

CGIAR Fund Council

July 14 & 16, 2010

Rome, Italy

Meeting Summary



CGIAR Fund Office
August 17, 2010

Opening Session

The CGIAR Fund Council met at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Rome on July 14 and 16, 2010. Fund Council Chair Katherine Sierra opened the meeting, and FAO Deputy Director-General James Butler welcomed the Fund Council to FAO, highlighting the strong relationship between FAO and CGIAR.

Anton Mangstl (FAO) was selected to serve as Co-chair of the meeting.

The draft agenda was adopted with the following additions (see Attachment 1):

1. An item on Fund Office Business Procedures
2. An update on establishment of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement

Issues Arising from Previous Meeting

Fund Council Rules of Procedure

Fund Council adopted as its provisional rules of procedure the revised version of the document (dated February 23, 2010) at its February 2010 meeting. It was agreed that the document would be circulated and if no objections were received, it would be brought to the next meeting for formal adoption.

Fund Council Seat Rotation Plans

As stated in the *Framework for the CGIAR Fund* (approved at December 2009 Business Meeting) regarding Fund Council seats, "Constituencies are free to rotate their seats according to their own rules (which should be shared for information with the Fund Council in the interest of transparency, not decision)." Although discussions on rotation were ongoing as of the meeting, only two constituencies had shared their rotation plans.

Update from interim Independent Science and Partnership Council

At its inaugural meeting in February 2010, Fund Council requested from the iISPC (1) a revised 2010 work plan and budget based on discussion at the meeting to be circulated, and (2) a paper on how future Science Fora will relate to other CGIAR-related meetings/events. These items are forthcoming and will be circulated virtually to the Fund Council.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Fund Council adopted the Provisional Rules of Procedures as its formal Rules of Procedure.*
- *Fund Council constituencies agreed to provide their rotation plans as soon as possible to the Fund Office for circulation to the full Council. Several constituencies indicated they will need more time to finalize rotation plans. (Note: a number of constituency groups shared their rotation plans with the Fund Office at the end of the meeting.)*
- *EIARD informed Fund Council that Switzerland will rotate into the seat currently occupied by Norway at the end of 2010, and discussions are underway on a broader rotation plan.*
- *Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) indicated that the Regional Fora group has agreed that FORAGRO will occupy the seat until the end of 2010, after which rotation will be alphabetical for each term, starting with AARINENA.*

Consortium Update

Consortium Board Chair Carlos Pérez del Castillo updated Fund Council on Consortium activities since February 2010, focusing on six main topics:

1. **Strategy and Results Framework (SRF):** the Consortium Board accepted the current version of the SRF for submission to the Funders Forum (July 15, 2010). The Board recognizes shortcomings in the SRF, and will lead a process to update and revise the document. At the Funders Forum on July 15, 2010, it was agreed that the Consortium would update the SRF for resubmission within six months. It acknowledged the less than optimal process for developing a portfolio of MPs, but considered it important that the CGIAR maintain the momentum by building on what has been produced so far.
2. **Development of Mega Programs (MPs):** Four fast-track MP proposals have been developed (rice, maize, wheat, climate change) and submitted to the Consortium Board. One (Global Rice Science Partnership (GRiSP)) has been finalized and submitted by the Consortium Board to the Fund Council for consideration. The Board has agreed that an additional 11 concept notes will be developed into MP proposals. The Board has also commissioned two scoping studies on gender and crosscutting genetic resources issues.
3. **Consortium interactions with the Fund Council and Trustee:** The Board has interacted with Donors and the Trustee and provided input on various legal documents and will continue discussions until the documents are finalized.
4. **CEO Search and Selection:** A number of candidates have been identified and selection of the CEO has been targeted for early September.
5. **Consortium Location:** Five sites have been shortlisted. Selection of the site is targeted for late August or early September.
6. **International Organization Status:** Legal counsel is assisting the effort to obtain international organization status for the Consortium. The Consortium hopes to secure this status in 3-6 months.

As requested by Fund Council, an interim report on 2010 expenditures was also provided for information.

