mission statement	Center boards to implement; CBC to monitor	CBC to report on progress at ICW99
2. IARCs as Global Centers	Agreed at ICW98			
3. Dual Strategy	Agreed at ICW98			
4. Integrated Gene Management	Systemwide review of plant breeding	Development of TOR for the review	TAC	TOR to be discussed at MTM99
	Institutional mechanisms for holding patents	Centers to decide, individually and collectively	Centers; CDC to monitor	CDC to report on progress at MTM99
	IPR audits	Centers to complete	Centers; CDC to monitor	CDC to report on progress at MTM99
5. Integrated Natural Resource Management	Strengthening existing NRM networks	Development of action proposals	CDC; TAC to review	CDC to present proposals at MTM99
6. Global Knowledge System	Ensuring quality and availability of the data generated by the centers	Determining appropriate action	Centers	CDC to comment at MTM99
7. Policy	Strengthening policy research and capacity building for policy research	Development of action proposals	CDC; TAC to review	CDC to present proposals at MTM99
8. Capacity Building	Maintain emphasis on capacity building	Determining appropriate action	Centers	CDC to comment at MTM99
9. Network for Women in Agriculture	Strengthen existing gender analysis program	Development of action proposal	CDC; TAC to review	CDC to present proposal at MTM99
10. Focus on Africa	Increase the centers' effectiveness in Africa	Development of plan to improve CGIAR's effectiveness in Africa	CDC	CDC to report on progress at MTM99

11. Broaden Partnerships	Conduct analytic review on “Partnerships and Research: Lessons for the CGIAR”	Development of TOR for the analysis	TAC	TOR to be discussed at MTM99
	Organize high-level meeting with private sector CEOs	Plan and convene the meeting	CGIAR Chair	Progress report at MTM99
	System-level public affairs unit: Defer action on structural questions pending the development of a fund raising strategy			
12. CG Principles: Member Sovereignty, Ctr Autonomy, Ind. Technical Advice	Principles accepted at ICW98; no follow-up necessary			
13. CG Principles: Consensus Dec.Making & Legal Status	Retain decision-making by consensus and CGIAR’s status as informal organization	Consideration by the CGIAR at MTM99		MTM99
14. Evaluation	As interim measure, IAEG to serve as specialized panel of TAC, with IAEG Chair as <i>ex-officio</i> member of TAC	TAC to work with IAEG on integration arrangements	TAC and IAEG Chairs	TAC to report on progress at MTM99
	Streamline evaluation processes	Development of proposals for streamlining	TAC	TAC to outline proposed actions at MTM99
15. Central Board	Establish a body akin to the Consultative Council to facilitate CGIAR decision making	Consideration of Chairman’s proposals on composition and TOR by the CGIAR at MTM99	Chairman	MTM99
16. CGIAR Membership	No change in conditions of membership at present	FC to keep situation under review	FC	FC to report as necessary
	Phase out regional representation	CGIAR Chair to communicate with FAO following MTM99	Chairman, FAO	MTM99
17. CGIAR Chairmanship	A Chairman should continue to be a VP of WB (devoting at least 50 percent time to CGIAR), appointed by WB President in consultation with the CGIAR	Consideration of the principle by the CGIAR at MTM99	Chairman to inform WB President of the CGIAR’s desire	MTM99
18. Streamline Committees:	TAC: Review future composition, role, working arrangements, and effectiveness of TAC	Development of proposals and TOR	TAC	TAC proposals to be discussed at MTM99

