CGIAR
Science for a food-secure future

CO-CHAIRS SUMMARY
Inaugural General Assembly of the Centers
24 and 25 January 2017, London, UK

Purpose:

This document captures a high-level summary of the key conversations during the Inaugural General Assembly of the Centers, highlighting the main principles agreed to help guide ongoing collaboration of the Centers over the 2017 calendar year. Where the General Assembly needed to take key decisions, the results are outlined as decision points (and set out for ease of reference in Appendix 1). While the summary also aims to indicate key items raised during the meeting, it does not provide a verbatim record of what resulted in being a very collaborative meeting with strong, robust inputs from all.

Meeting Co-Chairs:

- **Bruce Coulman**, 2016 Convener CGIAR Center Board of Trustee Chairs
- **Martin Kropff**, 2016 Convener of CGIAR Center Directors General

Prepared by: System Management Office under the direction of the Co-Chairs.

Distribution notice: This document may be circulated without restriction.

Summary Overview:

Contents

Additional Elements

In addition to the main body of this Co-Chairs' summary capturing the overarching principles and themes discussed during the meeting itself, the following Appendices provide additional information on:

- **Appendix 1** – Formal Decisions taken as the General Assembly of Centers
- **Appendix 2** – Register of Agreed Actions, *provided as a separate document*, and serving as an internal working document that can be used in the time leading up to and at the next General Assembly of Centers meeting, discussed at agenda 11 below.
- **Appendix 3** – A listing of '*CGIAR Communities of Practice'* and other collaboration networks within the CGIAR System, providing visibility of where engagement is also occurring outside of the General Assembly.
- **Appendix 4 –** A summary of the AIARC session, serving as the annual general meeting for the purposes of AIARC's reporting responsibilities to the 15 CGIAR Centers

Participants are listed in **Appendix 5**, with great appreciation for all that Center teams and the System Management Office did to help ensure almost full attendance. Appreciation is also expressed to those attending as a delegate of a Board of Trustee Chair or Director General, thus enabling the views of all Centers to be shared.

Agenda item 1: Opening

1.   The meeting was opened by the two Co-Chairs, and the Agenda was proposed and formally adopted.

2.   Noting that the General Assembly was created as part of the revised CGIAR governance structure that came into being on 1 July 2016, members were pointed to the description of its functions in Articles 5.3 to 5.7 of the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization.

3.   With the broad definition that *"The General Assembly of Centers shall be a forum for Centers to discuss issues related to the **CGIAR System** and the **CGIAR System Organization"** (Charter, Article 5.3) it was suggested that this provides a great opportunity for the Centers to collaborate with each other and provide collective guidance to the various entities of the CGIAR System.

4.   A working document of the System that sets out the differing roles of the System Council, the System Management Board and the System Management Office, was also available to the meeting, having been provided in advance.

Agenda item 2: Updating ourselves

5.   With appreciation for all of the work that has been undertaken to date, the meeting heard highlights from the four System Management Board meetings held between July and 31 December 2016, and three System Council meetings held over the same period, with meeting materials, Chair Summaries, and formal Meeting Summaries accessible here: http://www.cgiar.org/about-us/our-governance/

6.   The status of deliberations of the SMB's seven *adhoc* working groups was also discussed based on a presentation by the Chairs of the respective Working Groups, or a nominated delegate: http://www.cgiar.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/2.-Update-SMB-Adhoc-WorkingGroups.pdf

7.   *Key principles arising from the update session* included:

   a.   **Ongoing support for a 'Chair's Summary' to be issued as soon as possible after each SMB meeting** (taking note that meeting summaries can take some weeks to prepare), together with update calls scheduled to discuss the Chair's Summary soon after the meeting itself (and the same for System Council meetings to the extent possible);[1]

---

[1] It was noted that such calls may be sufficient in the place of the former monthly Board Chairs and Directors General calls. At a maximum, such calls should be each two-months, but flexibility to hold a special purpose call when circumstances require.

b. **Recognition of the importance of the SMB declaration of interests processes announced as a decision by the SMB at its 4th meeting in December 2016,** and a request for the practical application of that process as soon as possible; and

c. **Strong support for finding effective ways to involve the voices of the Centers in materials that come before the SMB for decision.** Whilst recognizing that the SMB's formation of 7 ad-hoc working groups was a short-term solution to move quickly from the former system to the new governance model in July 2016, meeting participants were appreciative of the inclusive nature of adhoc working group processes across almost all of the Centers. As the SMB forms its second standing committee (the Strategic Impact, Monitoring and Evaluation Committee), and continues to work with its existing Audit and Risk Committee, the General Assembly emphasized the benefits of the SMB adopting working practices that provide the opportunity for Centers to be able to feed into discussions of the SMB's Standing Committees before formal proposals come up to the SMB.

Agenda item 3: Strengthening System-level resource mobilization

8. Benefiting from high-level introductory remarks from Tony Simons, the meeting formed a series of adhoc groups to consider opportunities and challenges with regard to strengthening System-level CGIAR funding, including the practicalities and modalities of approaching and securing new funding from innovative sources.

9. With more specific initiatives/items to follow up on listed in Appendix 2 (agreed actions from the meeting), some of the *high-level principles arising from the group work included*:

a. **A strong CGIAR narrative, brand and marketing approach that can communicate the value of CGIAR research and the impact it can contribute to in a more compelling way is vital for better positioning CGIAR for funding opportunities and as a valued partner**. Recognizing that representing a System requires a focus on how the CGIAR System is greater than the sum of its parts, any exercise undertaken to develop a more compelling CGIAR System narrative and strengthen the CGIAR brand needs to consider the counter-factual situation of what would be lost or not available if the CGIAR System did not exist.

b. **CGIAR needs to explore a greater diversity of funding opportunities through a focus on engaging with new funders, including in partnership with key Foundations**. Participants also highlighted the benefits of exploring how innovative financing mechanisms may offer an opportunity for increased predictability, with the suggestion being made that CGIAR should take steps to familiarize itself with the range of potential innovative financing instruments, given the breadth of potential tools now available.

c. **Strong, more temporal funder intelligence is an essential requirement for enhanced engagement with CGIAR's funders.** Improved due diligence as well

as the mapping of funders to parts of the CGIAR System which match the priorities and strategies of those funders was identified as important. Such an exercise was also identified as a means of CGIAR ensuring that it is meeting donor expectations in a proactive, measurable way.

d. **CGIAR needs to be more strategic in its engagement with Countries, particularly emerging economies and developing Countries.** It was suggested that this could be done through better acknowledgement of their current contributions to the System; recognition of the range of future contributions they could make; engaging with a broader set of influential actors in the country beyond Ministries of Agriculture; and finding more effective ways for emerging economies and developing countries to play a meaningful role in CGIAR governance.

