



**Fifteenth CGIAR Consortium Board Meeting  
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania**

**March 19-20, 2014**

**Minutes**

**Chair:** Carlos Pérez del Castillo, Consortium Board (CB) Chair.

**Present:** Lynn Haight (Vice-Chair), Mohamed Ait Kadi, Ganesan Balachander, Klaus Leisinger, Marion Guillou, Martin Kropff, Agnes Mwang'ombe and Paul Zuckerman as CB members; Jimmy Smith (observer, Centers' representative), Jonathan Wadsworth (observer, FC Executive Secretary), Carmen Thoennissen (observer, Fund Council's representative), Frank Rijsberman (CEO, Ex-Officio CB member), Wayne Powell (Chief Science Officer), Enrica Porcari (Head, Shared Services), Pierre Pradal (observer, Director Internal Audit Unit), Luis A. Solórzano (Director of Staff), and Daniela Alfaro (Board Secretary).

**1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

The Board Chair opened the meeting by welcoming new CB Members Klaus Leisinger and Paul Zuckerman, Jimmy Smith new observer as Centers' representative, and Carmen Thoennissen new observer as Fund Council's representative.

The Board Chair asked for any amendments to the agenda and Paul Zuckerman requested to add a discussion on CIMMYT's very fast growth and related concerns.

The Chair provided his perspective regarding three matters:

- a) The good meetings with DGs during this week that bring to light the need for more face to face meetings of the CB with the Centers. From discussions with donors it is clear that they feel the same need as reflected in the positive comments after the meeting in Wageningen. The FC Consultant on Resource Mobilization (RM), Anthony Beattie, made the same observation – that the system is low on “social capital”.
- b) Concerns voiced by the Centers focus mostly on procedural issues and not so much on substance – as it appears the Centers and Consortium agree, or agree largely, on many of the substantive issues – as demonstrated by the Consortium Response to the IEA Review of CRP Governance and Management. Some of the frictions are beyond the Consortium's control. For example, the decision to fast-track the MTR was taken by the FC - and the Consortium and its members need to engage and respond. This is unlikely to change because there is a very heavy agenda with many activities underway to provide input for the MTR, various reviews, the update of the SRF and the preparation of Guidance for the CRP 2<sup>nd</sup> Call that will set the agenda for the next several years.
- c) There is a pervasive stream of comments from people from the outside saying that that we don't have a strategy, or a business plan. This is coming too often and needs to be addressed. We do have an SRF but that is not perceived as a clear strategy, or at least not a business plan. How can we improve this? This issue will be discussed in the closed session.

**Decision:** *The agenda was approved by the CB.*



## 2. Progress report on Consortium Office activities

The CEO summarised the CO activities since the last in-person CB meeting in Los Baños in October 2013 as follows:

Much of the CO work in the past five months has been on the preparation for the CRP 2<sup>nd</sup> Call – through the SRF Management Update; the Guidance CRP 2<sup>nd</sup> Call Document; the IEA Review of CRP Governance and Management; and the Mid-Term Review of the Reform.

SPPC Chair Martin Kropff hosted a meeting of the CB SPPC at Wageningen University (on Feb 7-8), with a large number of FC representatives, which offered an excellent opportunity to increase the engagement of both the CB and FC in these important processes. As a follow up the CO is planning additional work – an assessment of “what it will take to achieve the SLOs”, independent of the current CRP portfolio that Chief Science Officer, Wayne Powell, is preparing and will lead and for which additional budget is required. In general, in 2013 “IDOs” have become clear but indicators and targets are not yet established. The June meeting of CRP and science leaders is the next opportunity where we expect a breakthrough on indicators.

The CB is requested to approve the 2014 SRF Management Update at CB 15, and submit that document to the FC for approval. This includes an overview of the additional work to be undertaken in 2014, to arrive at the 2015 SRF management Update (late in 2014 or early in 2015) that incorporates the conclusions and recommendations of the MTR and satisfies the FC and CB as a basis against which to issue the request for CRP 2<sup>nd</sup> Call pre-proposals.

The IEA Review of CRP Governance and Management has now been finalized and proposes a revised model for the CRPs. The review will be discussed at the FC meeting in Mexico in May. The Consortium’s Management Response is an item agenda for CB15. The response drafted by the CO was discussed and agreed with the CB’s Governance Risk and Compliance Committee, and agreed with the Centers in the meeting with the DGs earlier this week.

Submissions to the MTR Panel are planned primarily through two separate papers: an Impact Paper that provides answers to the questions of the MTR on examples of CGIAR successes, policy engagements and private sector partnerships and a Consortium Position Paper to provide answers to additional MTR Panel questions as well as Consortium positions to be shared with the Panel.

The CO Science team has worked with the CRPs to produce 2014 CRP Programs of Work and Budget (POWB) and concludes that overall there is much progress in the clarity provided by the CRPs on the work planned in the year ahead through this process, compared to a year ago (that was the first year in which the Consortium asked the CRPs to submit a POWB).

There has been impressive progress on mainstreaming Gender-in-Research and all 15 CRPs now have submitted – and most have approved - gender-in-research strategies that are being implemented. The total planned investment in gender research in 2014 has increased to about 14% or \$110 million, sharply up from about 5% in 2013.

The Consortium HQ building is nearing completion, and the ratification process in French parliament of the treaty establishing the Consortium, and the HQ Agreement for the Consortium, is approaching its final steps (it passed the Conseil d’Etat and Council of Ministers). The CO expects to move into the new building and have its two laws confirmed by Parliament and published in the Gazette before the formal opening of the new building on June 2.



Work on establishing the Consortium's own policies has started – with priority for HR policies in 2014. The CO appointed a senior HR consultant, Bob Moore, who conducted a first analysis of the feasibility to move the Consortium definitively out of the classical CGIAR system with separate classes of staff (i.e. local and international staff). The CEO proposes to establish a true “One-Staff” system with one set of HR policies, salary bands and benefits that apply to all staff, plus a separate package of “Relocation and Transfer benefits” that is available to any individual that has to re-locate at the request of the Consortium. Conversion of the current (Bioversity) compensation system will likely involve monetizing many of the current (IRS) benefits and converting these into base salary. A separate consultancy in May-June 2014 will classify and grade CO jobs in a competency based system, following a recent similar exercise at CIP and using their system. The HR framework policies and the authority delegated to management to complete and implement the system will be submitted for CB approval in the October CB meeting and the new system will take effect from January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015.

The CGIAR Intellectual Asset Report and the FC IP Group's report agreed “that overall substantive gains have been made across the CGIAR Consortium resulting from the CGIAR IA Principles in terms of increased awareness, improved capacity and adoption of best practices”, both reports also found that a number of Centers did not comply in 2012 with certain provisions of the CGIAR IA Principles. The CO legal team has taken actions to improve its working relationship with the FC IP Group, to strengthen its oversight role and to ensure compliance of Center IA Reports submitted this year, and to resolve the cases of non-compliance mentioned above.