	GRPC should remain as separate committee. Composition and TOR should be reviewed	Development of proposals and TOR	DG of IPGRI	IPGRI DG's proposals to be discussed at MTM99
18. Streamline Committees: (continued)	NGOC and PSC should remain as separate committees. New partnership committee should be formed to link w. scientific community	Development of proposals for alignment (NGOC and PSC); proposal for science partnership committee	NGOC and PSC for their respective committees CG Chair for science committee	Proposals to be discussed at MTM99
19. Role of Cosponsors	Role and status should remain unchanged; should engage in greater consultation in system appointments	World Bank Cosponsor representative to review consultation modalities with Cosponsors	WB Cosponsor representative	MTM99
20. Global Forum	CGIAR should continue to provide GFAR with non-financial support; CG-GFAR relations should be reviewed after GF meeting in 2000	Review of CGIAR-GFAR relations	CGIAR	ICW2000
21. CG Meetings	Retain MTM for the next two years			MTM99
22. Human Resource Services	Search for best talent should be widened and deepened	Centers to explore means	CDC	Ongoing activity
23. SR Follow-up	Mechanism established (Consultative Council)			
24. Role of Centers in CGIAR Decision Making	The proposed Consultative Council should have representation from CBC and CDC			MTM99
25. Systemwide Programs	Design, implementation and governance of systemwide programs should be reviewed	Development of proposals for improvement	CBC, in consultation with TAC and FC	MTM99
26. Reverse ODA Decline	Endorse long-term financing strategy proposed by FC			MTM99
27. Contributions from the Private Sector	Develop fund raising strategy for the system, subsequently identify appropriate structures	Development of fund raising strategy; identification of appropriate structures	FC Chair	Preliminary comments by FC Chair at MTM99

28. Financing Issues	Reaffirm member commitment to financing propositions of FC			MTM99
29. WB Financial Support and Intellectual Leadership	Continuing strong role for WB endorsed at ICW98			

Introductory Note

OVERVIEW:

The third System Review of the CGIAR challenged us to rethink our role(s), and design our strategy, to ensure our continued impact in the approaching new millennium. The renewal program that the CGIAR launched in 1994 has already seen changes in the research agenda of CGIAR centers, the substance of CGIAR deliberations, the processes by which consensus is reached and implemented, the financial stability of the CGIAR system, and in its external relations. We can accelerate the momentum of change, bringing cutting edge agricultural science to bear on the needs of the poor, and to protect the environment. The strategic approach for the future demands dynamism, recommitment, and vision.

The System Review commended the accomplishments of the CGIAR system. The impact of that ringing endorsement is already evident. But institutions do not thrive solely on their laurels. So the System Review urged the CGIAR to build on past achievements but confront past weaknesses as well.

We made a useful start at Centers Week (ICW98), scrutinizing the twenty-nine recommendations and 126 sub-recommendations of the System Review in a spirit of openness, candor, and self-assessment. We agreed on some issues. Others that needed further elaboration were divided among various components of the CGIAR system for study and comment. This stage of the post-ICW98 program has been completed. The groups that studied different aspects of the System Review recommendations and produced recommendations for the benefit of the Consultative Council are to be wholeheartedly commended for undertaking and fulfilling this responsibility.

Their reports have been compiled into a single dossier. A matrix setting out the issues, the processes by which they were examined, and areas for action is attached. The purpose of this introductory note is to provide context to that matrix, and to the set of completed studies. The note is presented under four headings of the "Lucerne Declaration and Action Program": Science, Partnerships, Governance and Finance.

SCIENCE:

Scientific excellence and credibility are the defining strength of the CGIAR system. Thus, the System Review noted, the future effectiveness of the system also lies in "nurturing scientific credibility, building scientific strengths, and mobilizing scientific partnerships to meet the goals of eliminating poverty and hunger and protecting the environment." The CGIAR system was urged, therefore, to position itself "at the core of a scientifically credible network of partners" and "serve as the flagship of a global movement of science for sustainable food security and poverty eradication."

The System Review proposed a number of measures by which the CGIAR could reposition itself, in the context of:

- the rapidly advancing revolution in biotechnology and genetics,
- the simultaneous revolution in information and communications technologies, and
- the pressing need for ensuring that agricultural productivity is increased in a sustainable manner.

