

Joint Meeting of the
Alliance Board and Alliance Executive:

Alliance of the CGIAR Centers
November 30-December 1, 2006

Washington DC, USA
IFPRI



FINAL SUMMARY

Supported by



Consultative Group on
International Agricultural Research

Table of Contents

ATTENDANCE	1
WELCOME AND AGENDA APPROVAL	3
AGENDA ITEM 1A – ALLIANCE PRINCIPLES REGARDING “EQUAL PARTNERS” AND THE ABSENCE OF HIERARCHY IN DECISION MAKING... 3	3
AGENDA ITEM 1B – EUROPEAN UNION (EU) FUNDING	4
AGENDA ITEM 2 – FOLLOW-UP FROM CIAT MEETINGS, EXCO10 AND EXCO11.....	5
AGENDA ITEM 3 – GRPC PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE ALLIANCE POLICY ON BENEFIT SHARING FOR IMPROVED VARIETIES	7
AGENDA ITEM 4 – FUNDING FORMULA FOR THE ALLIANCE BUDGET	8
AGENDA ITEM 5 – DEVELOPING A SHARED VISION AND STRATEGY FOR THE ALLIANCE.....	9
AGENDA ITEM 6 – SUBMISSION OF NEW CHALLENGE PROGRAMS.....	10
AGENDA ITEM 7 – 2007 ALLIANCE BUDGET APPROVAL (ALLIANCE EXECUTIVE ONLY)	11
AGENDA ITEM 8 – PREPARATION FOR THE MEETING WITH THE CGIAR CHAIR AND DIRECTOR	13
AGENDA ITEM 9 – WRAP-UP AND FUTURE MEETINGS	14
AGENDA ITEM 10 – MEETING WITH CGIAR CHAIR AND DIRECTOR	14
MEETING WITH BILL AND MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION	16
ANNEX 1. DECISIONS AND ACTIONS TABLE- AE/AB.....	18
ANNEX 2. SYNTHESIS OF THE BRAINSTORMING SESSION.....	22
ANNEX 3. FINAL MEETING AGENDA AB-AE.....	24

Attendance

Africa Rice Center (WARDA)	Gaston Grenier, Board Chair Papa Abdoulaye Seck, Director General
Bioversity International	Tony Gregson, Board Chair Emile Frison, Director General
CIAT	Yves Savidan, Board Chair Joachim Voss, Director General and AE Chair
CIFOR	Angela Cropper, Board Chair Andrew Bennett, Board Chair Designate Frances Seymour, Director General
CIMMYT	Lene Lange, Board Chair Masa Iwanaga, Director General
CIP	Jim Godfrey, Board Chair and AB Chair Pamela Anderson, Director General
ICARDA	Guido Gryseels, Board Chair Mahmoud Solh, Director General
ICRISAT	Simon Best, Board Chair Willie Dar, Director General
IFPRI	Ross Garnaut, Board Chair (1 December) Suttitak Smitasiri, Vice Chair (30 November) Joachim von Braun, Director General
IITA	Peter Hartmann, Director General
ILRI	Emmy Simmons, Board Member Carlos Seré, Director General
IRRI	Keijiro Ostuka, Board Chair Robert Ziegler, Director General
IWMI	Nobumasa Hatcho, Board Chair Frank Rijsberman, Director General
World Agroforestry Center	Eugene Terry, Board Chair Lynn Haight, Board Chair Designate Dennis Garrity, Director General
WorldFish Center	Trond Bjorndal, Board Chair Stephen Hall, Director General
Alliance Office	Anne-Marie Izac, Chief Alliance Officer Jenny Cramer, Consultant
AB Executive Secretary	Jo Hernandez

Special Guests

CGIAR Secretariat

**Kathy Sierra, CGIAR Chair
Francisco Reifschneider, CGIAR Director**

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Don Doering

Science Council

**Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Chair
Ruben Echeverria, Executive Director**

Alliance Deputy Executive

**Gerry O'Donoghue, Chair ADE Finance
Douglas Pachico, Chair, ADE Science**

The meeting was chaired by Jim Godfrey (Alliance Board Chair) and Joachim Voss (Alliance Executive Chair) who shared responsibility for the specific items on the agenda.

Welcome and Agenda Approval

Jim Godfrey, (Alliance Board Chair), welcomed all members and extended a special welcome to incoming Board Chairs, Andrew Bennett (CIFOR) and Lynn Haight (WorldAgroforestry Center). He also welcomed Emmy Simmons (ILRI Board Member), standing in for ILRI Chair, Uwe Werblow, and for IITA Chair, Bryan Harvey, as a Board member of both Institutes, and Suttalak Smitasiri standing in for IFPRI Board Chair, Ross Garnaut on November 30.