At the request of the FC, the CO finance team, with the help of Centers' finance teams, has put together a preliminary (unaudited) CGIAR Financial Report. It shows that while in total more than a billion US\$ was received by the CGIAR system, some of that income is being carried forward to 2014, and the total revenue recognized by the centers in 2013 increased to about \$970 million (plus systems costs), an increase of about 16% over 2013 (final audited numbers still to be received and compiled).

The CO has worked with Centers to develop a database of all bilateral grants on the books of Centers in 2012 to monitor both the total number of contracts and the estimated overall transaction costs in the new CGIAR. In 2012 the Centers reported having 2640 bilateral grants from over 500 donors with a total value of about \$2.6 billion. Some of the largest donors have many active bilateral grants while there are also some 300 donors with a single (small) grant to one of the Centers. About 20% of the grants provide 80% of the income, and the other 2000+ grants provide only 20% of the income. The full analysis and database will yield many more conclusions but it appears that there is scope for increased efficiency and effectiveness - reduced transaction costs - by reducing the long tail of little projects – and increasing the average grant size.

Progress has been made to re-establish the Internal Audit Unit as a shared service under its new Director, Pierre Pradal, who started work on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014., hosted by the CO in Montpellier. Pierre will provide an update on this work (Item 8.f. and 8.g. in the agenda) for discussion at the CB15 meeting.

In summary, the 2014 calendar year is a critical year to prepare for the next stage in the development of the new CGIAR; to confirm or adjust the design put in place by the reform through the MTR; and to prepare for the second round of CRP investments, the CRP 2<sup>nd</sup> Call.

Discussion:

In general, the Board is very impressed with what is going on –compliments to the CO. But a lot comes at once. The Consortium needs to set priorities to get to higher efficiency and to monitor what the gains of the Reform are. We must also think about improving processes to be able to show that the Consortium and its members are working together.

The ARC Chair asked the CEO: What is the major risk that keeps you awake at night? The CEO responded that in his view it is our inability to report accurately on what CRPs have delivered (i.e. the percentage completion in terms of results, not just budget). The first set of CRP proposals list a very large number of “milestones” (50-100 for each CRP), but the milestones are not linked to budgets and are generally not a good representation of the key outcomes of each CRP. This does not mean that there is no good science going on in the CRPs (we know the quality is uneven – some excellent, some improving, others not so great) but it does mean we have no system in place to assess progress, results, or performance at the program level, let alone the portfolio level.

The SRF Management Update does address this problem (through the “IDO” process) but for the time being it is primarily a process document. The Common IDOs that the CRPs have identified still need clear indicators, and for these indicators target values have to be agreed (among CRP partners and with the countries where we work). In addition, we need the additional work now planned for the 2015 SRF Management Update.

The Centers’ representative agreed that the Consortium and its members, the CGIAR Centers, are closer in substance than it sometimes appears but we have an adversarial process mainly driven by a lack of clear communications. It was agreed that we need to change the narrative and tone in the debate to a more collaborative process.

The Centers’ Representative acknowledged that the Consortium “owns the CRPs” and has programmatic responsibility for the programs as a whole (including W3-Bilateral) and fiduciary responsibility for the W1-2 funding, and is accountable to the FC for the CRPs. The Centers, however, need to be engaged, need to be consulted by the Consortium on its actions and positions, and want to be acknowledged for the role they play as Lead and Participating Centers – both the fiduciary responsibility held by the Center Boards of Lead Centers, as well as the intellectual leadership for the CRPs provided by the Centers. While the Consortium can work closely with the CRP Directors, it needs to be aware that the CRP agreements are signed by the Centers – and the Centers want to be engaged. The Consortium Board generally agreed with this position presented by the Centers’ Representative and the CEO agreed that he personally will need to invest more energy in maintaining a good relationship with Centers’ leadership.

On Human Resources, the Centers’ Representative expressed support for the idea of closing the gap between International Recruited Staff and Locally Recruited Staff. Keep in mind, he counselled, that the big difference is benefits –local staff in most cases cannot avoid paying taxes. Also, a national individual cannot be a diplomat (in some countries), and therefore, that condition makes nationals unable to ascertain some roles and functions required by certain posts in their own country.

**Decision: *The CB adopted the Progress Report on CO Activities.***

### 3. Resource Mobilization (For Discussion)

Anthony Beattie (FC Consultant on Resource Mobilization) was unable to present to the CB for health reasons<sup>1</sup>, but as he presented to the Joint Center-CB meeting on March 18<sup>th</sup>, the CB members had the benefit of listening to his preliminary comments and conclusions the day before.

Mr. Beattie made a number of comments in his briefings on March 17 and 18:

1. The Reform is still a work in progress. It would have been helpful to set clear “change management” goals as part of the reform process, and to manage the necessary change accordingly.
2. There is not enough social capital in the CGIAR system – not enough opportunities for senior leaders in the system to talk to each other.
3. The lack of social capital impedes the development of a shared vision.
4. Donors have disparate views and short time horizons – different from the long term time horizons in the scientific production process. As the donors are the CGIAR’s customers, it behooves the Consortium and the centers to get to know what makes donors tick.
5. The CGIAR’s funding climate is at best stable, and could well deteriorate.
6. The system does not have a strategic plan – it has an SRF but this document does not lay out the “business plan” – the plan that specifies who does what and when, with what budget, and for what expected result.
7. Why does the system not focus more on its principal asset – its people. Why are there not centrally managed HR policies and systems?
8. Aim to capture and dominate the intellectual high ground; raise your profile; do the best science you can and make every effort to ensure that it gets used.
9. Become known for your excellence resource managers: excellent as a manager of people, manager of financial resources, and manager of facilities. Get out ahead of the game and reform yourself before others do it to you.
10. Grasp the nettle: there are many concerns (among the donors) concerning the transaction costs in the system – and these appear to center around “too many centers” – get ahead of this and merge centers.
11. Prepare for a more competitive world. Become more outward facing. Develop carefully thought-through advocacy and influencing campaigns. Stay abreast of the landscape of development funding.
12. Get more comfortable with the private sector.
13. Be ready for paradigm shifts: what will the impact be on the CGIAR of the next financial crisis (and there will be one).

The CB discussed Mr. Beattie’s comments:

Discussion:

By and large the CB considered Mr. Beattie’s briefing to be strategic, thoughtful and helpful – and will take his comments seriously. The FO will inform what will happen with his work – particularly the answers to the questionnaire’s mailed in to him.