Responding at ICW98 to the System Review's science-based recommendations, the CGIAR system:

- reformulated its mission statement, emphasizing food security and poverty eradication and agreed that, where necessary, the mission statements of individual centers will be modified for consistency with the new mission statement of the system.
- reaffirmed its commitment to genetic improvement and natural resources management as the foundation of sustainable agricultural development. The specifics of integrated gene management (IGM) and integrated natural resource management (INRM) as proposed by the System Review required further elaboration.
- agreed that to achieve the mission and objectives of the system, CGIAR centers would:
 - Serve as global resource centers on frontier technologies, policy research, sustainable use of natural resources, capacity building, and networking;
 - Enhance their scientific links with external partners -- NARS, the Global Forum, ARIs, the private sector, and NGOs in industrialized and developing countries;
 - Develop and disseminate environmentally relevant technologies based on effective blends of traditional and modern methods;
 - Undertake greater inter-center collaboration; and
 - Pursue new methods of increasing System synergy.

Science Thrusts and Programs

Following ICW98, the science-based recommendations of the System Review have been further studied, and several follow-up ideas, as well as follow-up mechanisms have been outlined. These are contained primarily in reports from the Committee of Board Chairs (CBC) and the Center Directors Committees (CDC).

Integrated Gene Management: The IGM approach suggested by the System Review requires a renewed approach to selective breeding, a more sensitive assessment of environmental impacts and safety risks, and the pursuit of a functional basis for a new agronomy. The System Review recommends the use of genomics and molecular plant breeding, as well as Mendelian methods of breeding, in an integrated manner; and it urges increased attention to the conservation, characterization and sustainable and equitable use of agro-biodiversity. It also recommends increased system-level attention to the Convention on Biological Diversity, farmers' rights, and intellectual property rights; and it urges a larger, system-wide effort to address new priorities.

This broad approach was positively received at ICW98 and has been re-endorsed by the CDC with some minor modifications such as, for instance, the proposed systemwide review of plant breeding to be undertaken by TAC. A subject requiring further scrutiny and considerably more discussion is that of patenting. The legal and other implications of the proposal for establishing a "wholly-owned subsidiary, under full centers' control," to hold "CGIAR scientists' patents" could be the starting point for a renewed effort to grapple with this complex set of issues. They cannot be kept on "hold" without damage to the system's credibility.

Integrated Natural Resource Management: Most elements of the proposed INRM approach for linking productivity research with the environmentally sound management of natural resources are consistent with principles already established within the CGIAR system. On this basis, the CDC has endorsed the integrated approach to natural resources management. What remains at issue, however, is whether a new International Network as proposed by the System Review is needed, or whether these activities can be fully carried out by strengthening and expanding existing networks and consortia. The Center Directors Committee on Sustainability and the Environment (CSE) plans to "take explicit leadership for a system-wide sharing of experiences, approaches, results and ways to control the high transaction costs of INRM partnerships." The CSE will seek to bring about increased cohesiveness and synergies among centers and centers and with partners. The approach promoted by the CSE may be subsequently assessed, as to whether it is an adequate substitute for the proposed new network.

Sub-Saharan Africa: The System Review recommended the development of a multi-faceted, science-based strategy for a concerted drive to eliminate production constraints and stimulate accelerated agricultural progress in Africa.

The benefits of a system-wide, concerted effort on Africa, driven by a clear strategy and implemented through effective institutional mechanisms, are likely to be considerable. The centers are in agreement with this, but have rightly noted that the focus on Africa should not be at the expense of other developing regions where poverty and food security is also widespread. The CDC's sub-Saharan Africa Committee proposes to hold an inter-center retreat in Africa, to develop ways of better integrating their work, particularly on the IGM and INRM research pillars and in training. The CDC's expected outcome of this retreat would be "a shared operational vision and action plan of inter-center activities as well as of our engagement with SPAAR, NARS, NGOs, SROs, bilateral donors, development agencies and other principal actors in the African agricultural R&D continuum." The idea of such a retreat is a promising step forward. But it is only a first step. Hence, further consideration is required of the full range of follow-up actions that should be contemplated by the CGIAR in the coming years, if it decides to adopt the System Review's recommendation on Africa.