Apologies had been received from Kerri Wright Platais, Senior Program Officer. Jenny Cramer had been requested to take minutes.

Joachim Voss (Alliance Executive Chair) welcomed new Directors General, Papa Abdoulaye Seck (Africa Rice Center), Frances Seymour (CIFOR), and Mahmoud Solh (ICARDA).

Joachim von Braun, as host, also extended a welcome to members and said he looked forward to friendly and hard hitting debate. On behalf of the Alliance Board and Alliance Executive he thanked all IFPRI staff responsible for the arrangements.

The agenda was approved as presented with the addition of a discussion on EU funding for 2006.

Agenda Item 1a – Alliance principles regarding “equal partners” and the absence of hierarchy in decision making

This item had been placed on the agenda to engage a discussion on fundamental issues that are of concern to all. The objective was to give an opportunity to all members to share their views on what it means to be “equal partners”, to understand where the differences of opinion were, and to try to work through them.

An exercise was conducted under the leadership of Stephen Hall where Center Board Chairs and Directors General shared their views candidly on specific issues

1. What is meant by a partnership of equals, with an example of an action/decision consistent with the principle and an action/decision in violation of the principle.
2. A statement that described each Center’s mandate and an example of an action or decision that would violate it.
3. Common themes emerging from the responses, areas of disagreement, implications of the findings and next steps.

Summary

Joachim Voss summarized the results of the exercise and the implications of Center views. Some of the key issues arising from the discussions related to leadership, competition for resources, communication and information sharing and improved organization. The instances of competition were clearly unhelpful and occurred at the

intersection of global and regional mandates. A possible way forward, emerging from the discussion was:

- (1) To discontinue seeing Center mandates and competencies as the basis for exclusive right; use competencies more effectively to fulfill the larger mission of the CGIAR, bringing in partners to achieve tangible results.
- (2) To put together a compelling Alliance vision and strategy and practical examples of harnessing Center competencies in an effective way and as a platform for attracting additional resources.
- (3) Straightening out the issues that lie at the intersection of global and regional responsibilities, with the assistance of donors and the Science Council.

Agenda Item 1b – European Union (EU) Funding

Centers discussed the failed negotiations between the European Union and the World Bank and the resulting absence of funding from the European Union in 2006, and the best approach to have it restored in 2007.

Decision:

It was agreed:

1. To bring up the topic as a priority concern of the Alliance in the meeting with the CGIAR Chair and CGIAR Director and to seek their feedback on the background that led to the default of the 2006 EU contribution; inform them in advance that this topic was going to be discussed with them so that relevant documentation on the reasons for the default could be provided to the Alliance in advance of the meeting; and to volunteer the assistance of the Alliance to work with the World Bank and the EU to reach a satisfactory conclusion.
2. Since at the heart of the matter were new WB regulations with respect to trust fund management and accountability that did not meet EU requirements, and considering that all EU funding has to be channeled through UN-type organizations, the Alliance should explore with IFAD the possibility of being designated at the recipient organization as an alternative to the World Bank.
3. To ensure that discussion of the situation be tabled on the AGM agenda to bring the issue to the attention of other donors.
4. After feedback from the CG Chair and Director, a decision was made on how the default should be handled by Centers based on advice from the ADE Finance. The following proposal by the ADE Finance was approved:
 - a. All Centers expense EU funding fully in 2006
 - b. Recognize 2006 EU grant and show it as a receivable at year end.
 - c. This accounting treatment must be consistent with previous year accounting treatment.
 - d. Given the current uncertainty that the year-end receivable is collectible, Centers were advised to make doubtful debt provision in 2006 books.
 - e. Impact on financial indicators: May result in some Centers falling below the benchmark of 75 – 90 days. However, the CG Secretariat confirmed that Centers would not be penalized for this in the 2006 performance indicator exercise
 - f. If 2006 funding is received in 2007, reversal of the doubtful debt provision through other income.

Agenda Item 2 – Follow-up from CIAT meetings, ExCo10 and ExCo11

2b. Pooled Reserves.

Anne-Marie Izac summarized the situation regarding pooled reserves. She had prepared a position paper on the basis of the reports submitted by the legal and the financial consultants, for the business meeting at AGM. The paper presented an analysis of the different options available to the Centers. Based on the legal advice the overwhelming response from the Centers was not to pool reserves. Also presented to ExCo 11 along with the report from the legal consultant was a report by a financial consultant on the subject of a mutual fund. Interest on the part of Centers in creating a mutual fund was still under discussion.