Mr. Beattie’s assessment of the CGIAR’s funding prospects (i.e. stable or declining) is very conservative. Yes, if we keep doing things the same way, funding may go down. However, the CB

---

<sup>1</sup> On March 31<sup>st</sup>, the CB received the sad news of Mr. Beattie’s passing away in Johannesburg.

and the Centers also see opportunities that may expand CGIAR funding, e.g. in climate smart agriculture or health and nutrition related subjects.

The CB takes the point on improved communication (of a strong value proposition – that comes first) very seriously. It is clear this will take more joint work of Centers, the Consortium (particularly CO) and the FC/FO – we need strong evidence of impact, strong impact stories, and clear, agreed messages.

With respect to transaction costs, the CB takes note of the Donors' concern on transaction costs (and focus on Centers mergers), but believes it is not the time to take on Centers mergers, as these are costly and disruptive (and not likely a good idea as we are preparing for the second round of CRP investments). We can follow Mr. Beattie's advice and get ahead of the issue through the preparation of a high level thought piece on where we, the Consortium, do see the major opportunities for increased efficiencies. These have more to do with shared services - particularly the fact that the centers collectively maintain approximately 264 offices in over 90 countries, with some 30% of the total staff strength (some three thousand people) located outside of HQ locations. If we were to bring together all different Centers offices in one country (for example consolidating the current presence of 6 Centers in Dhaka now) we believe we could reduce some 2-300 positions, and possibly more; save millions in back office costs -and increase the effectiveness of CGIAR operations in a country (the CRPs speaking with a single voice and approaching the government collectively rather than individually). The Guidance document foresees a "site integration plan" that integrates the actions of multiple CRPs in our focus countries, and this could be complemented with an office-integration / harmonization plan. The CO proposes to develop such a high level think piece on potential efficiencies / reduced transaction cost as a contribution to the MTR.

**Decision:** The CB invites the CO to put together a high level think-piece on increased efficiencies and effectiveness - such as the rationalization of country offices.

#### 4. Report from NEC

The CB will this year be conducting a search for two new Board members to join in 2015. The Constitution stipulates that the CB will propose one candidate per unfilled position for election. Last year, the CB Nominations and Evaluation Committee recommended, and the CB approved, an additional consultative step with the Centers. NEC proposes to follow the same process this year as well. SRI Executive Search has been contacted to assist the NEC in the search process.

In the process to elect the two new CB members NEC has considered the current CB profiles and the members who are stepping down to set out the criteria for the search. NEC is asking for suggestions and leads to be received by April 21. SRI will help to develop a long list by April 30. After vetting by the NEC, SRI will conduct virtual interviews and prepares a short list by June 13. The NEC Chair/members will then conduct face-to-face interviews to come up with at least four names for the CB to consider and submit to the Member Centres to vote on by July 31. Member Centers then choose two from this slate by Sept 15.

The NEC Chair requests the CB to approve: the selection process for the two new Board members to join the CB as of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2015 as described above, and a budget of \$30K to cover SRI's fees of \$10 K and \$15-20K for travel and accommodation.

Discussion:

For the selection process the CB has wide networks and each member is requested to put in 1-2 names. After a short evaluation, SRI conducts pre-interviews. Ideally new Board members will both be from the South (developing countries), at least one will be a woman and one will have a strong finance background. SRI will have a limited mandate to support the interview process, not a full search to identify candidates.

The Board discussed if the budget should be around \$100K, as the proposed \$30K may well be insufficient, given travel costs, but concluded that the proposed \$30K is already more than the \$20K budgeted last year, and as the Consortium's budget is tight, the amount approved at this stage is limited to the \$30K requested by the NEC. If this proves insufficient the CB will reconsider its options.

**Decision: *The CB approves the Process and allocation of \$30K for the search of new members.***

## **5. Report from SPPC**

### **a. Wageningen Workshop (For Information):**

In October/November the CO asked both the CB and the FC to get more involved in the preparation of the SRF Management Update and Guidance documents, as the process in 2013 was largely driven by the Centers (through working groups of CRP leaders that authored large parts of the SRF Management Update, and through several rounds of consultation). A meeting was hosted by SPPC Chair Martin Kropff at Wageningen University (Feb 7-8) for the CB's SPPC which also attracted a large number of FC representatives. This was an excellent opportunity to increase the engagement of both the CB and FC in these important processes. The outcome of the workshop was explicit feedback and guidance on these two key documents that will help shape and guide the work of the CGIAR in the coming years (see Wageningen Guidance Workshop report).

### **b. SRF Management Update 2014 (For Approval):**

The SRF Management update and Guidance for the CRP 2<sup>ND</sup> Call documents have already gone through several rounds of drafting and internal (CO, CRP, Center and ISPC) as well as external stakeholder feedback. The 2014 version of the SRF Management Update submitted for Board Approval incorporates feedback from CRPs, Centers, ISPC, FO, the Wageningen Meeting and three months of open public consultation through GFAR and other partners' networks. The primary focus of the work in 2013 that is reported on in the 2014 SRF Management Update is the "accountability framework" (the theory of change; impact pathway and intermediate development outcomes). The most important result is the development of 11 Common IDO's that are accepted by the CRPs as their primary reporting framework. The primary drawback of the result to date is that indicators have not yet been selected to measure progress on these Common IDOs, and that no targets have yet been set. This needs to be completed in 2014.

In addition, It became clear during the Wageningen meeting that the 2015 SRF Management Update needs to be revitalized to ensure that it is fit for purpose and this requires data and thorough assessments including an analysis of 'what it will take' to deliver on the four SLOs that is independent of the existing portfolio of CRPs. The CO requires additional funding to undertake these assessments. The strategic assessment to revitalize the 2015 SRF Management Update will include the following elements:

1. An analysis of the current landscape of CGIAR in terms of publication output both in quantity and quality. A comparison analysis of CGIAR output vis-a-vis a set of peer organizations. (\$60K)
2. A detailed portfolio analysis to validate, quantify and thereby better understand the relationship between Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) and the System Level Outcomes (SLO). This will include further analysis on the Investments currently in place to support each IDO, the geographical focus of CRPs, and the number and nature of partnerships embedded within the current portfolio. This will guide future resource allocation and ensure that the science and finance teams are better aligned. (\$150K)
3. Workshops to determine targets, metrics and baselines. (\$40k)
4. Consultancies to support drafting of a revitalised SRF and thereby provide the template on which to build the second generation CRPs in terms of number, nature and scope. (100k)

Discussion:

The Board discussed when we will ask the broader questions about the scope of research in the CGIAR. Should the CG look at Food Systems and what this entails in terms of the research agenda? Should the CGIAR also consider healthy diets, and consequently obesity as well as malnutrition? It was suggested that this broader discussion should be part of the agenda for June meetings.