Gender: The System Review recommended that a new international network for the technological empowerment of women be established. This proposal has both substantive (science-related) and partnership-related justification and implications. The emerging consensus is that a new network should not be created but that, instead, the existing CGIAR gender program could be strengthened and re-oriented to meet the objectives outlined by the System Review.

Policy Research: The need for greater attention to social and management sciences and policy analysis research was endorsed by the working groups at ICW98, as was the proposal that the CGIAR organize system-wide dialogues for policy makers at regular intervals. The need for a greater CGIAR presence in intergovernmental negotiations and other fora was also accepted, with the caveat that the CGIAR avoid taking positions or advocating specific policies. Policy dialogue on behalf of the system with a variety of interlocutors is essential if the CGIAR is to be heard on behalf of its beneficiaries, and respected for both its vision and compassion, in the global institutional debates that are shaping development strategies for the future.

Other Science Issues

Consolidation of Centers: The System Review noted the possible benefits of consolidating centers and center activities, and concluded that the issue required "a more in-depth management study and analysis of current strengths and weaknesses of individual centers and their possible future mandates in relation to a coherent CGIAR strategy." The issue is important, complex, and with costs as well as benefits. It needs, therefore, to be approached with care, lest the CGIAR system loses more than it gains. The Consultative Council could commission a small group of stakeholders to prepare the groundrules for further discussion.

Knowledge System: The System Review proposed that the CGIAR take the lead, in partnership with others, to establish an effective Global Knowledge System for Food Security. The System Review felt that this would enrich the work of the CGIAR and benefit the global agricultural research community. The need for the CGIAR to take full advantage of the information and communication revolution currently sweeping the world is unquestioned. But, as noted at ICW98 (and by both the CBC and the CDC), the cost and difficulty for the CGIAR taking the lead is potentially large as well. The centers prefer to strengthen existing efforts; and the issue for discussion is whether this is an adequate response to the vast array of opportunities arising from rapid changes in communication technology. The information revolution is progressing rapidly, and a knowledge system such as the CGIAR would be ill served if it were to be left behind by these developments.

Human Assets: The important science-related issue of human assets goes far beyond recruitment concerns and the role of the CGIAR Secretariat – which the CDC opposes, because the intrusion of the Secretariat in staff recruitment by the centers would violate the

principle of “center autonomy” and because the “centers are regarded as highly competent in the management of human resources.” The potential benefits to science in the CGIAR of modernizing human resources systems are substantial. Drawing appropriate lessons from “best practice” both within and outside the CGIAR could be best achieved if the process is systematic, center-led, and open to external inputs, as noted by the CGIAR Secretariat in a report on human resource services.

PARTNERSHIPS:

The System Review said that “broadening and deepening partnerships and collaboration with other actors in the research-development continuum is of utmost importance to the future of the CGIAR.” Discussions at ICW98 as well as the studies conducted thereafter demonstrate that the system accepts in principle the need to maintain and strengthen partnerships, but is uncertain about what practical measures would be most appropriate and effective. For example:

- Representatives of NGOs and the private sector reacted negatively to suggestions that they should join the CGIAR as members, rather than as members of partnership committees. A proposed merger of the two committees is considered potentially unproductive.
- The view that partnership-building should be left to the centers ignores the reality that the GFAR, several NARS, and NGOs wish to be engaged at the policy making level while some NARS and NGOs are more interested in working relations with centers.
- The need to develop “rules of engagement” governing equitable collaboration with private sector institutions is acknowledged, but no consensus has yet been reached on institutional arrangements for their management.