Gerry O'Donoghue presented the conclusions reached by the ADE Finance on the subjects of pooled reserves and mutual funds:

- The ADE Finance supports the legal council's advice against pooling reserves.
- Mutual funds would increase the risk to Centers because greater returns are accompanied by greater risks.
- Judged against external benchmarks the system does not have high reserves. Uncertainty of donor funding needs to be taken into consideration.
- The CGIAR Secretariat model for managing reserves (75 to 90 days) is considered an appropriate level of reserves for each Center. Centers have to also consider their unique risks and provide additional reserves to cover these risks.
- Inter-Center cooperation for mitigating financial risks would be useful. The CG Secretariat has agreed to provide financial support for a consultant to explore opportunities for mutual cooperation among Centers.
- One justification for pooled reserves that Centers might consider for collective action is in the area of international public goods such as genebanks.

The AE Chair thanked the ADE Finance for the presentation and noted that sharing risks was an area where Centers could demonstrate and achieve collaboration. He further noted the comments that the level of reserves held by the Centers was not in the top range.

2d. Funding of System Priorities

Anne-Marie Izac listed the five scenarios developed by the Ad Hoc Committee on funding the system priorities.

Scenario 1: Maintaining the status quo, i.e. Current CP and SWP activities all aligned with and incorporating the SP's endorsed at AGM05. (No guarantee of adequate funding)

Scenario 2: Partial maintenance of the status quo with appropriate SPs supported as Challenge Programs Maintain the status quo (Some migration of funding based on SPs)

Scenario 3: Full implementation. All SPs supported as CPs or SWPs (No guarantee that Centers will be adequately funded)

Scenario 4: Modified version of a proposal over a decade ago by Gordon Conway based on a proposal to adopt a programmatic approach to all CGIAR activities under four categories:

- a. Long term programs based on mandated core agendas of Centers with partners (not time bound)

- b. Long-term but time bound multi-Center programs with partners, including regional initiatives, through consortia, SWPs, CPs or other modalities
- c. Medium-term collaborative programs with competitive funding managed through SWPs, CPs or other collaborative approaches.
- d. Short- to medium-term programs on regional programs of a specific nature. Components of Centers and CPs led by consortia or NARS or sub regional organizations – providing more flexibility than what is currently on the table.

Scenario 5: Develop an International Fund for Agricultural Research but not considered workable as the CGIAR is not a legal entity.

The Ad Hoc Committee report was tabled for discussion at AGM to seek member feedback and exchange ideas on best practices and work out coherent mechanisms for funding.

Douglas Pachico reported on behalf of the ADE-Science. At the request of the Ad Hoc Committee and on behalf of the Alliance Executive, pilot case studies of four of the system priorities had been undertaken by the ADE Science covering (1) coherence of research activities; (2) possible gaps, duplications and overlaps; (3) development value of priorities and (4) origin of funding.

- Currently implementation of the SP was being undertaken at the level of Center MTPs within which there were also areas for collective action.
- The Alliance had indicated that the Centers were willing to work with the Science Council to develop framework plans for the implementation of the SPs
- The ADE saw opportunities for development of framework plans based on existing Center platforms and recommended that the Alliance remained fully involved in the exercise. SWPs and/or CPs were possible mechanisms to carry the process forward.
- Mechanisms from an existing platform within the CG that could serve as the convening entity to work with partners and the Science Council to begin developing framework plans had been identified.

The ADE Science requested the endorsement of the Alliance to carry the process forward. Centers would be required to allocate resources for costs of consultation such as workshops, while there might also be opportunities for funding from the Science Council.

Discussion/Comments

Responding to concern over the division of responsibilities between the Science Council and the Alliance on the development of plans for funding the system priorities, the CAO indicated that the Pilot Case Studies had been well received by the Ad Hoc Committee and once the Alliance was able to provide a clear view on implementing the priorities, the Committee would respond positively and welcome it.

- With respect to role of the Alliance in framework planning, the CAO indicated that clarification of responsibilities would be sought during the forthcoming meeting with the Science Council. In preliminary discussions with the Science Council Executive Director (but not with the Chair), the clear feedback was that the Science Council's responsibilities should remain with science quality.
- Members of the Alliance also expressed concern over the parallel thrusts running at the same time, the MTPs, the regional MTPs, and the framework plans, the additional layer of bureaucracy as well as the responsibility being placed on the ADE-Science with no clarity on the way forward. Collective action had the potential to drive up transactions costs and this was also a matter of considerable concern.