A major challenge is how to define global priorities and link these to the CGIAR portfolio, i.e. what is the “niche” for publicly funded international research for agricultural development. How to prioritize resource allocation is not a simple matter given the diversity of research topics currently underway across Centers and CRPs.

What level of indication are we going to give that during the extension and refresh we are already going to take some measures to correct what is not working?

Interactions with the private sector cannot be ignored and should be integral part of the CGIAR strategy.

The portfolio analysis proposed by the CSO, using the SCI2 software, is an interesting tool but it is data intensive - do we have the necessary data? The CO answered that the CRP portfolio mapping exercise carried out by PIM is likely sufficient to provide the data for the portfolio analysis.

Additional comments on the SRF are mostly editorial and CB members are invited to send these to Wayne Powell to update the document.

**Decision: *The CB approves the 2014 SRF Management Update. The CB also approves the request for an additional \$350K for the work to revitalize the 2015 SRF Management Update, to be submitted to the FC.***

**c. Proposal for 6 months extension for 3 CRPs (For Approval)**

Contracts of three CRPs (Aquatic Agriculture systems (AAS), Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA) and MAIZE) end in June 2014 and therefore a 6-month extension bridge to merge them into the 2015-2016 second phase approval process and timeline is required. Following the Consortium Board’s recommendation and with ISPC’s endorsement, the Fund Council approved the use of these

three CRPs' 2014 Program of Work and Budget (POWB) as the mechanism for extending them into the second phase process.

The submitted 2014 POWBs for these three CRPS have been reviewed by the Science Team. The CO considers that these three POWB are in satisfactory condition –as described in the supporting document “Six month contract extensions for AAS, FTA and MAIZE: Recommendation to the CB”. The CO recommendation provides specific justification for each CRP to include Window 1 and 2 together with Bilateral funding with a specific focus on program coherence.

During the analysis of the funding needs of the three CRPs, it transpired that the three CRPs (collectively) not only need an additional \$20 million allocation of W1-2 funding (which is already foreseen in the 2014-15 FinPlan) but are also estimating to have raised some \$100 million more in W3-Bilateral Funds than foreseen in their current CRP contracts.

This large amount of additional W3-Bilateral funding, which was quite unforeseen at the moment we designed this process, raises the question whether the CRPs still need the additional W1-2 funding.

Discussion:

The Board deemed that this request needs further clarification because the information presented was considered confusing.

**Decision: *The CB deferred the approval of 6-month extension for 3 CRPs (AAS, FTA and MAIZE) for virtual approval. In two weeks the CO will submit a revised document with a clear explanation on accountability and detailed information for requesting additional funds to extend the 3 CRPs for 6 months.***

#### **d. POWB 2014 for the CRP portfolio: Update (For discussion)**

The CO requested a CRP program of work and budget (POWB), as an internal Consortium document, for the second year. The first year was a sort of ‘warming up’ exercise and as explained in the supporting document, lessons that could be drawn were limited. This year the 16 submissions received were of much better quality and their review and analysis provided interesting insights into the evolution of each CRP. The CRP POWB and the CRP Annual Report are complementary documents, providing an ex ante (POWB) and an ex-post (Annual Report) view of each CRP. Each CRP 2014 POWB was thoroughly reviewed by the Science team, and comments were sent to the CRP Directors to guide re-submissions. The process of re-submissions and the analysis of the amended POWB is on-going and will stop when all POWB are satisfactory.

The document drawing lessons from these analyses, at the level of the whole CRP portfolio, is for the information of the CB. The CB will receive later in the year the analysis of all CRPs Annual Reports at portfolio level, and this will be tabled for Consortium Board approvals, for submission to the FC, as occurred in 2013 and 2012.

Discussion:

The Board discussed the report and found it a helpful analysis of the current condition of the CRP portfolio.

### **e. Biotechnology Statement (For Discussion)**

A CGIAR Consortium statement on Biotechnology (including GMOs) has been prepared by a committee appointed in Los Baños at CB14. The first draft Statement produced by this committee was circulated to Centers for comments in January (and many comments were received). A revised statement has now been produced by the committee that appears to be largely acceptable to the Centers (as at least one Center wants to make some final amendments; then the Centers will be asked to comment one more time). Once the Centers all agree on the statement, it will be passed to the CB for its endorsement. Once the CB has endorsed it, we will have a CGIAR Consortium Statement on Biotechnology.

Two follow up actions are foreseen thereafter:

- Centers are expected to use the Statement for internal awareness rising (as well as answering questions that may come to them in the meantime).
- The Consortium will approach the FC to see if there is willingness to start a process to try to come to a CGIAR-wide statement (including FC members). Given the wide range of views in CGIAR Fund donor countries, this is likely to be a complicated process – not unlike the process followed for the IP Principles – but worth trying.

## **6. Gender and Diversity**

### **a. Revised Gender Action Plan (For Approval)**

### **b. First Consortium Gender and Diversity Performance Report (For Approval)**

### **c. Issues in the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Strategy (For Discussion)**

FC10 (Nairobi, November 6-7, 2013) approved the Gender in Research Action Plan submitted by the Consortium in principle, but requested the Consortium to provide clarity on how gender equality will be captured in the IDOs, how accountability will be ensured, and an explanation of the cost and substance of the post-doctoral fellow program. In addition, the FC requested the Consortium to develop a strategy to address its own gender and diversity in-the-workplace issues. Moreover, the FC requested the Consortium to report on its progress on both gender in research and gender and diversity in the workplace issues at every future FC meeting (through a template of gender performance indicators provided by the FC).

The CO has revised the document discussed at the FC10 meeting “Proposed Actions to Speed Up Gender Mainstreaming in the CGIAR” and addressed the first three points above on gender equality in the IDOs, accountability and the postdoctoral fellowships. The plan for the CGIAR to address its own gender and diversity in the workplace issues is the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Strategy, which the CO has started to work on (see Consortium progress report) and that is expected to be presented for approval to the CB and FC in October/November 2014.

The Consortium has received from the FC a template with gender performance indicators it should report on at each FC meeting. For gender and diversity in the workplace, the FC template focuses on women in leadership – and proposes a target of 50%, to be reached in 5 years, with annual improvements of 15%.

The CO developed a database of all leadership positions in the CGIAR, based on the websites of the Centers and other entities. The result is that there about 250 leadership positions in the CGIAR, of which about 80, or 30%, are held by women.

If the CB and Centers accept the FC target of 50% in 5 years, then it would set a target of 34% in 2015; 38% in 2016; 42% in 2017; 46% in 2018 and reaching 50% in 2019.

The priority issues in a Gender and Diversity in the workplace Strategy were discussed with the DGs in a half-day workshop on March 17 (related to key HR areas in Recruitment, Development, and Retention). The DGs responded very positively, provided advice and mandated the CO and their HR managers to initiate work on this strategy.