Discussion:

- The Consortium was commended for the progress achieved to date.
- Revision of the SRF should be accelerated. There is danger in moving ahead with development of MPs without first having a coherent strategy in place. It creates a risk of public perception that nothing has changed, and business as usual.
- Concerns were raised on how to integrate the results of the gender scoping study into MPs already underway.
- The Consortium needs to ensure that concrete stakeholder engagement takes place during development of MPs and that it leads to clear partnerships, including capacity development, with transparent funding flows to understand what is being supported.
- The importance of genetic resources was stressed and Fund Council looks forward to the outcome of the study currently underway.

- More comprehensive information from the Consortium was requested on development of MPs, including name and description of MPs, lead Center/person, meeting dates, etc.
- A concern was raised about Donors being requested to participate in development of MPs, and the impact it may have on Fund Council decision making on MPs. Handling potential conflicts of interest should be agreed upon by Fund Council and the Consortium.
- C. Pérez del Castillo responded to the issues raised. He noted that the Consortium believes waiting for the outcome of the scoping study on gender is important in order to receive specific recommendations. He gave assurance that gender will be integrated into all MPs. The outcome of the study on genetic resources will also help the Consortium determine how to incorporate cross cutting issues and agree on a suitable financing mechanism. Partnerships and capacity development are essential ingredients in development of MPs, and the Consortium agreed there must be a sense of ownership not only among Centers, but partners too. The Consortium will provide more information on MP development, including objectives, lead Centers, stakeholders, consultation meetings, etc. The Consortium welcomes donor participation in the MP stakeholder meetings and consultations, and does not see a conflict of interest for its part. Any conflict of interest seen from the Funders side should be a matter for the Fund Council to consider.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Fund Council thanked the Consortium Board for its work over the past several months and acknowledged its robust work program.*
- *The interim report on 2010 expenditures was acknowledged, and no further action on this report from the Board is required.*
- *Strategy and Results Framework (SRF): Following discussion and decision on the SRF at the Funders Forum, Fund Council would like to see a fast-tracked revision that takes into account the comments made at these meetings on issues that need to be addressed or improved.*
- *Development of Mega Programs (MPs): Fund Council agreed that the fast-tracked MPs should continue to be developed in parallel with revision of the SRF. Fund Council requested the Consortium to provide information on MP development, including (i) a descriptive list of MPs, (ii) lead Center/person for each MP, (iii) timeline on dates for planning meetings and other milestones.*
- *Conflict of interest:*
 1. *The Consortium welcomes Donor participation during development of MP proposals. The Consortium will provide relevant information to the Fund Council representative to the Consortium Board for distribution to the full Fund Council to ensure transparency and opportunity for engagement. Fund Council members should forward this information to their constituents.*
 2. *Fund Council members who attend meetings related to development of a MP, or provide comments on a MP, should make clear to the proponents that their input does not imply endorsement of the MP, but rather as a way to add value to the process.*
- *Gender: Fund Council reiterated the importance of gender and the need for the outcomes of the scoping study on gender to be retrofitted into MPs already approved and under implementation.*

- *Partnerships: Consortium should ensure that partnerships in MPs, including capacity development, are concrete and include best practice.*
- *Genetic resources: Fund Council was pleased at the Consortium's focus on genetic resources and would like to see a clear policy emerge soon.*

Outstanding Business Issues Related to CGIAR Fund Establishment Documents

Draft versions of the CGIAR Fund Governance Framework and Form of Contribution Agreement were tabled for discussion. The documents will be further revised and submitted to Fund Council for virtual approval following the meeting.

The Consortium suggested that an overarching legal document, or “chapeau”, also be developed. It would tie all the other legal documents together, and underline the joint responsibilities of the new CGIAR.

Following the discussion, Fund Council Executive Secretary Ren Wang also highlighted the sections that will likely be included in a Common Operational Framework, which would serve as a policies and procedure manual to operationalize the various legal agreements.