Agenda item 4: Thinking as a System

10. The session was framed by a reminder that the transition to the new governance arrangements only occurred in July 2016, and that in the 6 months that has passed, everyone has been working very hard to make the reformed System work. It was pointed out that there are a number of clear champions of the CGIAR System, and growing recognition from the System Council of the capacity of the System Management Board to deliver on its role, and when required, take tough decisions.

11. By way of illustration of the new energy around CGIAR as a System, the Co-Chairs shared an extract of the remarks made by Dr. Juergen Voegele, Chair of the System Council during the joint CGIAR and CIMMYT 50 Years celebration in Mexico in September 2016. Highlighted through a small compilation of video clips, the General Assembly was reminded that *"we have to find a way to get our narrative to a point where the world will look to us as an institution and say this is where we're going to bet the money. If anyone can do it, it's the people in this room and it's the people of CGIAR."[2]*

12. Challenging themselves to ask whether CGIAR was now operating as a more effective System, General Assembly participants identified areas of real progress, while highlighting areas for further improvement together with the concrete ways in which they could contribute to these needs.

13. Key principles arising from the conversation included:

a. **A pressing need for CGIAR to be better able to articulate and communicate CGIAR's comparative advantage and the value it offers through a more compelling narrative and clearer branding**. It was agreed that a narrative for the system as a whole will need to be able to frame what all the parts of the

---

[2] The associated press release, made at the time of the System Council's approval of the program elements of the new 2017 – 2022 CGIAR Portfolio is accessible here: http://www.cimmyt.org/press_release/cgiar-system-retools-to-fight-hunger-and-climate-change/

System together offer in light of the world's current grand challenges and the expected impact that CGIAR can contribute to.

b. **Improving the performance of the system needs to involve careful consideration and collective action** on key areas of priority setting, monitoring and evaluation, and impact assessment.

c. **Collaboration in the implementation of the new 2017 – 2022 CGIAR Portfolio is essential for successful delivery against the 2022 intermediate targets**. The System should be continually exploring and implementing approaches in which entities across the System can better collaborate with each other and with Partners, all the while focusing on outputs, outcomes and potential impacts, and ensuring efficiency in our actions.

d. **A strongly held view was that greater direct engagement between the System Council and the Centers will create opportunities for a meaningful dialogue with funders on impact,** as well as being able to provide funders with an increased opportunity to see the realities of CGIAR's strengths first hand. Meeting participants thought one of the most effective ways to deliver on this principle was to hold all System Council meetings at a CGIAR Center, and suggested this be immediately put forward for consideration.

e. **There is an urgent need to find effective and efficient ways to support renewal of infrastructure across the System**, which may be better achieved through a collective approach.

Agenda item 5: Ideas sharing space

14. Recognizing the inevitability of new strategic issues arising for consideration in 2017 beyond those that are already on people's radar, this session allowed participants to put forward subjects and ideas for future action or discussion. <u>Observations made during the session included</u>:

a. **The framing of a strong 'value for money proposition' for CGIAR could be extremely valuable –** with the need first to find agreement on the definition of 'value for money' and then identify appropriate criteria for that value to be measured. Meeting participants supported the idea of drawing on earlier draft materials, without being limited by that work.

b. **The need for the governance arrangements of the CGIAR Research Programs to be brought into line with the July 2016 governance reforms.** Meeting participants noted that whilst the roles and functions of the SMB, System Management Office and System Council were now more clearly defined, there was considerable confusion, and thus operational risk, in terms of the multiple views across the System on where oversight responsibilities rested in respect of the CRPs. Taking note that the SMB's 2017 work plan will include a review of CRP governance arrangements, meeting participants emphasized the need for that review to also consider the ongoing role of Independent Steering Committees, to better reflect the advisory nature of those groups, and the fiduciary responsibilities carried by the Lead Center.

c. **While capacity development is well embedded in each CGIAR Research Program and many CGIAR Centers, opportunities should be found to improve the coherence and scale of impact of CGIAR capacity development efforts.** One proposal was to ensure appropriate membership and leadership of the existing community of practice on capacity development, perhaps through a strengthened mandate.

d. **There would be benefit in additional clarity being obtained around which Center activities do not fall within the definition of 'CGIAR Research',** thus facilitating Center participation in new non-science research initiatives without the pressure that such actions will be caught up in the cost sharing policy and its procedures.

Agenda item 6: Improving system-level financing modalities

15. This session sought to collect ideas to contribute to a planned May 2017 System Council strategic conversation on improving financing and financing modalities for the System against the background of:

   a. A number of fundamental questions now arising in respect of whether the 'Windows' funding mechanism can provide sufficient predictable and sustainable resources to deliver on the research agenda in the System Council approved 2017 – 2022 CGIAR Portfolio; and

   b. CGIAR System Organization's Executive Director, Elwyn Grainger-Jones, having been asked by the System Council to prepare a discussion paper for that May 2017 conversation.

16. Making use of smaller groups to discuss the details of the various challenges now before the System, in the plenary report back the <u>following key principles arose</u>:

   a. **Genetic resources, including genebanks, are an important asset of the CGIAR system which need to be supported in a way that ensures that they can continue to provide value to the whole CGIAR and the world.** However, while there is a value to the whole CGIAR System, more careful consideration needs to be undertaken on the exact modality for funding genetic resources, and particularly the genebanks, taking into account that not all Centers and programs manage a collection or make direct use of genetic resources in their work.

   b. **A more effective funding model for CGIAR System entities should focus on which governing body has jurisdiction over the particular entities' activities and budgets**. One specific proposal tabled for consideration as the paper for the System Council's May 2017 meeting starts to take shape, is whether funding for the ISPC, IEA and trustee, and a proportion of the CGIAR System Internal Audit Function arrangements (once agreed) and System Management Office's costs, could be paid from a contribution from all of the System Council's voting members (thus addressing the "free riding" issue that

Window 1 funders are particularly concerned about), and that the Centers should be funding, through a mechanism they agree, the Centers' proportional costs of the System Management Office's operations dedicated to the Centers, and for the SMB and the work of its committees.

c. **Stability and predictability of funding are key pillars in supporting effective program planning and implementation, and should be reflected in both the development of annual financing plans and the actual allocation of funds received**. Recognizing that the final decision on the 2017 Portfolio Financial Plan ('FinPlan') will need to be taken by the SMB, the General Assembly proposed that any methodology developed to guide the disbursements of Window 1 and Window 2 to balance funds received against what was budgeted, would benefit from significant advance consultation with the Centers.