#### Discussion:

The CB was pleased with the progress on gender in research and supports the efforts to put in place a Gender and Diversity in-the-workplace Strategy. It was pleased with the first Gender Performance Report as well, but is not sure that the pace of change to reach an ambitious goal of 50% in such a short period of time is realistic. It was agreed to initiate the work on the Gender and Diversity Strategy; carry out the analysis related to perceived key bottlenecks, and analyse possible actions that could be taken (including an analysis of turnover, that determines how fast change can be achieved) – and then come back to the targets. That is, the CB does not commit to the targets at this stage, but prefers to engage with the FC on this issue in October-November, when the homework for the Gender and Diversity Strategy is on the table.

**Decision: The CB approves: 1) The Revised Gender Action Plan for submission to FC11; 2) The First Consortium Gender and Diversity Performance Report for submission to FC11 (after verification of data with Centers), without a commitment to adopt specific targets at this stage; and 3) The development by the CO, in close collaboration with the HR CoP, of a Gender and Diversity in the workplace Strategy, along the lines proposed by the CO, for approval by the CB in its October meeting.**

## 7. Report from GRCC

### a. New GRCC Agenda Work Plan (For Endorsement)

In 2012, the GRCC was established as ad-hoc committee for a period of one year to liaise with the CGIAR Governance Review (phases 1 and 2) and reviewed the recommendations of both phases. In addition, the GRCC carried out several assignments as a follow-up to the 2012 Governance Retreat: it developed a Good Governance Framework (requesting certifications from Centers and laying out a Consortium policy adoption process) which was approved by the CB at CB12, as well as a checklist for good governance of Center Boards.

The Committee proposes that in 2014, the GRCC will continue to work on the recommendations of Phase 2 of the CGIAR Governance Review as there is still work in progress on these with the Consortium-FC Governance Group. In addition, the GRCC will follow-up with additional items identified during the 2012 Governance Retreat, and work on the Consortium's own internal (CO/CB) policies as the Consortium separates administratively from Bioversity. The GRCC presented its 2014 work plan of 12 items for endorsement by the CB (See Background Documents).

Discussion: the proposed work-plan was discussed, as well as the option to make the GRCC a permanent committee. It was noted that there are potentially some overlaps with both the ARC and, particularly, the new Policy Coordination Committee (PoCCo, the former MIC). It was agreed that

PoCCO would focus on the interaction between the Consortium and its members, regarding Consortium policies and guidelines that affect the Member Centers. GRCC will look at governance issues at an early stage, to develop new policies and guidelines related to governance, and hand-over to PoCCO for interactions with the Centers. The CB decided to extend the mandate of GRCC for one year.

**Decision: *The CB endorses the New GRCC Agenda and extends its mandate for one year.***

#### **b. Review of CRP Governance and Management (For Discussion and Approval)**

As the Centers endorsed the Management Response to the IEA Review of CRP Governance and Management as prepared and approved by the GRCC, the GRCC Chair did not think it was still necessary to have the IEA present and discuss the report, and he cancelled the presentation.

The Review of CRP Governance and Management has been completed by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA). The focus of the review is on CRP-specific governance and management, including the intersection of these functions with CGIAR lead Center management and boards, the Consortium and FC. The 16 CRPs are covered. The GRCC discussed and recommends a Consortium Response to the 8 IEA recommendations to the CB. The GRCC concurs with most findings and recommendations of the review but proposes that the CRP Leader reports to both the Lead Center DG (solid line reporting) and to the Independent Steering Committee (dotted line reporting), as is normal in matrix organizations.

Discussion:

The Centers agree with the Consortium Response as recommended to the CB by the GRCC, with the exception of the proposed ex-officio membership of the Independent Steering Committee of a Consortium representative. The CEO agrees, the intention was to propose the right to observe Steering Committee meetings for a Consortium Representative – not to be a member. The Centers agree with an observer status for a Consortium Representative.

CB members questioned whether the governance diagram in the Consortium Response should not show how the Lead Centers report to the FC, through the CB. It was decided to clarify this through a footnote, rather than in the diagram itself.

To the question of when the new governance model will be implemented, the CEO responded that it was agreed with centers, and is now proposed to the CB, that the new model will become mandatory for the new round of CRPs (2<sup>nd</sup> Call), and that CRPs will be encouraged to put the new model in place as soon as they reasonably can. The CB concurred.

**Decision: *The CB approves the Response to the Review of CRP Governance and Management with: 1) a change in page 4 indicating that a Consortium Representative should not be an ex-officio member of the Independent Steering Committees but should have the right to attend as an Observer; 2) a footnote pointing out that the CB and FC are part of the accountability line from CRP to Center Board to CB to FC; and (3) that the new model will be implemented for all CRPs from the second phase, and that CRPs will be encouraged to implement the new model as soon as they are able.***

## 8. Report from ARC

### a. Preliminary 2013 CGIAR Financial Report (For Information)

In 2013 the FC requested to be provided with a preliminary (unaudited) CGIAR Financial Report in its Spring meeting. The CO attempted to put this together for information for CB15, but the board documents were late and incomplete. Center information was received very recently and needs considerable checking and corrections; CRP information was not available ahead of CB15. The CO intends to have available a more complete (and stable) preliminary report before FC11 (May 6-8). At this point in time few useful conclusions can be drawn based on this report.

The Chair of the ARC noted that the CO is in between Directors for the Finance and Corporate Service Departments, and that the Interim DCFS (David Theriault) had started only weeks before CB15. There are only 2 other staff members in the CO Finance Department and the conclusion is that the department is “fragile” at this point in time.

### b. Preliminary 2013 CO Financial report (For Information)

The 2013 CO Financial Report is also still a draft. The overall conclusion is that, as projected at board meetings last year, the CO managed to end the year with its budget fully spent. The presentation of the report needs more work, and the numbers are still subject to audit.

### c. 2014 CO Budget Update (For Approval)

The 2014 CO Budget is very tight, with the full complement of staff now on board, running additional costs to continue paying Bioersivity overhead as we did not separate on January 1 as initially budgeted (an estimated \$400K in additional costs), and the FC refusal to action (i.e. fund) on PwC’s recommendations for 4 additional CO positions, notably and extra position on the Science Team and a Strategic HR Manager, while at the same time give the Consortium additional HR-related responsibilities regarding the development of a Gender and Diversity Strategy and Gender Performance reporting. The FC also did not approve a Consortium request to add \$150K to the budget for expanded CRP audit functions. In short, there is very little flexibility in the Consortium budget, and with additional costs (such as the increase in costs requested by the NEC), combined with the 2013 letter of the FC Chair indicating that in the view of the FC the Consortium can only be funded through W1 of the CGIAR Fund. That de facto ties the Consortium’s hands – prevents it from taking full responsibility for its own budget and raising its own funds.