Discussion:

- Detailed notes of the discussion will be provided to the document authors to incorporate the issues raised by Fund Council members. A summary of the discussion follows.
- Differing views were expressed on the future of Window 3. The original intent for Window 3 was for it to be a transitional funding mechanism and that a date for its closure would be set after a review in two years. Some members agreed with the original intent, while others stated it should be reviewed but not necessarily closed in order to retain flexibility.
- It was suggested that only contributions to Windows 1 and 2 should qualify for Fund Council membership eligibility, since Fund Council does not have oversight authority over Window 3 funds.
- To maintain an overview of all funds that flow through the Fund, it was suggested that the Trustee provide a periodic report on funds channeled through Window 3, and the Consortium a similar report on the use of those funds.
- Funding to Window 2 should allow targeting funds to specific components of a MP, and regular reporting from the MP would include the amount of funding provided to each of the MP components. Special sub-accounts and reporting would not be needed, but rather the ability to indicate where funds should be used and reporting to show that the funds were used as agreed.
- Language on funding “other proposals” should be maintained to provide flexibility, but “blue sky” research should be embedded in MPs.
- All System costs, including Consortium costs, should be included in the cost sharing formula at the System level.
- There was general support to explore a chapeau, as suggested by the Consortium. However, the need for the Contribution Agreement to remain the controlling legal document at the top of the hierarchy was stressed.
- Concern was raised that the GCARD process isn't more prominently included in the Governance Framework document.

- The issue of full cost recovery was reiterated, noting that all funds (Fund and bilateral) should pay for Fund and System costs.
- While reiterating their support to the CGIAR, some members highlighted the difficulty they would have to join the Fund under the current provisions in the various documents. Further legal discussions will need to take place in order to resolve remaining issues.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The Governance Framework and Contribution Agreement will be revised, taking into account comments and issues raised by Fund Council members.*
- *Fund Council agreed to the Consortium's suggestion to develop an overarching legal document, or "chapeau", which will be explored over the next 5-6 weeks. However, if a chapeau cannot be agreed in this timeframe (i.e., by the week of August 23, 2010), the Governance Framework and Contribution Agreement will move forward as standalone pieces in order to not delay establishment of the Fund, and be sent to Fund Council for virtual approval. Donors who wish to participate in the discussion on a chapeau should indicate their interest to the Fund Office.*
- *The "chapeau" would be a short and sharp, general document and build on the CGIAR Joint Declaration (approved at the December 2009 Business Meeting). The Contribution Agreement would take legal precedence over all other documents and continue to control the flow of funds. All documents would recognize this point.*
- *A specific and concise statement on GCARD will be provided by GFAR for inclusion in the chapeau or Governance Framework.*
- *The current wording on the future of Window 3 (i.e. a shift from closure of the Window to a neutral "review" after a two-year period) will remain. However, the original intent was for Window 3 to be a transitional window, and for it to be closed once MP funding via Windows 1 and 2 had stabilized. Given this background, at the time of the review of Window 3 after a two-year period, the burden of proof will be on why the window shouldn't close, as opposed to keeping it open.*
- *Prior to the review of Window 3, all funds channeled through Windows 1, 2 and 3, will count toward Fund Council membership eligibility (minimum \$500,000 per year contribution). Following the review of Window 3, the issue of membership eligibility will be revisited by the Fund Council. Any decisions on eligibility will be taken prior to the end of the current term in time for formulation of the next Fund Council. Fund Council has no fiduciary oversight of Window 3 funds, but has an interest on the use of those funds channeled through the Window. To provide transparency, Fund Council therefore requested the Trustee to provide a report every six months on the amount of funds that are channeled through Window 3, and a separate report (also every six months) from the Consortium on use of the funds.*
- *In order to accommodate Donors that wish to provide funding through Window 2 for specific components of a Mega Program, Donors could specify their funding preferences in the contribution agreements, and MPs would contain sufficient granularity in their proposals and reporting. There will be no tracking of funds through Window 2 below the level of a Mega Program, but information would be provided on the funding of MP components.*
- *Donors that may have difficulty joining the Fund as currently envisioned, will have side discussions with the trustee to resolve their outstanding issues.*

Fund Office Business Procedures

This item was added to the agenda to highlight the need for the Fund Office to serve all Donors openly and transparently, as it is jointly supported and owned by all Donors. Some of the issues raised included requests for:

- Transparency of all invitees and participants to teleconferences and clarity on their roles,
- Balance in preparing summaries of teleconferences,
- Mechanisms that allow Fund Council members to communicate with each other, and that allow responses to communications be made public to all who were addressed in the original communication.