Agenda item 7: Starting to frame a system-level statement on risk appetite

17. Noting that the revised governing documents envisage the System Council's approval of a 'risk management framework of the CGIAR System' as recommended by the SMB (Charter, Article 8.1), this session provided an opportunity for the General Assembly to provide some early reflections on risks that need to be considered from a System perspective when developing the relevant risk management framework.

18. By design, input generated from the General Assembly was framed in a way that it could be shared as a 'thought piece' to feed into discussions during the inaugural meeting of CGIAR's Center Audit Committee Chairs (or their respective Audit/Finance committee delegates) on 31 January 2017.

19. Guided by the principle that Center-specific risks must be overseen and managed by individual Center Boards and management, once consolidated from the inputs of the small group conversations, the plenary session saw the Centers put forward an initial list of 17 non-prioritized, non-categorized (and not necessarily final or exhaustive) risks for the System to consider as it set out about to develop a risk management framework of the CGIAR System.

20. <u>That early list of non-ranked risks to consider comprised:</u>

a. **Security of our personnel** – political instability, personnel security given the very challenging areas in which we work
b. **Scientific fraud** – Centers are the best placed to prevent it happening, but if it does happen, then it could taint the system more broadly
c. **GMO/CRISPR – are we speaking as a System and saying the same thing?** Important to recognize that there are stewardship questions as well as legal and compliance considerations

d. **Questions on communications capacity and coherence undermining our credibility as a System** – with questions arising on the System's ability to respond appropriately to negative press; capacity to manage CGIAR's social media interactions and footprint; the consequences for the System and its brand name from delivering different messages/not speaking with one voice

e. **Financial sustainability:** ability to mobilize; stability/volatility, sustainability, overall amounts, timing and overall amounts in the particular windows

f. **IT Systems integrity** – availability & performance of the IT platforms, but also capacity to identify and effectively respond to cyber-attacks and denial of service issues

g. **Failure to deliver outcomes and impact** – Not simply failure to deliver against agreed targets, but incorporating failure to be able to adapt to changing circumstances/demands; the pressures facing CGIAR to deliver 'impact in the short term', when the research questions necessarily require a capacity to undertake both high and low level science

h. **Inconsistent contracting policies** – giving rise to the risk of negative precedents for other System elements

i. **Inconsistent employment policies** – 'best employer' type terms are undermined with inconsistent practices and policies

j. **Incoherent in-country approaches and hosting arrangements** – including how we work with governments, and legal risks in countries in which we operate

k. **Financial fraud –** Center specific cases impacting the System as a whole; the inherent risks from the CRP model; potential misappropriation of funds internally and across the many partnerships

l. **Inability to adapt to changing political environments** – altering how CGIAR positions itself and interacts with its traditional Funders, creating also potential opportunities for new relationships and/or new avenues through which traditional relationships can be accessed and supported

m. **Intellectual assets management and potential non-compliance with treaties** - misappropriation of assets; being too risk adverse and missing opportunities to be in the lead and capitalize on CGIAR's comparative advantages; operating according to rapidly changing external environments with out-of-date procedures; bio-piracy issues and not playing by rules for movement of genetic material

n. **Partnerships** – particularly questions regarding the complexity of undertaking due diligence on the many partners and funding sources;

o. **Reserves policy and Center closure procedures –** whether these are appropriate, and how individual Center financial positions may impact the capacity to deliver the holistic research agenda

p. **Inconsistency in indirect costs being applied across the system** - possible future liability issue

q. **Governance within CGIAR system**: e.g. (a) potential for conflict between SMB and the System Council; (b) Conflict of Interest particularly in the deliberations of the SMB

21.   During the report back, the meeting participants acknowledged that as work on the development of the risk management framework of the CGIAR System evolved, it would be important to:

a.   **Ensure an appropriate categorization of the risks** that are ultimately identified as the relevant System-wide risks after broad consultation (with categories to potentially comprise: governance, finance, science, communications, security, partnerships).

b.   **Allocate oversight for those risks between the relevant stakeholders so that the right body is charged with responsibility in regard to the most relevant of risks** (and maintaining as a core principle that the Centers themselves manage Center-level risks).

c.   **Articulate clearly for System-level risks, the overall risk appetite for the System**, noting that there are clearly risks such as staff security or the misuse of funding, where there is zero tolerance, but that there are also other risks that also give rise to significant potential opportunity if exploited in an appropriate way.

d.   **Ensuring that the risk management framework is developed in conjunction with appropriate cross-system escalation processes,** and that any such system envisages both escalation and de-escalation of risk issues, building and relying upon the Center-specific escalation processes that are already in place.

e.   **Strengthen the System's capacity to communicate risk issues in a way that enhances the capacity of the responsible party to take informed action on that issue** (whether Center Board, SMB or System Council).

f.   **Support implementation of a risk management framework of the CGIAR System with some common principles across the Centers.** Potential elements suggested included having a statement of intent; educate staff to more effectively embody risk management in all that they do; champion values across and within the system; and build a better sense of shared responsibility to support the System becoming truly impactful.

22.   Thinking beyond bio-piracy considerations and the risks of non-compliance with international treaties, the meeting also had the benefit of Ann Tutwiler posing the broader question of what should CGIAR's position be in those areas where there are no, or very few, rules or norms in regard to some of the issues that CIGAR is dealing with. Examples included: (i) the absence of rules around the dematerialization of intellectual assets (although noting these were now under development); (ii) very different views on whether there should be specific legislation and ethical norms adopted globally in respect of the use of 'CRISPR' (*Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats*) technology; and (iii) inconsistent implementation and rules at the national level for the Nagoya protocol in the treaty.