In addition, from the participating CB and FC members in the Wageningen meeting it is clear that a “revitalized SRF”, with an assessment of what it will take to achieve the SLOs independent from the current CRP portfolio is critically important. The CO doesn’t have the funding budgeted to take on these additional tasks. The CO could raise funds bilaterally but the current FC position is that the CO can only be funded through W1. The logical step is therefore to request the FC for additional W1 funding (while proposing to the MTR to change the funding mechanism). Additional funding is requested for work on the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Strategy (\$150K) and the 2015 SRF Management Update (\$350K).

Discussion:

Several CB members noted that the current situation, with a very limited budget for the work of the Consortium, that does not allow the Consortium to take full responsibility for the tasks assigned to it

by the Constitution, and by requests from the FC, is highly undesirable. The CB agreed to take the request for additional funding to the FC, playing by the rules as they were established by the FC last year, but at the same time propose to the MTR to change the funding system. If this does not produce the desired results by the end of the year, the CB may need to consider what its options are to ensure it can carry out its tasks with adequate resources.

The FC Executive Secretary acknowledged some of the Consortium's concerns, but also pointed out that a number of FC members have serious concerns about the overheads (transaction costs) of the system, and want to control this by limiting the "central expenses".

As discussed above, the Consortium will respond to this concern through a think-piece on the opportunities to limit transaction costs (increase overall system efficiency).

**Decision: *The CB approves the CO Budget Update and supports the request to FC11 for an increased allocation of \$500K as requested by the CO in the CB15 documents.***

#### **d. ICARDA Investment Plan Support: Update on additional allocation (For Approval)**

At CB13 the Board approved support to ICARDA's Decentralization Strategy and Investment Plan on the grounds that it will provide critical and unique contributions to the CRPs. The Board asked ICARDA to specify and justify its investment plans by CRP. At CB14 the CB approved support for ICARDA's Investment Plan at a level of \$4M for 2014 and \$2M for 2015, through the CRPs, and included these elements in the 2014-15 CGIAR Financial Plan.

At CB14 the CO recommended CRP-supported investments worth \$3.6m in 2014 and \$1.8m in 2015 respectively based on the information provided by ICARDA. The CO recommended that the additional \$400K in 2014 and \$200K in 2015 be allocated if and when further satisfactory justification was provided by ICARDA.

Following an additional submission from ICARDA in January 2014, providing additional details concerning about \$1.7m worth of equipment requests, the CO recommends a final additional allocation of \$450K to the genotyping platform in Morocco (\$250K in 2014 and \$200K in 2015) and \$150K to barley work in India (in 2014). This completes the allocation of \$4m in 2014 and \$2m in the CGIAR Financing Plan to support ICARDA's investment plan through the CRPs.

Discussion:

This is the balance of the allocation approved at CB14; not new money.

CB members expressed support for the process followed by the CO. Dr Ait-Kadi, from Morocco, which is a location where the proposed new ICARDA integrated breeding platforms are established, and where the NARS has been much involved in ICARDA's planning, noted that the engagement of the CO in the process was much appreciated and provided significant added value.

CB members also asked after the status of the additional funds ICARDA estimates it needs for its Investment Plan. The CEO responded that the ICARDA DG shared earlier this week that the Arab Fund has made a \$3.5 m grant to support the ICARDA Investment Plan. Together with the \$6m from the CGIAR Fund, this puts a solid foundation under the ICARDA plans (and the ICARDA DG is optimistic that additional funding will be forthcoming from regional donors).

The FC Executive Secretary explained that at the last FC meeting, the FC expressed support for the approach followed by the Consortium. The question was also asked by the FC Chair if that was enough, and encouraged FC members to support ICARDA if they could. Consider it a message of moral support. Some FC members are following up with the FO and ICARDA.

**Decision: *The CB approves the additional allocation to ICARDA's Investment Plan: 1) an additional allocation of \$450K to the genotyping platform in Morocco (\$250K in 2014 and \$200K in 2015); and 2) \$150K to barley work in India (in 2014), completing the \$4m and \$2m allocations in 2014 and 2015, respectively, approved at CB14.***

**e. Audit Oversight Group Terms of Reference (ToRs) (For Approval)**

The ARC Chair introduced Pierre Pradal as the new IAU Director, who presented the various documents on the CB's agenda. The Internal Audit Unit (IAU), as a shared service, reports to each Center's Audit Committee as well as to the CB Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARC). The Audit Oversight Group (AOG) is created to support Centers and the Consortium in exercising a direct and frequent oversight over the IAU. Successive versions of the ToRs have been presented to Centers' Chairs of Audit Committees and CSEs, have all provided feedback and this version incorporates comments received.

Discussion:

The CEO noted that he is very pleased with the progress made on the IAU; the appointment of a strong new Director, hosted at the CO in Montpellier, the establishment of the new AOG; the workplan and Charter on the agenda of the CB today, and the recruitment of new staff for the IAU. Very satisfactory to see the progress to putting a strong new shared service in place in a manner that provides comfort to the Consortium and reasonable independence for the centers.

The Centers' Representative confirmed that the Centers by and large find the new AOG an elegant and balanced solution. It has taken some time to establish, and is possibly a bit innovative in its set up, but it has raised the level of comfort of the Centers with the new solution.

The FC Executive Secretary asked what was meant by the reference in the AOG ToRs by "external review mechanisms", where the Crop Trust is provided as an example. The IAU Director responded that the Crop Trust is not a good example of an external review mechanism, and proposes to remove this from the text.

The IAU Director noted that from his perspective the new AOG arrangement provides the necessary independence for the IAU.

**Decision: *The CB approves the Terms of Reference of the new Audit Oversight Group ToR and appoints Klaus Leisinger as the CB representative to the AOG, and therefore as its Chair.***

**f. 2013 Internal Audit Unit Activities and 2014 Plan for the Consortium (For Approval)**

The IAU Director presented the status of its activities at the end of 2013 and the plan for Consortium related audit activities (i.e. CO audits, CRP audits and system wide audits) for 2014.



2014 is a critical “re-establishment” year for IAU: IAU staffing for management is almost completed. Three strong individuals were recruited as Associate Directors respectively for Africa and Americas, and Head of the Professional Practice Unit (based in Montpellier). These managers, once in place, will be able to select their own teams, which will reduce the current dependency on consultants that did not always provide homogenous quality or CGIAR system knowledge.

Discussion:

CB members asked about the scope of the IAU CRP audits – it should not only look at finances but at management and governance issues as well. The IAU Director confirmed this would be the case.