Discussion:

- The Chair requested members to provide feedback and suggestions, and suggested that an electronic chat be considered to discuss these issues.
- Preparation of summaries of teleconferences could be distributed in draft for a set number of days before being finalized to give participants a chance to make any corrections.
- Information sharing protocols should be explored, as Donors and others may wish for some information to be shared more widely (or not) than others.
- Transition from the CGIAR Secretariat to Fund Office presents an opportunity to ensure appropriate expertise in needed areas.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The Fund Office should serve the full Fund Council in a transparent and responsive manner.*
- *Fund Council members were requested to provide feedback and suggestions on ways to improve.*
- *The Fund Office should subject itself to periodic evaluation (e.g. 360 degree review, surveys).*
- *The Fund Office will take on comments on handling of summaries, and also explore protocols on information sharing.*
- *The report of a review of the staffing and resource needs on the Fund Office, commissioned by the Chair, will be shared with Fund Council.*

Mega Program Proposal Assessment Process and Criteria

R. Wang introduced the item and provided a brief overview of the paper provided for discussion. Fund Council was requested to provide feedback, including on whether a single or multiple sets of criteria should be developed for MP assessment by the Consortium, ISPC, and Fund Council.

Discussion:

- iISPC noted the importance of establishing appropriate assessment criteria that are few in number, clearly understood, simple and measurable. This will facilitate assessment of MP proposals. A single set of criteria should be agreed to enable the System to work together and deliver results.
- The Consortium concurred that a common set of criteria would facilitate efficient assessment of MP proposals. In line with simplifying criteria, it would also like to see a shift to simplification of the external review process, so that MP proposals would not have to undergo multiple external reviews by the Consortium and ISPC.

- A single set of criteria makes sense. It was understood that different bodies assessing MP proposals would place different weight on various criteria.
- Support was also expressed for a unified external review of MP proposals, but with safeguards in place to maintain the independence of ISPC.
- The SRF, use of evidence base, and identification of impact pathways are all essential elements needed for assessment of MP proposals to be carried out.
- A checklist of information to be included with MP proposals should also be developed.
- Specific efforts should be made to learn from each MP and build these lessons into subsequent proposals.
- A rigorous and systematic process is required to capture and harness synergies between MPs.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Fund Council requested iISPC to take the lead and work with the Consortium and Fund Office to develop a single common set of criteria that is clear and well understood for use by the Consortium, ISPC and Fund Council to assess Mega Program proposals. The criteria will be submitted to Fund Council for virtual approval, and should also include a checklist of documents and other information that are needed in MP proposals.*
- *It was understood that a single set of criteria means that each body that assesses a MP proposal may give different weight to different criteria. Fund Council has the final decision making authority on approval of Mega Programs.*
- *Fund Council agreed that external peer reviews of MP proposals by the Consortium and ISPC should be combined, but done in a way to avoid any conflict of interest. ISPC was asked to develop a one-page note on how this would be done (with input from the Consortium) and maintain its own independence. The note should also include a dispute resolution clause in case, for example, a review is not positive and the proposal may need to be redone.*
- *Although peer review documents do not need to be shared, the names of individual peer reviewers will be made public for the sake of transparency. (The decision to make names of individual peer reviewers was subsequently overturned in a virtual decision by Fund Council on September 15, 2010. Names of individual will NOT be made public.)*
- *The Fund Office was asked to develop steps and a timeline on funding individual MPs, following their approval by Fund Council.*