23.   Recognizing the significant reputational risks for the CGIAR System and its Funders as a whole in respect of genetic resources use, it was confirmed that a primary goal of the soon to be operational policy module within the Genebanks Platform, was to

ensure better connectivity and awareness of different parts of the System around the various issues. It was noted that a survey to help the SMB think about the implications for the contracting arrangements for the Genebanks Platform and its overall governance has been circulated to the Directors General of the eleven 'Article 15' Centers (i.e. those managing a genebank and thus having legal obligations under the treaty), with the confirmation that the survey, and its results in due course, would be shared more broadly.

24.   Before moving to the next agenda item, meeting participants agreed that CGIAR needed to be on the front foot on topics such as CRISPR, recognizing that it has the power to be an incredibly powerful tool, but that there is a critical need to be able to marry the interests of those involved in the biodiversity world and the CGIAR impact agenda to make sure that CGIAR as a System gets its position right.

25.   There was also recognition that, as for past conversations on genetically modified organisms, the substantive risks arising in respect of the CRISPR technology are not necessarily formal and legal, but political. Further, that there are not only potentially negative risks, but opportunities for the impact that CGIAR wishes to have, and that to take advantage of that opportunity, CGIAR needs to be much more agile in how it talks about CRISPR technology.

26.   Thus, it was suggested that in addition to having the technical policy module of the Genebanks Platform working on key policy questions, CGIAR needs to:

   a. develop a succinct CGIAR position on CRISPR that is able to be understood by external stakeholders (with the request that the CGIAR position on GMOs also be again shared to see if it needs to be updated or refreshed);
   b. ensure that through an appropriate mechanism, technical positions are reviewed for political astuteness before being released; and
   c. be more active at a leadership level in international fora, particularly in respect of the treaty, and attending such fora not as one CGIAR speaker, but being present as a senior team to ensure positive, proactive engagement on the key topics before the international community.

Agenda item 8: Thinking on selected CGIAR System Entities

27.   Advance planning for this session took into consideration that 2017 represents a year when a number of the key functional responsibilities of the System's operational or advisory bodies are under review by the System Council and/or the SMB.

28.   Specifically:
   a. **The System Council will approve in 2017 revised terms of reference for the ISPC and IEA**, taking into consideration input from the SMB (CGIAR System Framework, Article 6.1.e);

b. **The SMB will approve in 2017 the terms of reference and process for fulfilling the Internal Audit Function**[3], taking into account the inputs from the System Council and audit arrangements of the Centers; and

c. **The Executive Director of the System Organization will, in 2017, set a strategic business plan for delivery by the System Management Office** to meet the functional responsibilities of the Office (Charter, Article 8.1), although prioritized according to the 2017 needs of the System, as articulated by the SMB and System Council.

29. Before breaking out in to groups to reflect on possible input and next steps, the Executive Director presented his early reflections on an appropriate business plan for the Office for 2017, as informed by calls that he had made in December 2016 with Board Chairs, Directors General, CGIAR's Funders and other stakeholders.

30. Welcoming the Executive Director by virtual connection, the meeting expressed appreciation for the opportunity to provide direct input into the business planning process for the Office. Meeting participants provided high-level feedback on the Executive Director's suggested priority areas for the Office's 2017 actions, together with his proposals to address capacity gaps in key areas (including prioritizing a modest number of new resources to focus on System-level funder engagement activities and a stronger effort on System-wide communications).

31. After a breakout group session on the various System entities, the plenary session was used as an opportunity to identify strengths in the operations of the ISPC and IEA models, noting also areas for potential clarity and/or strengthening. Similarly, the meeting participants recognized the importance for the System as a whole of having internal and external audit arrangements that provide adequate assurance as contemplated by the CGIAR System Framework and Charter. The sentiment however, was that looking to the future, the System will benefit from an assurance framework that builds heavily on what already exists at Center level, is risk-based, and delivers a value add for the System on a cost-effective basis.

32. With time not permitting an exhaustive conversation, the preferred view was for the incoming 2017 conveners of the Board Chairs and Directors General to prepare a communication to the System Council on the key elements of the conversation in respect of the ISPC and IEA. A separate aide-memoire was agreed to be prepared by the Co-Chairs from the session to help that work be taken forward.

33. The Centers' Audit Committee Chairs' forthcoming meeting on 31 January 2017 was then identified by the group as an appropriate forum for a more detailed conversation on the issues arising in respect of adequate Internal Audit Function arrangements, to be ultimately agreed between the System Council and SMB.

---

[3] The 'Internal Audit Function' is defined in the new governance system as: "*the arrangements agreed between the System Council and the System Management Board to provide independent and objective assurance and advisory services to the System Council and System Management Board.*" (Charter, Article 2(q).)

Agenda item 9: General Assembly of Centers Core Functions

34. Recognizing the relative brevity of the definition of the role of the General Assembly in the Charter, a key goal of the session was to support a common understanding of the scope of the General Assembly's function. Margret Thalwitz, Chair of the SMB's adhoc Rules of Governance Working Group, set the scene by presenting the Working Group's recommendations on the forthcoming SMB member selection process, accessible here: http://www.cgiar.org/about-us/our-governance/centers-general-assembly/

35. Accepting that the Charter's language could be open to differing interpretations, but agreeing not to propose any amendments to the Charter so early after the transition process, meeting participants discussed high level principles that could be used to develop Rules of Procedure for the General Assembly, appreciating that the Rules could prove to be an important clarification tool as to where certain functional responsibilities lay in the System vis-à-vis the SMB and General Assembly.