- The Science Council had expressed impatience and disappointment that the Centers had not addressed the priorities other than through the MTPs and considered this a failure on the part of the Alliance.
- The exercise undertaken by the deputies provided a platform for moving forward. It was clear that the Alliance could not work on all 20 priorities at the same level at the same time. A collective exercise that prioritizes each SP on a time axis in relation to current resources, excluding Center specific issues, would provide the basis for moving forward. It would also be a message to the system that all 20 priorities would be undertaken through a phased approach and not at the same time.

Decision

Members unanimously decided to proceed with the implementation of the system priorities focusing on the 4 priorities already analyzed by the ADE-Science as a test case, to see how the process could be moved forward, learning lessons from the exercise and in discussion with the Science Council They mandated the ADE Science to proceed with the task and to engage the SC in their discussions.

It was further noted there were fundamental issues of accountability and governance related to the models being proposed that should be tabled for extensive discussion by the Alliance at an appropriate time.

Agenda Item 3 – GRPC proposal to modify the Alliance policy on Benefit Sharing for Improved Varieties

Emile Frison introduced the topic. In June 2006, the Governing Board of the International Treaty adopted the Standard Material Transfer Agreement (SMTA) to be used for all transfers of germplasm of Annex 1 crops following the agreements signed between the Centers and the Governing Board of the International Treaty in October 2006. The following related points were noted:

- a. Implementation of the SMTA is effective January 2007. Although the legal starting date is 14 January; Centers are requested to begin implementation together 1 January 2007.
- b. Draft guidelines were circulated to Centers providing guidance on the way forward in implementation.
- c. The adoption of the SMTA by the Governing Body now supersedes the Centers' policy adopted at the CBC/CDC meeting in May 2004 at ICARDA with respect to Products of Centers Research.
- d. The SMTA adopted by the Governing Body incorporates the concept of "PGRFA under Development; the Products of Center Research are PGRFA under development and therefore also require use of the SMTA.
- e. Modification of the decision by the AB/AE at its meeting in Cali, April 2006 for PGRFA under Development. Under that policy Centers would require payment from the private sector for commercialization of Center PGRFA under development even when the material is available for further breeding. The SMTA adopted by the Governing Body now allows for additional conditions related to PGRFA under development including monetary contributions, but it was felt desirable not to mix this issue with the normal level of payments required under the SMTA. As an alternative, the Centers would examine the desirability to require a distinct payment for products of Center research to be made to the fund established by the Governing Body rather than to individual Centers.
- f. If it is not possible for Centers to make modifications to the SMTA.

The AB/AE by unanimous vote:

1. Reconfirmed the use of the SMTA for all Annex 1 crops and the products of Centers research for those crops starting 1 January 2007.
2. Revoked the AB/AE adopted policy in Cali, April 2006 for an additional clause/requirement on mandatory payments by the private sector for commercial sale derived from the use of Center-developed products, even when the material was available for research and breeding.
3. Requested each Center to update its IP policy on the Center website to reflect the new arrangements. The ADE would propose a recommended opinion that would be circulated 1 January 2007. It would be the responsibility of each Board to endorse the policy.

The AB/AE further agreed that Centers should provide their inputs on the following for discussion by the GRPC to Emile Frison on:

1. The percentage (e.g.0.5%) payment to be made to the IT trust fund in addition to what was required by the IT for products of Center research.
2. How to deal with non-Annex 1 species.

Agenda Item 4 – Funding Formula for the Alliance Budget

The topic was placed on the agenda at the request of IITA and IRRI. A discussion paper prepared by the DG of IRRI and an historical account of collaborative projects and funding by the Centers were circulated as background material for the discussion. In question was the fairness of the current system of financing the Alliance (Alliance Office and of specific system office units) by levying a percentage charge based on the audited grant income irrespective of the benefits derived by each Center. Members shared their views on four options proposed towards a more equitable distribution of charges:

1. The full cost of the Alliance Office and System Office Units is divided equally among the Centers, continuing with the practice of one vote per Center.
2. The cost of the Alliance Office is divided equally among the Centers and the SO units move to a full cost recovery mode of billing. Each Center has one vote in the Alliance.
3. The full cost of the Alliance Office and System Office units is charged according to the current formula but the number of votes allocated to each Center is based on the amount it contributes to the Alliance Office and System Office units, e.g one vote per \$20/K.
4. The full cost of the Alliance Office is charged according to the current formula while the System Office Units are completely self supporting with voting rights assigned on the basis of (3) above.

A compromise proposal by the DG of IWMI was tabled and Centers by unanimous vote agreed:

1. To maintain the current formula for contributing to the 2007 Alliance Executive budget for both the Alliance Office and all related System Office Units and through December 31 2007.
2. The principle of one Center, one vote was maintained.