Establishment of Independent Evaluation Arrangement

Catherine Coleman (Canada), member of the Fund Council Search and Selection Committee for establishment of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA), updated Fund Council on its activities and search for a senior evaluator to design the IEA. The committee reviewed the terms of reference for the senior evaluator, and suggested the following changes: 1) shortening the length of time of the assignment from 18 to 12 months, and 2) hiring a second person with different skills to help in the design. There would not be a budgetary impact due to the shortened timeframe.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Fund Council agreed to shorten the timeline for design of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) from 18 months to 12 months. It also agreed that a second person should be hired to help design the IEA.*

Mega Program Proposals

The Global Rice Science Partnership (GRiSP) proposal was submitted to Fund Council by the Consortium Board for preliminary discussion only (not decision). IRRI Director General Robert Zeigler and Deputy Director General Achim Dobermann presented the proposal.

iISPC provided preliminary comments on the proposal, which will be circulated to Fund Council Members. Full comments will be available in September.

A timeline for handling the GRiSP proposal and other fast-tracked MP proposals is included in the Conclusion and Decisions for this item below.

Discussion:

- Detailed notes of the discussion will be provided to the MP proponents. A summary of the discussion follows.
- General support was expressed for the overall approach, scope and objectives of the GRiSP proposal.
- Fund Council expressed appreciation to the iISPC for its comments on the MP proposal and commended the quick turnaround and comprehensive preliminary assessment. It looks forward to the full iISPC commentary/assessment following the external peer review of the proposal. Fund Council also reiterated the importance of receiving independent scientific advice and commended the positive relationship that iISPC and the Consortium Board has established.
- Several members noted that they will provide more detailed comments as agreed in the timeline below.
- Establishing milestones will be important, particularly SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) indicators that link to the goals of the SRF.
- Concern was expressed about the budget level requested in the proposal, and the disagreement of the proponents to take on the Consortium Board's advice to include different funding scenarios and priority ranking of activities. These should be included.
- Genebank costs should be listed separately.
- Lighter governance arrangements should be explored and the addition of new layers avoided.
- It was suggested that the lead Center provide overall program leadership (Program Director position), rather than creating new positions with potentially confounding authorities.
- The proposals should take a systems approach to rice to ensure all important aspects are included, e.g. genomics, production, post-harvest, link to other commodities, sustainability, etc.
- Gender and partnerships (with increased funds going to gender components and partners) should be refined and strengthened.
- Link to climate change and environmental impact assessment should be made more explicit.
- Reduction of hunger and poverty (as measured by the MDG1 indicators, including child nutrition) and impact pathways to achieve those goals need to be sharpened.

- A shorter marketing piece should be developed that explains the GRiSP clearly and concisely. It should also emphasize what is different and new.
- The Consortium highlighted the need for more detailed funding information from Donors in order to move forward with MPs.
- R. Zeigler responded to some of the issues raised. He noted that the budget in the proposal was developed through a bottom-up process based on solid data and analyses, and indications of support from donors outside the Fund. However, he agreed on the need for prioritization and development of different budget scenarios.
- There is a desire for the Mega Program proposal on climate change to be finalized so that it may be discussed at the next Fund Council meeting. The Consortium Board Chair advised that the climate change proposal had been returned to the proponents for further revisions.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Recognizing that there was not enough time in advance of the meeting to fully review and make a decision on the Global Rice Science Partnership (GRiSP) proposal, Fund Council gave preliminary advice to the proponents and the Consortium Board, and developed a timetable for progressing the proposal (see below).*
- *Fund Council expressed appreciation to the proponents for being the first group to submit a MP proposal, and also provided validation for the proposal's objectives, scope and approaches, and was pleased to see signs of the new CGIAR in it.*
- *The discussion indicated several improvements that are needed to the GRiSP proposal (e.g. results agenda, impact pathways, budget scenarios with different funding levels, environment, gender, a marketing piece, etc.) which the proponents will take into account in a revised proposal. Fund Council looks forward to a strong proposal.*
- *Fund Council members agreed to provide information on funding before revision of the proposal, so that the budget envelope for all MPs can be better understood and facilitate decision making by the Consortium Board. The Fund Office will conduct a survey of Donors for this information to be provided by August 2, 2010. Fund Council expected that the Consortium Board would then work with the GRiSP proponents to develop the program consistent with a realistic budget. Fund Council noted that GRiSP should not fundraise beyond this level with CGIAR Fund Donors outside the Fund Council processes. Nonetheless, fund raising with non-traditional donors could be envisaged, as long as the strategic alignment and agreed cost recovery principles are followed.*
- *With the timeline established, Fund Council was pleased that the GRiSP proposal can be showcased at the International Rice Congress (November 9, 2010). Recognizing its responsibility to ensure high quality, Fund Council encouraged the Consortium Board to finalize the Mega Program proposal on climate change so that it can be discussed at the November 2010 Fund Council Meeting, prior to the 2010 United Nations Climate Change Conference in late November/early December.*
- *Final approval of MPs will be subject to eventual approval of the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF); if donors wish to fund activities in MPs prior to SRF approval, existing disbursement mechanisms may be used until the SRF is approved.*
- *Agreed timetable:*
 - *July 23: preliminary iISPC comments on GRiSP*