36. The <u>key principles that the meeting requested be translated into a draft Rules of Procedure</u> by the Office (and for consultation across the Centers thereafter), included:

   a. **The importance of capturing in the Rules of Procedure the intended spirt of the reform, namely that there is proactive engagement, information sharing and consultation between the SMB and Centers.** In this context, it was noted that the General Assembly is a consultative forum, and not a legal entity with a separate legal personality. Accordingly, the General Assembly's role is to provide strategic input and guidance on topics being addressed by the SMB, although it cannot formally direct the SMB to take a particular action.

   b. **The General Assembly is comprised of the Chairs of the Board of Trustees in their capacity as representatives of the Board of Trustees, and the Directors General, or their respective delegates, of all fifteen Centers**. The possibility of providing invitations to attend the meeting to the Executive Director of the System Organization and any independent Chair of the SMB should be included, together with other invitations determined important for the effective functioning of General Assembly meetings.

   c. **The one vote per Center will be exercised by the Board Chair or his/her delegate**, as notified to the Co-Chairs in writing.

   d. **One in-person meeting per year**, unless strategic opportunity or need arises to suggest otherwise.

   e. **As a clarification of the Charter, General Assembly meetings will have a Chair and Co-Chair** (the Conveners of the Board of Trustee Chairs and the Directors General, as elected by their peers annually) **and will work in partnership**.

   f. **The conveners of the Board of Trustee Chairs and the Directors General will also serve as the two ex-officio non-voting Center representatives on the**

System Council absent a reason to not follow this practice in a particular situation.

g. **The Centers' two Council representatives (who represent the Centers as a whole)** have the responsibility to ensure that if they cannot participate in a particular System Council meeting, they work amongst their fellow Board Chairs or Directors General, respectively, to identify and notify to the Office, and the System Council Chair, their nominated alternative.

h. **A separation of functions is required to maximize the voices of the Centers in the System, particularly in respect of the important role of representing the Centers at the System Council.** To capture that spirit, if it is a Center-affiliated member who serves as SMB Chair (acknowledging a strong preference from meeting participants for an independent member to serve as SMB Chair in the future), they should not also serve in the convener role (for the Board Chairs, or Directors General, as relevant).

i. **The General Assembly will receive an annual written report from the SMB**, provided two weeks before the meeting of the General Assembly, to facilitate an informed and focused report-back on SMB actions during the in-person meeting. Effort will be made to ensure increased clarity as the SMB provides updates and reports to the General Assembly, but recognizing that the SMB Chair's formal accountability is to the System Organization, and thus the other members of the SMB.

j. **Incorporating a means for the General Assembly to provide input into decisions on the ongoing appropriateness of the SMB voting members**, with the potential for individual members to be changed mid-term if required.

k. **Both the quorum requirements and decision-making (affirmative) will require a two-thirds majority**.

l. **Unless and until a future General Assembly meeting considers it appropriate to revisit the topic**, the Rules of Procedure would not provide any guidance on the balance between Board of Trustee Members and Directors General in respect of the 7 center-affiliated SMB voting member roles (taking note that the General Assembly declined to adopt the Working Group's recommendation that the voting membership of the SMB be re-aligned to a model of 3 independent members; 3 Board of Trustee members; 3 Directors General from the current 2:7 ratio, where the 7 Center-affiliated member roles were not allocated between the Center Board of Trustee members and Directors General).

37. It was also proposed that there be a standing invitation (but not an obligation) to the Conveners of the Board Chairs and Directors General to attend all SMB meetings, with the appropriate SMB Rules of Procedure being amended if required.

38. The General Assembly then made the **following key decisions** required as part of the functions outlined in the Charter, Articles 5.3-5.7, relevant for this particular gathering, provided in summary below and in full form in Appendix 1:

a. **GA/M1/DP1: Formation a Nominations Committee** based on agreement to use Approach 2 – Build a new ad hoc Nominations Committee comprised of five persons with the time to commit to the process as follows: Two Board of Trustee members as selected by the Boards of Trustee Chairs, with a preference for at least one Board of Trustee Chair to be so nominated; Two Directors General, as selected by the Directors General themselves; and One independent member with knowledge of the System, but not currently directly involved in it

b. **GA/M1/DP2: Election of representatives of the Board of Trustee Chairs and the Directors General**, selected by the groups themselves as both Conveners of their respective groups and Co-Chairs of the General Assembly for 2017[4], and agreement that the Conveners also would serve in the capacity of the Centers' two ex-officio non-voting members of the System Council[5].

Agenda item 10: Open Space

39.   Recognizing that in formulating the agenda for a two day gathering of the General Assembly not all topics could be covered, this second 'Open Space' session allowed participants an opportunity to identify items which are important to put on the agenda of the Centers and the General Assembly for future review.

40.   The following thoughts emerged:

a. It is **vital for CGIAR to align with key development agendas such as the SDGs and the Paris Agreement**. Following on from that, CGIAR needs to be able to properly articulate and communicate the relationship between CGIAR and these development agendas through any new CGIAR narrative developed, specific communication pieces, and in its web presence. Meeting participants agreed it would be important for CGIAR to be able to better articulate its business case in the context of SDG terminology, and a sub-set of meeting participants agreed to collaborate on this front (as more clearly set in Appendix 2).

b. It is of **equal importance to be able to make the case of the value of CGIAR's global work which generates international public goods as well as the value of the site specific application of those goods** through country level engagement approaches such as CGIAR Country Collaboration.

Agenda item 11: Wrap up and Meeting close

41.   Taking note that the meeting had covered a number of governance and procedural meetings, Centers were invited to also take the opportunity to give a very short intervention on the exciting science that is emerging from CGIAR Centers as they continue to strive to achieve CGIAR's 2022 intermediate targets, and make major

---

[4] As required by the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization, Article 5.6(b)
[5] As required by the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization, Article 5.6(f)

contributions to the Sustainable Development Goals. When inviting Centers to make a strategic contribution each, Martin Kropff, Convener of the Directors General confirmed that a deck of slides was being collated on key success stories and innovative new science, and that ongoing contributions were always welcomed, directed to him. However, for now, he invited one story from each Center to maintain the energy and momentum that had been very much a feature of most of the meeting itself.

42.   The inputs shared by WorldFish, AfricaRice and IRRI showed important advancements in breeding and genetics work, and provided real examples of how CGIAR's research is contributing to lifting millions of people out of poverty and hunger. CIMMYT and ICRAF gave strong examples of important work on seeds, particularly for vital work in rehabilitation programs and addressing new diseases.

43.   Centers also provided examples of work on tackling specific problems such as aflatoxin which both ICRISAT and IITA have taken direct action on in response to urgent demand in countries where CGIAR works.