3. The current formula (% levy on grant income) was maintained for funding the Alliance Office from 2008 and beyond.
4. From 2008, Centers might elect to withdraw from supporting the System Office Units and the Marketing Group. System Office units and the Marketing Group would be funded from 2008 on a user pay basis.
5. Centers that did not support a System Office unit financially would not have access to the services provided by that unit.
6. Centers that wished to withdraw from participating in the SO and the Marketing Group in 2008 must formally serve notice to these units by June 1, 2007.

Agenda Item 5 – Developing a Shared Vision and Strategy for the Alliance

The objective of this agenda item presented by the Chief Alliance Officer was to initiate discussions on an Alliance Strategy, reach agreement upon key objectives the Alliance wished to pursue over the coming years and to identify immediate areas of priority for collective action. Against the backdrop of a range of opportunities as well as challenges, the Alliance was in a unique position to enable more effective and efficient contribution to the mission of the CGIAR, adding value through internal coherence that increased the overall impact of Center activities and the efficiency through which the impact was achieved.

Strategic/Program Objectives for 2006-2010

- Adding value through increasing internal coherence – pro actively engage in collective action under the 20 system priorities or propose an alternative model
- At the regional level target regions where impact had not met expectations to design and implement a more cohesive research for development approach
- Adding value by increasing partnerships with external partners working in areas of relevance to the work of the CGIAR either through new challenge program or other relevant collaborative undertakings, in areas such as climate change, horticulture and high-value crops, human health, agricultural science-policy linkages, bio-energy production or on other important themes.
- Submit a coherent set of new proposals for Challenge Programs under the responsibility of the Alliance
- Examine whether the meta review of systemwide programs can be used to assess which were essential and should be continued and which should be discontinued.

Proposed Institutional Objectives 2006-2010

- 2006-2008 Develop a strategy for the Alliance starting with the strategic vision for the CGIAR system five to ten years down the road.
- 2006-2007 Address donor fatigue and develop a fundraising framework in dialogue with donors to better coordinate fund raising efforts of the Centers, turning unproductive competition into productive competition between Centers
- 2006-2007 strengthen internal Alliance mechanisms for engaging proactively in identifying issues for which the Alliance needs to develop a collective position to increase impact
- 2006-2007 follow up on pooled reserve consultancies with decisions and implementation mechanisms
- 2006-2009 Increase the effectiveness of virtual meetings and discussions.

Immediate priorities

Consider what the Alliance can undertake and complete in 2007 so that it could record concrete accomplishments. Possibilities were:

- Putting in place a system to buffer Centers against system level risks (e.g., EU). Eight Centers were interested in pooling part of their reserves into a mutual fund, pursue an insurance scheme, led by the ADE-Finance
- Developing a more coordinated fund raising framework. This was considered a priority for the Alliance
- Work on internal mechanisms to speak as a single voice
- Improve the effectiveness of meetings and decision making.
- The responsibilities lie with the AE, AB and the Alliance Office in supporting facilitating roles.

Each Center DG and/or Chair provided views on behalf of the Center and a summary of the key points were presented by the Joachim Voss as Chair

Summary

Opportunities and challenges facing the Alliance

- Reconnect with the investor community, including traditional donors in a way that was not donor driven but driven by the needs of the poor.
- Address the maladies that currently existed, reducing transaction costs and eliminating the competition.
- Capitalize on the opportunities with both new science and new investors, not only the Gates Foundation, and develop a coherent approach on how best to address them.

Alliance Goals over the coming years

- Ensure that the Centers as the platforms for implementing the system goals stayed healthy and had a mutually reinforcing relationship. They remained the key vehicle for addressing poverty in the tropics.
- Consider the optimum mechanisms for managing science, utilizing the lessons learned from the challenge programs vis-à-vis the traditional approach.
- Reconceptualize the aggregate effort of the Centers and develop a compelling story about the Centers and what they offered.
- Ensure, in the dynamic and evolving environment, that the Centers remained flexible and adaptable, while staying true to their mission.
- Engage with the system's main investors on their vision and strategies and mechanisms for engagement with stakeholders.
- Follow a focused business approach to realize the potential of the Centers in an efficient way.
- Utilize the Science Council priorities for putting together some major themes and move to get them funded
- Improve dialogue with the Science Council.
- In the final task of this discussion, the AB/AE endorsed the five programmatic objectives presented in the discussion paper (Climate Change, Biofuels, Horticulture, Human Health, Science Policy Linkages) plus restoration of degraded environments for the short and medium-term.

Agenda Item 6 – Submission of New Challenge Programs

In response to ExCo's decision to lift the embargo on Challenge Programs, the Science Council had launched the call for proposals due for submission 5 January 2007 (Note: This deadline was later changed to 5 February, 2007), that conformed to the approved

Science Council priorities. The recommendation of the Executive Committee of Alliance Executive was to adopt a consolidated approach to the call as a demonstration of collective action by Centers.