The CBC has proposed four levels of partnership -- global, CGIAR system, centers, and activity-oriented. The CBC and CDC also endorsed a proposed meeting with private sector CEOs, as well as the System Review’s proposal for enhanced capacity building in the South. The Oversight Committee (OC) has suggested other options, including the creation of a new Science Partnership Committee. Three criteria emerge from the continuing explorations across the system, as essential preconditions for partnership building.

- The linkages already developed by the CGIAR with a range of partners must be strengthened.
- These linkages are most effective when they serve as conduits for two-way communication based on mutual respect, and a sense of commonality.
- Science and research must always be at the core of partnership mechanisms.

GOVERNANCE:

The System Review proposed a number of changes in the broad area of governance. These recommendations are an important segment of the remit to the Consultative Council. They appear at different points in the report of the System Review and have therefore been studied, post-ICW98, by more than one CGIAR body.

Leadership

At ICW98, the System Review’s comments on CGIAR leadership, i.e. chairmanship, could not receive the discrete attention they deserved, because they were mixed in with discussion of other governance issues. In the context of daunting challenges that loom ahead, the crucial question to be decided is the quality of leadership that will best serve the CGIAR system. The tasks and responsibilities of the CGIAR chairman have been outlined by the OC as well in a brief report from the Secretariat. The need for continued leadership from the World Bank is uniformly supported. To be effective, the chairman needs to draw on all resources of the system and receive support from all its components. To receive such support and collaboration, she/he needs to be someone with outstanding competence,

credibility and commitment. His personal qualities need to include acknowledged stature within and outside the CGIAR system, acceptance by the Bank's leadership, respect within the global agricultural research system, and effective linkages with the political leadership of CGIAR members and potential members. If an individual with the character and quality noted above cannot be identified from within the World Bank, an outside candidate should be considered for appointment as CGIAR Chair and World Bank vice president. If an existing vice president fits the profile and can devote the time necessary for carrying out the required responsibilities, outside recruitment would not be necessary. This profile and responsibilities require full-time or close to full-time engagement of the chairman with the CGIAR. In addition, they demand strong support from an executive officer and from a corporate secretariat.

Cosponsors

The System Review recommended that the institution of cosponsors be eliminated from the CGIAR and that the current cosponsors be named as permanent members of a new, central Board. FAO, UNDP, and the World Bank are cosponsors of the CGIAR system because they, in fact, jointly sponsored its creation, and that status cannot be abolished. (UNEP joined as cosponsor on the invitation of the CGIAR in 1994.) The functions performed by cosponsors could, of course, be assigned to others, as noted by the OC, but there is no support within the system for such a change.

CGIAR Membership

As the System Review's recommendations about membership had several financial implications, they have been comprehensively dealt with under "Finance." See below.

Central Board

The System Review recommended the creation of a central Board, with access to funds, power to act on behalf of the CGIAR, and a chief executive. In addition, the System Review recommended that the CGIAR be incorporated as a legal entity, thus eliminating the informal nature of the CGIAR. These far-reaching proposals evoked a generally negative response, primarily because of concerns that the proposed structure would erode member sovereignty and the sense of ownership that existing arrangements endow on individual members. It has been argued, as well, that conversion of the whole CGIAR into a legal entity would turn the CGIAR into a treaty organization, a transformation with many implications. Although some semantic disagreements exist as to whether or not the Group reaches decisions, improved decision-making processes have been a long sought goal of the CGIAR. Several experiments have been tried over the years, and the system has shown a consistent interest in making further improvements. The CBC and CDC have suggested that the Consultative Council, currently a temporary unit, be made permanent. Such a council would not make decisions for or on behalf of the CGIAR but would prepare or facilitate decision making by the CGIAR. To work efficiently, it could form sub-committees covering governance, finance and public affairs, as indicated by the OC.