44.   Other achievements served to illustrate the great breadth of CGIAR work in supporting decision-making through information, tools and advice being made available to governments, companies and global bodies; as with the work of IFPRI with the Ethiopian government and its safety net program, Bioversity with its agricultural biodiversity index, and ILRI's work on providing better data around livestock to inform discussions on climate change. Stories from CIFOR on further growth of its Global Landscapes Forum initiative and ICARDA on its strategy development process highlighted the key importance of engagement and partnership with actors both across the System and beyond. IWMI's work on business models for sustainable use of natural resources through irrigation showed a good example of natural resource management having an impact.

45.   The work of CIP on the orange flesh sweet potato, recognized through the award of the World Food Prize in 2016, highlighted the value of this work in bringing about necessary improvements in nutrition and health for the world.

46.   With appreciation for all the contributions made during the two days of the General Assembly, Martin Kropff recapped the areas of recommended focus and the agreed actions that emerged on behalf of both Co-Chairs. These actions can be found in the Action Register in Appendix 2, comprising a separate file that is a working document of the General Assembly of the Centers.

47.   **The next in-person gathering of the General Assembly of Centers was proposed for November 2017 in connection with the celebration of CIAT's 50th anniversary when there will also be System Council and System Management Board meetings**.
It was agreed that the in-coming Co-Chairs will make a final proposal on this.

APPENDIX 1: FORMAL DECISIONS

Inaugural General Assembly of the Centers
24 and 25 January 2017, London, UK

Purpose:

This document is an Appendix to the Co-Chairs Summary of the Inaugural General Assembly of Centers and provides the Formal Decisions taken during this gathering.

GA/M1/DP1: Forming a Nominations Committee

The General Assembly **agreed** to form a Nominations Committee in order to nominate for election candidate for members of the System Management Board[1], constituted as follows;
- Two Board of Trustee Chairs: Lindsay Falvey and Nicole Birrell
- Two Directors General: Harold Roy-Macauley and Matthew Morell
- One independent member: To be selected by the other Nominations Committee members

GA/M1/DP2: Electing Center representatives for 2017

The General Assembly:

- **Took note** that CGIAR's Board of Trustee Chairs have selected Nicole Birrell and that CGIAR's Center Directors General have selected Matthew Morell as their respective Conveners, and as co-Chairs of the General Assembly for 2017[2].

- **Agreed** the practice that the Conveners of the Board Chairs and Directors General would serve as the Centers' ex-officio non-voting members of the System Council.[3]

* Appendix 2 is a separate working file, providing the Centers with the opportunity for a flexible means of tracking agreed priority actions, whilst remaining flexible as circumstances alter.

---

[1] As required by the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization, Article 5.6(a)
[2] As required by the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization, Article 5.6(b)
[3] As required by the Charter of the CGIAR System Organization, Article 5.6(f)

APPENDIX 3
RESOURCE NOTE ON SYSTEM-WIDE COLLABORATION MECHANISMS:
*A compilation of information on various mechanisms for
collaboration across CGIAR Centers and other entities*

Purpose and Background
The purpose of this resource note is to document the various mechanisms for collaboration across the system that are currently or have been recently active in bringing together personnel from Centers, programs and other entities around key themes.

The tables* below present highly summarized information on:
 i.   The name of each system-wide collaboration mechanism
 ii.   Basis of existence, operation and current known membership
 iii. Any current, or past, activities or responsibilities
 iv.   A first potential cross-reference to the preliminary high-level risks identified at the 1st General Assembly for input into the Audit Committee Chairs' identification of a way to take forward development of a risk management framework of the CGIAR System. (see list below)
       Please note that this list may not be complete and is provided as a resource note only to assist with consideration of ongoing engagement across the System.

The risks identified as input to the development of a risk management framework include:
      R1. Security of our personnel
      R2. Scientific fraud
      R3. GMO/CRISPR statements and actions
      R4. Coherence in System-wide and System-focused communications
      R5. Financial sustainability
      R6. IT system integrity
      R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact
      R8. Inconsistent contracting policies
      R9. Inconsistent employment policies
      R10. Incoherent in-country approaches and hosting arrangements
      R11. Financial Fraud
      R12. Adaption to changing political contexts
      R13. Intellectual assets management and compliance with treaties
      R14. Partnerships - Due diligence on partners and funding sources
      R15. Reserves policy and Center closure procedures
      R16. Inconsistency in indirect costs across the system
      R17. Governance within CGIAR system

(i) Currently ACTIVE Collaboration Mechanisms

No	Currently Active Collaboration Mechanisms-	Basis of existence, operation and composition	Any current activities and responsibilities	What are the key risks that these collaboration mechanisms link to? (Link to initial General Assembly exercise, R=Risk)
1.	**Communications** Community of Practice	Membership generally includes the Heads of Communications of each Center and CRPs as well as the System Management Office Communications Manager	• Sharing knowledge, tools and experiences • Planning collaborative and joint activities • Discussing key guidance for the 2017-2022 Portfolio branding	R3. GMO/CRISPR R4. Coherence in System-wide and System-focused communications R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact R12. Adaption to changing political contexts
2.	**Corporate Services Executive** (CSE) Group	This group includes the Corporate Services Directors from Centers and the System Management office, plus sometimes other personnel from Center finance departments. A Chair of the group is nominated from one of the Centers Corporate Services Directors.	• Sharing knowledge, approaches and experiences • Planning collaborative and joint activities • Developing key guidance and policies for consideration by the Centers, and adoption by the SMB • Development of policies required by System Council	R1. Security of our personnel R5. Financial sustainability R6. IT system integrity R8. Inconsistent contracting policies R9. Inconsistent employment policies R10. Incoherent in-country approaches and hosting arrangements R11. Financial Fraud R14. Partnerships - Due diligence on partners and funding sources R15. Reserves policy and Center closure procedures R16. Inconsistency in indirect costs across the system
3.	**Data Management** Task Force	Emerged from a previous, wider Community of Practice on Knowledge Management to include technical experts	Has been linked to the BMGF-supported Open Access initiative and will be re-evaluated under	R2. Scientific Fraud R6. IT system integrity R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact

No	Currently Active Collaboration Mechanisms-	Basis of existence, operation and composition	Any current activities and responsibilities	What are the key risks that these collaboration mechanisms link to? (Link to initial General Assembly exercise, R=Risk)
		working on data across the Centers.	the Big Data Platform arrangements	
4.	**Evaluation** Community of Practice (ECoP)	Established and lead by IEA this CoP includes evaluation and monitoring specialists from across the CGIAR System	The ECoP meets annually.	R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact R12. Adaption to changing political contexts
5.	**Gender** Network	Established with funding for system-wide gender activities. Membership includes any gender researchers across the system.	System-wide gender studies, data collation, communication activities. Currently being mapped to PIM Flagship program on Gender	R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact
6.	**Human Resources** Community of Practice	Members include the Directors of Human Resources of CGIAR Centers and a representative of the System Management Office	Diversity and inclusion initiative	R1. Security of our personnel R8. Inconsistent contracting policies R9. Inconsistent employment policies
7.	**Information Technology** Community of Practice	Members include the Heads of ICT of the Centers, OSU and the System Management Office.		R4. Coherence in System-wide and System-focused communications R6. IT system integrity R10. Incoherent in-country approaches and hosting arrangements
8.	CLIPnet= CGIAR **Legal and Intellectual Property** Network	IA principles require it. Members include Center Legal and IP focal points and members of the System Management Office Legal team	• Sharing information and best practice • Supporting the IA Principles and Annual IA reporting	R2. Scientific fraud R3. GMO/CRISPR R10. Incoherent in-country approaches and hosting arrangements R12. Adaption to changing political contexts

No	Currently Active Collaboration Mechanisms-	Basis of existence, operation and composition	Any current activities and responsibilities	What are the key risks that these collaboration mechanisms link to? (Link to initial General Assembly exercise, R=Risk)
				R13. Intellectual assets management and treaty compliance R14. Partnerships - Due diligence on partners and funding sources R15. Reserves policy and Center closure procedures
9.	**Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning** Community of Practice (MEL CoP)	Initiated by a group of Centers and lead by Co-Chairs from Center and System Management Office plus a Steering Committee of other Center members M&E specialists from Centers and CRPs	-The MEL CoP meets annually, often linked to the meeting of the ECoP as some members are shared. -The MEL CoP leads the Task Force on Indicators and the process towards developing an Integrated Framework for Performance Management for the system.	R4. Coherence in System-wide and System-focused communications R5. Financial sustainability R7. Failure to deliver outcome and impact R12. Adaption to changing political contexts
10.	**Open Access** Working Group	This Working Group was established as part of the BMGF-supported Open Access initiative. The membership includes information management personnel from the CGIAR Centers.	Next meeting scheduled for April 2017	R2. Scientific fraud R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact R13. Intellectual assets management
11.	**Resource Mobilization** Community of Practice	Business Development, fundraising, donor relation staff	Face-to face meeting of the RM CoP scheduled for 21 and 22 February 2017.	R4. Coherence in System-wide and System-focused communications R5. Financial sustainability R12. Adaption to changing political contexts

No	Currently Active Collaboration Mechanisms-	Basis of existence, operation and composition	Any current activities and responsibilities	What are the key risks that these collaboration mechanisms link to? (Link to initial General Assembly exercise, R=Risk)
12.	**Science Leaders** Group	This group includes CRP Directors and Deputy Director General for Research supported by the System Management Office	This group meets at least once annually to discuss CGIAR science and programmatic planning. Next meeting is planned for June 2017.	R2. Scientific fraud R3. GMO/CRISPR R4. Coherence in System-wide and System-focused communications R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact R11. Financial fraud R12. Adaption to changing political contexts R13. Intellectual assets management

(ii)   <u>Possible future Collaboration Mechanisms</u>

- Open Access Ethics group- proposed as part of the Big Data Platform
- Community of Practice on CGIAR Country Collaboration- to be proposed by the Working Group 5 on CGIAR Country Collaboration
- Community of Practice on Gender in the Workplace- proposed by the IEA Evaluation on Gender in the Workplace

(iii)   Recently ACTIVE- but currently not operating- Collaboration Mechanisms

Number	Previously Active Collaboration Mechanism	Basis of existence, operation and composition	Past activities and responsibilities	Potential support to addressing system-level risks identified at the General Assembly (R1-17) (plus other General Assembly recommended actions)
1.	**Capacity Development** Community of Practice	The current CoP was re-initiated by a number of Centers. The CoP involves a wider membership of DG-nominated Center CapDev specialists with an elected Steering Committee and Chair.	-Sharing knowledge, approaches and experiences -Developing CapDev Framework -Preparing key guidance for the CRPII portfolio -Developing CapDev Indicators	R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impact
2.	**Communications, engagement and partnerships** group (KMC4CRPs)	Based on an initiative by three CRPs to address communications, engagement and knowledge sharing topics specifically aimed at CRPs	-Providing guidance on communications and engagement for the Guidance for CRP2 proposal development. - Meeting amongst CRP communications and engagement staff to share experiences and tools and develop joint programs and products.	R4. Lack of coherence in communications

Number	Previously Active Collaboration Mechanism	Basis of existence, operation and composition	Past activities and responsibilities	Potential support to addressing system-level risks identified at the General Assembly (R1-17) (plus other General Assembly recommended actions)
3.	**Genetic Resources** Working Group	An informal working group of genebank managers and IP focal points.	Included as an aspect of the Genebank Platform-establishment not yet confirmed.	R3. GMO/CRISPR R12. Non-compliance with treaties R13. Intellectual Property
4.	**Private sector engagement** group	A process was initiated by ICRAF, The Netherlands Ministries of Foreign and Economic Affairs with support from CGIAR system level to organize a workshop to discuss possible platform/alternate format on Private sector engagement in CRP2 Portfolio	A workshop was held on 21 September 2015 hosted by The Netherlands Ministries of Foreign and Economic Affairs in The Hague, Netherlands.	R5. Financial sustainability
5.	**Security** Community of Practice	Members included security focal points from all Centers.	-Discussing security issues, needs and ways to address these for CGIAR	R1. Security of our personnel
6.	**Youth and employment** group	A process was initiated by IITA together, with support from CGIAR system level to organize a workshop to discuss possible platform/alternate format on addressing youth and employment in CRP2 Portfolio	A workshop was held in September 2015 in Montpellier, France with a number of CGIAR Centers and Research Programs, and partners including African Development Bank, Universities and NGOs	R7. Failure to deliver outcomes and impacts

APPENDIX 4
AIARC – ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CENTERS
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SESSION

Tuesday 24 January 2017, London, United Kingdom, 17:30pm

1.   In fulfillment of the AIARC annual General Meeting, Jeff Hungate, President and CEO of AIARC, joined the Centers by virtual connection from Washington, D.C., to address questions and provide additional comments on the detailed AIARC report prepared by AIARC and shared with the 15 Centers in advance.