- *August 9: Fund Council to provide preliminary comments on GRiSP*
- *August 23-28: Meeting of GRiSP proponents and stakeholders at IRRI*
- *September 9-10: iISPC meeting at IRRI*
- *September 13: Final GRiSP proposal due to Consortium Board*
- *September 13: Formal iISPC comments on GRiSP provided to the Fund Council*
- *September 15: Fund Council to receive final GRiSP proposal*
- *November 1-2: Fund Council meeting in Washington, DC*
- *November 9-11: International Rice Congress in Hanoi, Vietnam*

2011 Program Budget

The Consortium prepared the CGIAR Financing Status Overview for 2011 and presented on this item at the Funders Forum on July 15, 2010. It reiterated its concerns on liquidity gaps emerging at the Centers due to the delay of Donor confirmation of pledges and disbursement of 2010 funding, and the urgent need for more detailed funding information for planning purposes.

Discussion:

- Donors agreed to provide information on funding as soon as possible to facilitate Consortium planning.
- Donors will endeavor to disburse funds as quickly as possible to avoid disruption to Center activities and provide as much flexibility as possible. Guidance from the Consortium and Fund Office will be important.
- Several Donors announced increases in funding, but noted that it will take time to be fully approved and disbursed.
- More information from the Consortium was requested to better understand actual funding gaps.
- Concern was expressed about the future of the Gender and Diversity program in the CGIAR, which manages AWARD. The CGIAR has a need for a corporate capacity in gender and diversity staffing. The Consortium provided assurance that AWARD will continue, but it will be the CEO's decision where and in what form.
- The future of the Challenge Programs was raised and information provided by the Consortium. In particular, the Consortium confirmed that the Generation Challenge Program will be continued up to its foreseen termination.
- Funding System costs was raised, and the Option 2 (flat rate levy on all funds) endorsed at the Funders Forum was confirmed, subject to a legal check by some donors.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Fund Council affirmed the need to provide assurance during the transition and to maintain funding stability. Several members indicated flexible use of funds in the coming months in order to resolve current funding issues. This positive outlook was tempered, however, by political and financial realities of uncertainty in Donor Countries, budget cuts, slower disbursements, etc.*
- *Fund Council will work closely with the Consortium Board to understand Center issues and find solutions if a Center is in distress. Fund Council members agreed to provide future funding information with as much granularity as possible as requested by the Consortium, especially for*

2010 and 2011, and to the extent possible for 2012 and 2013. The Fund Office will conduct a survey of Donors.