Committees:

OC and FC: These committees were established as an experiment in strengthening transparency, accountability, and decision-making. The Group assumed when they were launched in 1993 that their work would be reviewed at an appropriate time and their future role would be defined on the basis of such a review. The System Review recommended that the Executive Committee of the proposed central Board should assume the functions of the OC, and that the FC should become a committee of the Board. These recommendations are not compatible with the view that the CGIAR does not need a central Board. The usefulness of both committees is acknowledged. How they should function in the future will depend very much on whether the system creates a permanent Consultative Council, and what relationship the OC and FC should have with the council.

TAC and IAEG: The System Review reaffirmed the view that the scientific capacity of TAC needs to be strengthened and its independent scientific advice maintained. Towards this end, the System Review proposed that TAC be reorganized as a smaller group. TAC Chair plus two or three strategic visionaries supported by expert panels. TAC has suggested that it should consist of ten members and that it should continue to put more weight on strategic considerations. The OC has argued that the System Review recommendation meets the “strategic” demands of TAC’s work but does not address its operational and evaluative dimensions. The OC suggests that TAC should consist of the Chair and a core of at least six members, supplemented with the following standing panels:

- genetic resources (to replace GRPC),
- natural resource management (the second pillar of the CGIAR work),
- evaluation and impact assessment (IAEG).

The integration of IAEG with TAC proposed by the System Review is broadly endorsed. Several different models of merger have been proposed. The most significant issue, however, is not the mechanism, but the critical need to strengthen the practice and substance of independent impact assessment.

Other Key Issues

Meetings: Opinion across the system favors the continuation of both the MTM and ICW, and further discussion of the nature and agenda of meetings..

Evaluation: The system Review’s view that evaluation processes need to be made less cumbersome, and more effective, is broadly supported.

Public Affairs: The need for CGIAR centers to develop a strong public affairs/public information capacity is unquestioned. Experience has proved that, additionally, a systemwide approach, with clear coordination and professional implementation is a plus factor. The leadership requirements of the CGIAR include support from a public affairs capacity of international caliber, as suggested by the System Review. Accordingly, the Secretariat has argued the need for a System Public Affairs Unit reporting to the Chairman. It would be guided, as well, by a committee of CGIAR members, at the same level as the OC and FC.

FINANCE:

Initiatives and innovations arising from the System Review will require sustained financial support. The System Review did not attempt to estimate a total cost of changes, but emphasized a number of goals. These included:

- Ensuring increased ODA for the CGIAR;
- Leveraging the CGIAR’s small contribution to global research efforts;
- Ensuring a suitable North/South balance in funding of and influence on the research agenda; and
- Financing issues: predictability and stability of funding, rational resource allocation, restricted versus unrestricted funding, and disbursement practices of donors etc.

The thrust of the System Review’s recommendations was supported by the Finance Committee (FC) and endorsed at ICW98 as well as, subsequently, by the CBC and CDC. In its submission for the Consultative Council, the FC has further elaborated its proposals for the future financing of the system.

Finance Strategy

The FC has identified four clusters of issues, and suggested that the response of the CGIAR to these issues would help shape an overall financial strategy to reverse the decline in ODA for agricultural research. The issues are:

- Stable, possibly increasing, resource needs;
- A multi-faceted, multi-source resource mobilization strategy for tapping both traditional as well as new funding sources (both from the public and private sectors, including corporate philanthropy);
- Effective financial management, at both the system and center levels, for supporting the agreed research agenda, including strategic system-level initiatives; and
- Action to cope with the volatility of the external financial environment.

Private Sector

The System Review urged the CGIAR system to develop an overall policy for collaboration with the for-profit sector, keeping in mind the public interests and objectives of the CGIAR. The private sector already contributes to research by the centers. This involvement, including project financing, might grow in the future. The extent and quality of funding required, however, calls for more than sporadic project support. The establishment of a Foundation for securing endowments from the private sector has therefore been suggested. This approach was endorsed at ICW98.