The Executive Committee therefore sought the consensus of the membership that (1) the responsibility for CP development should be entrusted to the Alliance, to identify the priorities for CPs, and to propose a mechanism for identifying and following up on topics; (2) to propose to the Science Council and Secretariat to defer the submission date to give adequate time for a more effective selection process and (3) to give the mandate to the ADE Science to carry the process forward.

The AE/AB unanimously endorsed the collective approach to the submission of CPs and taking into account comments from the floor: (1) Deferral of the submission date; (2) The need to be inclusive, both internally and externally; (3) the importance of encouraging creative thinking and give the opportunity to Centers to propose topics; (4) top quality submissions and mechanisms for quality control, agreed to give the responsibility to the ADE Science for carrying the process forward based on the topics proposed plus an additional five topics to be identified. It was recognized that topics that did not strictly relate to the SC priorities would have to be accompanied by an explanation of what the linkages were. If the Alliance was clear that the themes were of high priority, focused on cross cutting issues and added value to Center work, they could be submitted to donors as a separate initiative of Centers in the event they are not accepted as Challenge Programs.

The ADE Science was requested to prepare concept notes that would be submitted to the AE for approval on a no objection basis, before being sent to the SC by the CAO on behalf of the Alliance.

The topics selected for further development, and the Centers responsible for coordinating the preparation of the CN were:

Climate Change	Chief Alliance Officer for all the Centers
High value vegetables and fruits	Centers plus Global Hort Initiative – AVRDC
Biosafety/GM-crops	CIP
Oasis (Desertification)	ICARDA/ICRISAT
Bio-fuels	CIMMYT
SMART (Farms to Markets)	ICRISAT
Food Safety/Agric & Health	CIMMYT
Central Asia and Caucasus	ICARDA (with PFU)
South Asia	IFPRI (involving RWC)

Agenda Item 7 – 2007 Alliance Budget Approval (Alliance Executive Only)

System Office Units

The former AE Chair, as Chair of the System Office Sub-Committee, reported on a meeting of his sub-Committee with SO unit heads in Paris, immediately following the Systems Office workshop to discuss 2007 budget proposals for each of the units. Modifications were requested and the budget presented to the AE for approval incorporated the modifications.

Subsequent to the decision under Agenda Item four earlier, giving the option to Centers to withdraw from contributing to SO units, further modification of budgets would be required and a process for transition from the old to the new model of funding system office units would need to be put in place.

Since 2007 budgets and workplans were prepared under the old model, the Chair proposed a one-year period for making the transition. Centers electing to withdraw from units to which they currently contributed were required to give six months notice of their plans to do so and at the latest by mid 2007 to give sufficient time for the units to prepare their budgets (end of September) for the subsequent year. The 2007 budgets would be maintained as prepared and the 2007 contribution by Centers would be based on the old model of % levy on audited grants.

2007 Budget

Also discussed by the sub-Committee were the Alliance Office and Alliance Board budgets. Details were forwarded to the Alliance Executive as background material for the meeting. Specific recommendations for 2007 were:

Program	Alliance Budget	Sec. Matching funds
G&D	\$100,000	\$100,000
Marketing	\$150,000	\$150,000
CIO	\$150,000	\$150,000
CAS IP	\$125,000	under discussion
Alliance Office	\$534,000	
AE meetings & special events	\$ 46,000	
Alliance Board	\$ 95,000	
SSA-MTPs	\$100,000 (\$50,000 for each)	
Total	\$1,300,000	

The Secretariat has agreed to consider providing matching funds for CAS IP of \$125,000 based on a request from the supervising Director General, reducing the overall budget to \$1.3 million. With the request to add an amount of \$100,000 to be reserved for contingencies, the total 2007 budget was maintained at \$1.4 million, the same level as 2006.

In the discussion that followed members expressed some concern about the request for matching funds from the Secretariat and its impact on core funding. The growing role of the Secretariat was also questioned; however, the majority viewed the Secretariat participation and share in governance of the unit to be an important step for opening up channels of communication on this subject and ensuring a consistent approach. It also addressed the request from the Science Council for proper IP management at the system level.

In response to a concern about contingencies, the CAO explained that contingencies were meant for unbudgeted and unforeseen expenses that were approved during the year by the Alliance Executive Committee. In 2006, these unexpected expenditures paid for the pooled reserve consultancies, the special meeting with EU at AGM, among others.