- Fund Council welcomed clarity from Consortium on two of the Challenge Programs (CPs), and indicated the need for the Consortium to decide how the full portfolio of CPs will fit into the new research agenda.
- Fund Council stressed the importance of resourcing other programs and System Office services (e.g., Gender and Diversity Program, AWARD, Internal Audit Unit, ICT-KM, etc.) and was encouraged that the Consortium Board is focusing on these as well. The CEO will make decisions when s/he is in place. Fund Council stressed the need for the CGIAR to maintain its focus on gender while awaiting recommendations from the gender scoping study.
- System Costs: the Chair reiterated that the numbers in the Fund Office draft paper on financing System costs are “soft” and illustrations only. Each unit will build a budget that will be submitted to Fund Council for review and approval. The budget for the Trustee would be circulated in July for virtual approval.
- Fund and System cost sharing: Option 2 (flat rate levy on all funds, including bilateral), the option endorsed at the Funders Forum, was confirmed by Fund Council, subject to a legal review [by some donors] to ensure it doesn’t hinder bringing in donors because of the way that overheads are handled.
- Fund Council agreed that an external expert review of GCARD be conducted to help facilitate decision making by Fund Council. The review should especially assess the GCARD contribution to CGIAR priority setting.

Appointment of New CGIAR Fund Council Chair

Note: This item was conducted in closed executive session.

In line with Fund Council Rules of Procedure, the World Bank President nominated Inger Andersen to serve as the new CGIAR Fund Council Chair. Following her introduction at the meeting, a motion was made to support the nomination and seconded. The motion was approved and the appointment made.

Following her appointment, she thanked Fund Council members for their confidence in her and pledged to serve in an open and transparent manner. Recognizing CGIAR’s journey through the change process, she looks forward to taking on the remaining challenges and working with Fund Council, the Consortium and ISPC.

Decision:

- Fund Council supported the nomination of Inger Andersen, and appointed her as CGIAR Fund Council Chair. Her term would begin at the end of the July 14 & 16, 2010, Fund Council meeting.

Other Business

Appointment of New Fund Council Executive Secretary

R. Wang formally informed Fund Council that he will be leaving the CGIAR at the end of September. K. Sierra thanked him for his service to the CGIAR and hard work during the change management process. She proposed that a more formal farewell celebration be held later in the year.

The Chair outlined the process for appointment of the new Fund Council Executive Secretary:

- 1) Develop terms of reference and circulate to Fund Council to ensure it meets its expectations,
- 2) Advertise the position and request Fund Council members to help circulate the advertisement,
- 3) Establish short listing and interview panel that includes three Fund Council members,
- 4) Short list to be approved by the World Bank Vice President (Inger Andersen),
- 5) Interview short-listed candidates and panel to make recommendations,
- 6) Selection and appointment by the World Bank.

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *Fund Council agreed to the appointment process outlined above.*
- *Three Fund Council members will serve on the short listing and interview panel—one each from the South, North, and Multilateral/Global Institutions/Foundations groups. Each group will provide the name of their representative to the Fund Office by July 23, 2010.*

Closing

K. Sierra closed the meeting by thanking the Fund Council for the opportunity and privilege to serve as its Chair. She also thanked FAO for hosting the meeting and the support received from staff. She concluded by expressing appreciation to Fund Council members, Consortium, iISPC, Trustee, and to the Fund Office and other System Office Units for the support they have provided during the transition. Fund Council members recognized K. Sierra's enormous contributions to the reform of the CGIAR and wished her every success in her new endeavors.

Agenda

Opening Session

Issues arising from previous meeting

- Provisional Fund Council Rules of Procedure
- Fund Council Seat Rotation Plan
- Update from interim Independent Science and Partnership Council

Consortium Update

- Status on establishment of Consortium
- Interim report on 2010 expenditures

Outstanding business issues related to CGIAR Fund establishment documents

- Governance Framework
- Contribution Agreement

Fund Office Business Procedures

Mega Program proposal assessment process and criteria

Establishment of Independent Evaluation Arrangement

Mega Program Proposals

- Introduction (Consortium)
- Interim comments by iISPC on key issues

2011 Program Budget

Appointment of New CGIAR Fund Council Chair

Other business

- Appointment of New Fund Council Executive Secretary

Closing Session