The CBC considers the “Future Harvest” campaign to be a functioning fund-raising mechanism, and prefers that the CGIAR be served by only a single fund-raising entity. The FC has outlined the key features of a non-profit CGIAR Foundation, based on the existing International Fund for Agricultural Research (IFAR), with its own CGIAR-linked governance structure. Its view is that both instruments may be necessary:

- IFAR, sharply focused on creating a major endowment for the CGIAR by securing substantial contributions from individuals,
- “Future Harvest” more broadly focused on its advocacy portfolio for international agricultural research, and seeking charitable donations from a broad base of contributors.

It is obvious that the CGIAR needs to seize all suitable opportunities for augmenting its funding for research.

Financing Issues

There is widespread agreement that stability and predictability of funding are essential for research, and that the modalities of funding (unrestricted/restricted funding, indirect cost recovery, and timely disbursement) need to be improved in the CGIAR. The recommendations of the System Review on these points were broadly endorsed at ICW98. The FC has proposed that:

- CGIAR members should make multiyear funding commitments.
- Each center should receive about half of its funding without any restrictions.
- The CGIAR should implement a project-based logical framework for planning, implementation and monitoring.
- Resource allocation should ensure a balance between (individual) donor sovereignty and (collective) CGIAR decisions for full financing of the agreed research agenda.
- Members should ensure timely disbursement of funds.
- Members agree to cover indirect costs in project funding, and centers ensure transparent cost accounting.

Membership

The System Review encouraged the CGIAR to include private sector and NGO representatives in its membership, to increase the minimum contribution target to \$1 million per member, to recognize in-kind contributions, eliminate the selection of regional representatives through FAO, and establish ethical ground-rules for collaboration with new partners.

The general thrust of the System Review recommendations was endorsed at ICW98. The FC has subsequently proposed that:

- CGIAR membership be open to governments and institutions committed to its mission,
- The minimum membership contributions be set at \$1 million (with Southern members with low GDP allowed to contribute less),
- In-kind contributions, in support of the CGIAR research agenda, be formally included in financial reporting,
- South-North ownership and representation goals be pursued through membership, regional fora and the global forum, and
- The selection of regional representatives through FAO be discontinued.

The CDC welcomes increased recognition of in-kind contributions, particularly from host countries, and hopes that this would not be in lieu of existing financial requirements for CGIAR membership. It does not support increasing the minimum membership contribution required from Southern members.

Systemwide Programs

The System Review sought to improve various aspects—including funding, partnership requirements, and governance and management—of system-wide, especially ecoregional, programs (SWPs).

Working group discussions at ICW98 endorsed the need for giving high priority to ecoregional research conducted in collaboration with NARS, and to improving inter-center collaboration on system-wide programs in general. The FC focused on the financial aspects of systemwide programs, and has subsequently elaborated on its views. The CBC and CDC have also provided extensive comments covering both substantive and financial aspects.

The CBC's view is that the incentive structure at the system level, and transaction costs at the center level, are problematic for system-level projects, and that neglecting the problem is not in the CGIAR's long term interest. The FC notes that the "financing problems manifest the incompatibility of using governance and financing arrangements, modeled on existing arrangements for individual centers, for SWPs."

The FC proposes multi-year financing of system-wide programs, increased inter-center collaboration, use of a project approach, and full integration of SWPs in the centers' research agenda. It also proposes that a special task force aimed at reforming the governance and financing arrangements for the SWPs, including issues of leadership, be constituted and action taken at MTM99.

NEXT STEPS:

An agenda for the meeting of the Consultative Council will be distributed early in January. The agenda will cover the clusters of issues that remain to be addressed, and will provide adequate time for full discussion. If necessary, a second meeting of the Consultative Council will be held before the May 1999 Mid-Term Meeting.

Based on discussions at the January meeting of the Consultative Council a set of propositions will be drafted for discussion and submission by the council to MTM99.

In fulfilling its special responsibilities, the council can enable the CGIAR system to:

- Seize the opportunities provided by dazzling new developments in the world of science,
- Serve as the catalyst of a new international order of genuine research partnerships, and
- Ensure that the work of the CGIAR and its partners will help to strengthen diminished human lives.