The proposed 2007 budget was endorsed by the AB/AE at \$1.4 million inclusive of the \$100,000 set aside for contingency on the understanding that any unspent funds in 2006 would be applied against the 2007 budget.

Additionally, the AE requested the CAO, and Alliance Program Officer to work with the AIARC Director to ensure greater transparency in budget submissions and ensure that income and expenditure, actual and estimated, were provided for the full year in the December budget figures.

Governance

AE members were also requested to provide their inputs to the request from the CIO on the next large investment plan in ICT-KM, to ensure that all members have a opportunity to comment on the process for preparing the next ICT-KM plan. Feedback was to be given to the AO through Emile Frison with a copy to the AE.

Agenda Item 8 – Preparation for the meeting with the CGIAR Chair and Director

Preparation for the meeting with the CGIAR Chair and Director

The following topics were proposed for discussion with the CGIAR Director and CGIAR Chair.

- (1) The World Bank’s role in agricultural and rural development and commitment to agriculture**
- (2) EU Funding**
- (3) Challenge Programs**
- (4) Meeting with FAO DG**
- (5) Recruitment of CGIAR Director**
- (6) CGIAR Vice Chair**

Centers and Members Day – Update of Program

Centers and Members day was intended to portray the collective work of the Centers on important themes. Climate Change from an agriculture perspective had been selected as the theme of the day in view of the ongoing debate among the Centers. Members of the Alliance were requested to leave ample time for market place interactions with partners, investors and other stakeholders during the allocated times. Parallel lunch sessions were planned around specific themes. One experiment in the program was time allocated for a presentation by European donors on European strategies and initiatives to support agricultural research and development. This might be a format to pursue for the future.

Preparation for Meeting with representative of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

The Chair summarized the feedback from the AE on issues to be addressed with the Gates Foundation representative. The consensus among members was that the focus should be on issues of substance rather than funding, on presenting a united front, responsiveness to engage with the Foundation in its intellectual exercise to address key topics of mutual interest, the Centers areas of comparative advantage, experience of the Alliance to support the Foundation’s intellectual exercise in addressing key topics of mutual interest, highlight the importance of sustained resources to deliver the products.

Agenda Item 9 – Wrap-up and Future Meetings

The AE/AB recommended a strong representation of the Alliance in the meeting with the FAO DG and urged members to participate. Call for the meeting originated from the FAO DG to enhance collaboration with Centers on R4D activities and dates had to be postponed twice before. Reviewing the schedule of the Alliance, i.e. the FAO meeting, the Alliance meeting and the meeting of the Science Council to be held around the same time, consideration was given to holding the meetings back to back or close together to minimize transcontinental travel costs.

It was eventually agreed to maintain the original dates for the Alliance Meeting, i.e. April 27 and 28 but change the venue to Rome. The meeting with FAO DG was proposed for 3 April for those DG's who were available to attend. Seven DG's indicated their availability.

Additional proposals were:

- Scheduling periodic meetings with the CGIAR Chair
- Review of the Alliance meeting dates that take into consideration key commitments during the year such as preparation of submissions to ExCo meetings to allow for maximum consultation among members.

Agenda Item 10 – Meeting with CGIAR Chair and Director

The CGIAR Chair expressed her appreciation to the AB/AE for the invitation to the meeting. She was very enthusiastic and privileged to Chair the CGIAR, considered one of the commendable programs of the Bank. Her views on the specific issues of concern to the AB/AE are presented below:

The World Bank's role in agricultural and rural development and commitment to the CGIAR.

The Bank has launched a renewal program on agriculture and rural development. In the 80s and early 90s agriculture was the mainstay but in recent years activities declined in both agriculture and infrastructure. The re-appraisal of the agriculture and development strategy was intended to bring them back on to the agenda. Merger of Infrastructure and ESSD bringing together the rural strategy and infrastructure plan in a holistic manner was viewed as a mechanism for meeting targets in a meaningful way. New solutions to global issues such as climate change, bio-energy, deforestation were among the broad themes being explored

The Bank was very committed to the CGIAR. Its role in agriculture and rural development with its quality of work and prestige and opportunity to make a difference in terms of science and development research was of great value. The World Bank President planned to attend AGM to become informed about CG activities and it was the opportunity for Centers to engage in discussions both formally and informally. Maintaining a healthy CGIAR that would lead to results on the ground was a priority.

EU funding

The issue of EU funding had a long history and important principles associated with the management of trust funds. Both the World Bank and the EU were committed to resolving the difficulties, adhering to the rules of both organizations.