2.   Taking the AIARC Report as read, and highlighting that AIARC manages assets of over US$ 450 million per year, Mr. Hungate reiterated that AIARC valued its strong working relationship with CGIAR, accepting that there was always the opportunity to improve services, and thus AIARC welcomed any such feedback.

3.   Some of the points raised during an open conversation with meeting participants included:

a.   AIARC's new service offering of a train-the-trainer program for the SOS staff security program, in recognition of the benefit to Centers if their staff better understand the benefits of the program and take full advantage of it;

b.   Appreciation for the revised, more favorable terms that AIARC has negotiated for death and disability insurance;

c.   The importance of people being aware of the changes that were made in the portability of retirement savings held on behalf of CGIAR Center staff by AIARC during the third quarter of 2016, restricting movement of funds on separation from CGIAR for persons impacted by age restrictions, which was an unexpected change, highlighting the need for better communication on matters that were so topical; and

d.   The steps that have been taken to ensure a smoother transition between underlying health insurance providers, including a change of account manager, which AIARC reported as a positive step to ensuring better service delivery.

4. In response to a question on whether changing exchange rates may have an adverse impact on staff retirement benefits, Mr. Hungate confirmed that in terms of the interest rates, all investment portfolios are self-selected. That is, individuals make their own decisions, choosing to invest in stocks, in bonds, or a combination of options. Thus, it was noted that changing exchange rates will impact people in different ways depending on their holdings. Recognizing that rates will inevitably change, it was noted that AIARC encourages people to diversify their assets in terms of asset classes and geographical regions, with the final decision and risk being on the individual concerned.

5. With appreciation for the presentation and the ongoing work by AIARC to provide services to CGIAR's 15 Centers, a question from the floor invited Mr. Hungate to reflect briefly in terms of what potential future service offerings may be able to be provided by AIARC, with the goal of continuing to maximize financial and operational efficiencies across the System.

6. As an early suggestion of potential additional service offerings that may be of interest to the CGIAR Centers, Mr. Hungate noted a potential opportunity to leverage CGIAR's efforts in regard to the considerable recruitment efforts required for senior level employees. He raised the potential to think innovatively about how to manage a pool of talent that Centers could draw upon as required (building on a like experience from a different industry). A second potential opportunity, should Centers wish to explore this at a future time, was the prospect that reserves may be able to be managed through a common platform, with the prospect of finding efficiencies in scale. Both were topics that Mr. Hungate noted could be taken up when and if thought appropriate.

7. Again thanking AIARC for its service, the meeting was closed at 6:00pm.

APPENDIX 5
Attendance List of the Inaugural General Assembly of Centers, 24 &25 January 2017, London

Issued 20 February 2017

Key: * Co-Chair of Inaugural General Assembly

Total persons= 34

** Delegated member

Center	Persons	Position	Email
Africa Rice	Harold Roy-Macauley	Director General	H.Roy-Macauley@cgiar.org
	Eric Tollens	Board Chair	eric.tollens@kuleuven.be
Bioversity	Ann Tutwiler	Director General	a.tutwiler@cgiar.org
	Julia Marton-Lefevre	Board Chair	jmartonlefevre@gmail.com
CIAT	Geoff Hawtin	Board of Trustees Chair	geoffhawtin@hotmail.com
CIFOR	Peter Holmgren	Director General	p.holmgren@cgiar.org
	José Campos	Board of Trustees Chair	jjcamposarce@me.com
CIMMYT	Martin Kropff*	Director General	m.kropff@cgiar.org
	Nicole Birrell	Board of Trustees Chair	nicolebirrell@kintan.com
	Miriam Shindler	Communication Specialist CIMMYT	m.shindler@cgiar.org
CIP	Michael Gerba **	Chief Operations Office- representing Barbara Wells, Director General	m.gerba@cgiar.org
	Rodney D. Cooke	Board of Trustees Chair	rodneydcooke@yahoo.co.uk
ICARDA	Aly Abousabaa	Director General	A.Abousabaa@cgiar.org
	Margret Thalwitz	Board of Trustees Chair	mcthalwitz@gmail.com
ICRAF	Tony Simons	Director General	t.simons@cgiar.org
	John Lynam	Board of Trustees Chair	johnklynam@gmail.com
ICRISAT	David Bergvinson	Director General	d.bergvinson@cgiar.org
IFPRI	Shenggen Fan	Director General	s.fan@cgiar.org
IITA	Nteranya Sanginga	Director General	n.sanginga@cgiar.org
	Ylva Hilbur	Deputy Director General	y.hillbur@cgiar.org
	Bruce Coulman*	Board of Trustees Chair	bruce.coulman@usask.ca

Center	Persons	Position	Email
ILRI	Jimmy Smith	Director General	j.smith@cgiar.org
	Lindsay Falvey	Board of Trustees Chair	L.Falvey@cgiar.org
IRRI	Matthew Morell	Director General	m.morell@irri.org
	Jim Godfrey	Board of Trustees Chair	Jim.Godfrey@godfrey.uk.com
IWMI	Jeremy Bird	Director General	j.bird@cgiar.org
	Donald Blackmore	Board of Trustees Chair	donaldblackmore@gmail.com
WorldFish	Blake Ratner	Director General	B.Ratner@cgiar.org
	Yvonne Pinto **	Board of Trusttee Member	yvonne@firetail.co.uk
Invited Guests	**Name**	**Office title (at January 2017)**	**Email**
System Management Office	Elwyn Grainger-Jones (remote participant, Agenda item 8)	Executive Director, CGIAR System Organization	EGraingerJones@cgiar.org
	Karmen Bennett (except Agenda Item 8)	Senior Advisor, Governance	k.bennett@cgiar.org
	Nadia Manning-Thomas (except Agenda Item 8)	Partnerships Manager- Governance	n.manning@cgiar.org
	Albin Hubscher (except Agenda Item 8)	Director of Finance and Corporate Services	a.hubscher@cgiar.org
	Alain Vidal (Agenda items 1 - 3)	Director of Strategic Partnerships	a.vidal@cgiar.org