CB members also cautioned that the expectations for IAU CRP audits should not be too high (we have budgeted \$250K for four CRP audits this year; while the IEA budgets \$400K per CRP review). The IAU Director agreed.

CB members also asked the IAU Director whether he found any surprises when he started in the new position. The IAU Director responded that there are many challenges, but that he was fairly informed by the various stakeholders what these challenges are, and he has not found any surprises beyond those outlined to him before he started.

The Centers’ Representative asked how CRP audits will be performed – will IAU staff undertake the audits, or will audit staff from Lead centers audit the participating Centers? The IAU Director responded that CRP audits will be performed by IAU Staff (possibly supported or complemented by center audit staff where this makes sense).

**Decision: *The CB approves the IAU 2014 audit plan and activities for the Consortium.***

#### **g. Internal Audit Charter (For Approval)**

Internal Audit is required by the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) Standards to have a Charter describing its position, role and responsibilities, rights and duties. Failure to comply with this requirement would prevent the IAU from being able to provide assurance to the Board. The IAU Director has employed an IIA standard Charter to develop the CGIAR Internal Audit Charter.

Discussion: None

**Decision: *The CB approves the Internal Audit Charter***

#### **Updates:**

The ARC Chair introduced the concern raised by IFPRI of CIMMYT’s charging 15% indirect cost (over its HarvestPlus activities in 2013, invoiced to IFPRI) while its audited 2012 indirect costs are only 7%. The CIMMYT response to IFPRI explained that the CIMMYT Board had decided to keep the indirect cost at 15% because CIMMYT needs to build up its reserves (i.e. the indirect cost charges covers more than costs; it provides a surplus to reserves).

The ARC Chair indicated initially that as the new FG5 explicitly indicates centers cannot recoup more than their actual costs through the indirect cost charge, it would have proposed that the Consortium withholds the excess charged by CIMMYT in 2013 from its 2014 W1 contributions. However, as the

ARC has learned that the FC has still not yet approved the new FG5 (submitted to them last October), the situation now is less clear.

The FC Exec Secretary responded that the FG5 had been sent out to FC members for comments, and none were received, but not yet sent out for approval, as the FC governance committee had a query on the consultation process followed by the Consortium to develop the new FG5. This query will be (but has not yet) relayed to the Consortium, so it can respond.

The CEO indicated that we then now have to determine whether the current FG5, that is in force before the new FG5 is formally approved by both CB and FC, is sufficiently clear (as IFPRI believes it is) to determine that CIMMYT cannot charge more than its real cost and whether that means any excess charged needs to be returned (withheld).

The Centers' Representative indicated that until the new FG5 is in effect, in his opinion the situation is ambiguous and the Consortium should not take punitive action. He advocated a collaborative approach through diplomacy.

The CEO responded that he had asked CIMMYT to respond with a formal explanation after IFPRI raised the issue (last December) but that CIMMYT had not responded to this letter. This information will also be shared with the FC (through the preliminary annual report) and we will see what their position is. At the same time, CIMMYT and IFPRI annual reports will be audited by external auditors, which also may give us clarity on whether the external auditors find that the current FG5 is sufficiently clear to provide a basis for a position one way or the other. The Consortium will determine its position once we have this feedback from the FC and the external auditors.

The CB decided not to take any decision at this point in time, but to await the results of the actions outlined by the CEO. In addition, CB Member Martin Kropff will attend the upcoming CIMMYT Board meeting and explore this and other issues with the CIMMYT Board.

## **9. Shared Services**

### **a. Shared Services Strategy (For Approval)**

In December 2012 the CO initiated a "pilot" on Shared Services to explore whether and how Shared Services should become a permanent part of the Consortium's program of work, as foreseen in the Constitution. As part of the preparatory work for the Reform, Accenture carried out a study in 2009 to explore the potential for shared services in the CGIAR system. This study concluded that there is indeed a significant potential – but this had not yet been followed up until this pilot. Enrica Porcari was asked to lead this work for the CO, as head of Shared Services, working with a reference group of center and CRP representatives. Enrica – who also led a small group working on shared ICT and knowledge management for about ten years pre-reform (the CGIAR's ICT-KM program) found that there is a growing appetite among the centers and CRPs. She has developed an overall approach, working with various stakeholders and communities of practice, and carried out specific pilots related to "procurement" and "staff security". She also led a small study to explore the potential for CGIAR hubs in Addis and Dhaka (bringing together collections of small country offices into a shared larger CGIAR office).

Enrica Porcari presented the Shared Service Strategy to the CB. As CGIAR moves towards the next phase of reform it is important to assess how the organization can most effectively manage its growing research portfolio to produce the greatest possible impact on investment – and become

known as an “excellent resource manager”, as Anthony Beattie put it. CGIAR Research Centers face growing pressure to increase performance while meeting exacting donor expectations for transparency and accountability. Resting on 4 pillars of Science, HR, ICT and Finance, the vision of the CGIAR Consortium Shared Services Initiative is one of a sustainable, relevant research organization, attractive to investors, staff and partners and delivering real change integrating operational and science efficiencies across CGIAR Centers. Through shared services we aim at realizing economies of scale and scope towards an efficient and effective organization.

#### Discussion:

CB members asked if the strategy is sufficiently ambitious and whether the cost savings have been estimated. The head of SS responded that currently the shared services conducted through her group are small (turnover of about \$600K in signed contracts and fees for service of about \$150K in 2013) – but the potential for shared purchasing, for example, is an estimated 20% savings on a total spend of about \$250 m per year – or savings of some \$50 m potentially. In terms of rationalizing country offices, the system operates over 260 offices in more than 90 countries – we estimate that single CGIAR offices in each country could save hundreds of positions, tens of millions of dollars – and bring about significant increased effectiveness through improved collaboration across centers and CRPs.

CB members asked if the centers have been involved in setting this agenda. The head of SS answered that they have. Corporate Service Executives were the primary group that was interviewed for, and worked with the 2009 Accenture study, and many of the same individuals were involved in the reference group for this SS pilot. It was the reference group that has identified the opportunities for SS (such as purchasing, and within that, lab equipment, travel and several other priorities). The pilot has explored the potential for “organic” bottom-up shared service development in close collaboration with the centers.

The CEO added that as discussed earlier, there is an opportunity to look at accelerating the shared service approach, to cut transaction costs more quickly – which would probably meet some resistance, but might well be preferable to (and be less disruptive than) “center mergers”. As discussed earlier, the CO will put a think-piece together on the potential for accelerated Shared Services.

The Centers’ Representative supports the SS approach as presented – in fact stated that the Accenture report should have been followed up more quickly. He noted that the document could be strengthened by adding a little more of what has been done in the past, e.g. AIARC, the IAU, CGNET etc. The head of SS agreed and noted that she had worked with Jeff Hungate (the AIARC CEO) and Pierre Pradal (the IAU Director) to prepare this approach and herself has been involved in the CGNET projects for many years.