First Meeting of the CGIAR Consultative Council

EU Centre de Conference A. Borchette, Brussels
January 27-28, 1999

DRAFT AGENDA

January 27, Wednesday

08:30-10:30

1. Introduction

- a. Opening by Chairman
- b. Adoption of the agenda
- c. Comments by CC members

2. Issues with emerging consensus on follow-up

- a. *Science*
 - Conduct systemwide review of plant breeding (Rec. 4)
 - Strengthen existing NRM networks (Rec. 5)
 - Strengthen policy research and capacity building for policy research (Rec. 7)
 - Strengthen existing gender analysis program (Rec. 9)
- b. *Partnerships*
 - Organize high-level meeting with PS CEOs (Rec. 11)
- c. *Governance*
 - Maintain CGIAR's informal status and consensus decision-making (Rec. 13)
 - Link IAEG more closely with TAC (Rec. 14)
 - Streamline evaluation processes (Rec. 14)
 - Discontinue regional representation (Rec. 16)
 - Maintain Cosponsor status (Rec. 19)
 - Retain MTM (Rec. 21)
- d. *Finance*
 - Endorse long-term financing strategy (Rec. 26)
 - Endorse strong role for WB (Rec. 29)

10:30-11:00

Coffee Break

11:00-12:30

3. Issues with emerging consensus on follow-up (cont'd)

12:30-14:00

Working Lunch

(Agenda will be decided during the morning session)

14:00-18:00

4. Issues Requiring Discussion

- a. *Science*
 - System-level entity for holding patents and central IPR service unit (Rec. 4)
 - CGIAR role in global knowledge networks for agricultural research (Rec. 6)
 - CGIAR role (and mechanisms for participating) in global policy dialogues (Rec. 7)
 - Is there need for any new mechanisms for capacity building? (Rec. 8)
 - CGIAR strategy for Africa (Rec. 10)
- b. *Partnerships*
 - Is there need for new measures for strengthening partnerships? (Rec. 11)
 - System-level public affairs unit (Rec. 11)

- c. *Governance*
- Mode of linking IAEG more closely with TAC (Rec. 14)
 - Decision-making structure of the CGIAR (Rec. 15)
 - Conditions of CGIAR membership (Rec. 16)
 - CGIAR chairmanship (Rec. 17)
 - Organization of TAC (Rec. 18)
 - Future role of GRPC (Rec. 18)
 - Future roles of partnership committees (Rec. 18)
 - Support for GFAR (Rec. 20)
 - Needs for central HR services (Rec. 22)
 - Modalities of stronger center role in system-level decision making (Rec. 24)
- d. *Finance*
- Improving funding and management of systemwide programs (Rec. 25)
 - Future roles of IFAR and PARC/Future Harvest in fund raising (Rec. 27)
 - FC propositions on financing (Rec. 28)

19:30-22:00

Dinner Hosted by the Chairman

January 28, Thursday

08:30-10:30

5. Issues Requiring Discussion (cont'd)

10:30-11:00

Coffee Break

11:00-13:00

6. Next Steps

7. Chairman's Summary of Conclusions

Composition of the CGIAR Consultative Council

Northern Members

Canada
Germany
Japan
The Netherlands
Sweden
Switzerland
United States

Southern Members

Brazil
China
Colombia
India
Iran
Philippines
Uganda

Multilateral Organizations and Foundations

Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development
European Commission (EC)
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Rockefeller Foundation

Cosponsors

Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO)
UN Development Programme (UNDP)

CGIAR Standing Committees (Chairs)

Oversight Committee (OC)
Finance Committee (FC)
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Non-Governmental Organization Committee (NGOC)
Private Sector Committee (PSC)

Centers (two representatives from each)

Committee of Board Chairs (CBC)
Center Directors Committee (CDC)