The ARC Chair asked if there were low hanging fruits. What would it take to quickly consolidate the country offices, for example – if this could be done in a short time and lead to significant results, it may be possible to raise some additional resources to make this happen. The head of SS agreed to explore this in the promised think-piece on accelerated SS – to date the approach has been that the Centers would have to pay for SS – to prove that there is demand (and stop the subsidies the old CGIAR Secretariat used to hand out to promote shared services).

**Decision: The CB approves the approach laid out in the Shared Services Strategy and approves “Shared Services” as a permanent part of the Consortium’s program of work.**

**b. Staff Security Plan (For Discussion)**

**c. Status of Staff Security Accountability Framework (For Discussion)**

The CGIAR Consortium and its members have 10,000 members of staff in 96 countries, 3,000 working in countries without headquarters, and about 1,000 are travelling at any one time. There is variability between Centers in respect of their security preparedness but the main concern is in respect of the non-headquarters and travelling staff. While Centers and Consortium are legally responsible for the safety and security of their respective staff, the responsibility for the global reputation of the CGIAR Consortium rests with the Consortium and the Member Centers jointly. The goal of the CGIAR Consortium Security Management System is to enable the conduct of the activities of the CGIAR Consortium and its members while ensuring the safety and security of its personnel and other designated individuals, and security of its premises and assets. The concept of a Consortium Security Management System has been discussed and reviewed with the Community of Practice of Staff Security focal points from across the Consortium. It is currently being discussed with Directors General and Board Chairs and we aim to reach agreement in time for CB 16 when we will seek Board approval. In the meantime the CO will continue working with the Community of practice, develop a Consortium Staff Security Management System (for CO and Board) and will prepare and monitor implementation of guidelines for the development of Centers Staff Security Management systems.

**Discussion:**

CB Members asked if there is an incident list or register. The Head of SS answered that while some centers have this, it does not yet exist at Consortium level; in fact a first list was put together as part of this Staff Security exercise and it turns out that Centers have indeed faced a long list of serious issues – from kidnappings, terror acts, natural disasters to wholesale relocations due to large conflicts or wars.

CB members asked what is the advice received from the security consultants on the liability of the CB. The CEO and head of SS answered that the advice received is that the CB's duty of care, beyond the immediate care for its own employees, would appear to extend to ensure that there are good staff security policies (a staff security management system) in place, and complied with, in all the centers. If we do that we should not be liable if incidents happen – if we do not do that we may well have some form of liability.

**Decision: The CB endorses the statement that *'The CGIAR Consortium affirms that the safety and security of every staff member and other designated individuals is a primary concern'*.**

**The CB endorses the CO to develop a Security Management System for the CO – and to continue work on the staff security accountability framework.**

**10. Report from PoCCo**

**a. CG Consortium Policy Adoption (For Approval)**

The PoCCo Chair presented the CGIAR Consortium Policy Adoption Process for CB approval (See Background Materials). The proposed process includes four steps: 1) development and consultation; 2) Submission to the CB for approval and Entry into Effect; 3) Submission to CGIAR Consortium Members for endorsement; and 4) Step 4 – Voting and endorsement. This formalizes the policy adoption process described in the memorandum contained in the Good Governance Framework that was approved by the CB and Centers on 13 June 2013. It applies to Consortium policies and

guidelines that are, and that are not, part of the Common Operational Framework (two separate workflows, with and without Center voting to endorse) and sets out a process for Center consultation and endorsement (in addition to CB adoption).

PoCCo members will start working on the work program for the development and revision of COP and CGIAR policies and guidelines once the CGIAR Consortium Policy Adoption Process is approved by the Board. The first draft will be prepared by the CO to be discussed at the next PoCCo meeting. This meeting will be held in a special session in June at Montpellier. The PoCCo's Chair will communicate on this regard.

Discussion:

In addition to the Policy Adoption Process presented here for approval, PoCCo has also identified that it would be helpful if the Centers and Consortium would have more joint statements and messaging at major events. PoCCo offered to help craft such shared messages, which was welcomed by all.

**Decision: *The CB approves the Consortium Policy Adoption process recommended by PoCCo.***

## 11. CGIAR Mid-Term Review

### a. Draft CB Submission to the MTR Panel (For Approval)

CB Member Mohamed Ait-Kadi and the CEO represent the Consortium in the MTR Reference group, together with CIAT DG and IFPRI Board Chair. They presented their feedback from the first MTR Panel meeting in Berlin (as was shared earlier through the shared notes).

The MTR has asked a number of questions that we are working to provide answers for. In addition to some products which could be readily passed on (such as the Globescan CGIAR Stakeholder Perception Survey) the key products in preparation are:

- An "Impact Paper", what work we are most proud of, with assessments of impact and "value for money"; examples of policy engagements; and examples of public-private partnerships. Centers have provided inputs for this paper and it will now be synthesized under Wayne's leadership.
- A note on "sources of funds", particularly bilateral grants (as the data on contributions through the Fund are more readily available); for this the CO has put together a database of all the 2640 bilateral grants reported by the Centers in their annual reports; the conclusions of this analysis are very interesting, and have been discussed with the DGs and will be shared with the MTR. The bottom line is that there is a very long tail of small projects (over 2000 with an average value of \$250K, and an average contract duration of some three years) – and that transaction costs could be much reduced if the Centers were able to increase the grant size (as some Centers are actively promoting) and/or the CGIAR (Fund) developed a cost-effective (low transaction cost) manner of receiving small donations, e.g. through W1 or W2. A Consortium Position Paper – including the Consortium's Vision for the CGIAR in 2019. The CEO prepared a short presentation with Consortium positions and a Consortium vision, which was shared with the DGs and well received, and presented to the CB in the meeting.

Discussion:



The CB discussed various elements of the CEO's presentation and provided feedback on a number of points. By and large the CB felt the presentation was a good basis for the development of the Consortium's Position Paper. The CB requested a substantial improvement in the section about achievements "what we are most proud of". Once developed, this paper will need to be circulated to the Centers for their comments and will then be submitted to the CB for virtual approval.

**Decision: *The CB deferred the approval of the Consortium's Position Paper. The CO will produce draft document based on discussion in CB15, circulate among Centers and submit for virtual approval to the CB.***

## **12. Other Business**

There were two additional issues raised during the CB meeting: the selection process of the New Consortium Board Chair and CIMMYT's policy related to reserves, in general, and overhead charge, in particular. Both matters were discussed by the Board members at in camera session.

**Without other business to discuss, the Fifteenth CGIAR CB Meeting was adjourned.**