A review of the Bank's trust fund management resulted in wide ranging reforms, concerning issues of Bank accountability, what it could take responsibility for and what it could not. The EU's expectation that the WB was accountable for the funds it received from the EU went against the CG principle of autonomy and compromised the World Bank's role, a responsibility the Bank was not prepared to undertake. In 2005 the EU was informed about the new regulations but no agreement had been reached. An exception was granted in 2005 and the EU informed that no further exceptions were possible. The Bank had invested a lot of its time to reach a satisfactory conclusion, giving the EU a number of possible options, (e.g., the multi-donor trust funds), and was optimistic that a satisfactory conclusion will eventually be reached. It was, however, unlikely that a resolution could be reached that would revive the EU contribution to the CG in 2006.

The dialogue was not simple; there were a number of critical issues to overcome. The EU contribution affected other EU/WB activities in addition to the CGIAR. Similar discussions were ongoing with USAID.

The Alliance volunteered to assist in the resolving the problem. The loss of this funding in 2006 would have considerable impact on the Centers and support to the Centers to address the shortfall would be welcome. In this context the Alliance emphasized the importance of maintaining healthy reserves in helping Centers to deal with similar unexpected loss in funding.

Francisco Reifschneider gave a brief summary of the funding environment:

- A decline in funding from the Netherlands
- The anticipated reduction from the US had not taken place.
- Increases in funding were expected from Canada, China and India
- Stability in the World Bank contribution
- Funding from Japan was better than expected.
- Strong support for research was expected from DFID and also from France. There was volatility but also optimism.

The CGIAR Chair reminded the Centers that while there was strong support for the CG on the part of the World Bank, there was no room for complacency. The process of allocating funds from the development grant funding was subject to intense competition and discussions related to CGIAR funding were tough and open to scrutiny. Centers should be mindful that performance management, good governance and quality research were crucial for leveraging and sustaining World Bank funding in the future.

Challenge Programs

The CGIAR Chair and CGIAR Director welcomed the Alliance decision to take a consolidated approach to the submission of Challenge Programs under the leadership of the ADE Science. They agreed to deferral of the submission date by one month after consultation with the Science Council.

On a question of the 14 month time frame for the CP approval process, the CGIAR Director explained that an open system such as the CGIAR did not lend itself to reducing the time frame; attempts to do so had not been successful. Establishing lessons learned from the current cycle to reduce the time frame could be undertaken.

On the subject of CP funding, the World Bank would provide \$3.0 million as seed money and continue its support at this level until new donors came on board.

Alliance involvement in the CG Director recruitment.

The CGIAR Chair assured the Alliance that she would come to them for advice and provide opportunities for their feedback during the process of the CGIAR Director recruitment. The process had been established in accordance with the CGIAR charter and the input of the donor constituency to be provided through an advisory group. The Alliance proposed that it would look into appointing a representative of the Alliance to channel feedback into the recruitment process.

With respect to the TOR, Kathy Sierra agreed that CG and Alliance interaction was critical and necessary for the good functioning of the system. It was a key aspect of the role as was the ability to build trust and work well with donors including new donors such as the Gates Foundation, being responsive to their strengths and at the same time ensuring a balance between the long term goals and the focus on impact as well as growth and stability of the system.

Meeting with FAO DG

The Alliance reported it was close to finalizing the dates of a meeting with the FAO DG to discuss issues of alignment and would be communicating with the CG Director to confirm these dates.

Other Issues

The CGIAR Chair noted the request for evaluation of the reform process, the increase in bureaucracy and transaction costs and the need for streamlining. She also noted the proposal for the appointment of a CGIAR Vice Chair and agreed to give it further thought. Clearly the reform objectives were correct and reform would continue; it was critical for assuring World Bank support to the CGIAR; at the same time she agreed with the need to streamline the system and reduce bureaucracy and transaction costs.

Closing

The Chairs of the Alliance Executive and Alliance Board thanked the CGIAR Chair and Director for the opportunity to meet, and looked forward to similar interactions in the future to discuss strategic issues as well as ongoing Center activities.

Meeting with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

The Alliance Chair welcomed Don Doering and expressed appreciation for allocating time to meet with the Alliance to discuss issues of mutual interest. Some highlights from the exchange between the Alliance and Don Doering are presented below:

- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is a family foundation driven by the values of the Gates family whose objective is to reduce global inequity. Programs are people centered and impact driven
- The Foundation seeks solutions to eradicating global poverty and hunger. Sustainably raising agricultural productivity and incomes is considered critical to this goal.
- The Agricultural Initiative organizes its own activities in four areas: (1) Science and Technology; (2) Farm productivity including production inputs as well as education and extension; (3) Linking farmers to markets Access to markets and income generation; (4) Advocacy and Policy covering a cross section of regions, technologies and crops. However, programs toward any specific outcomes or in a specific arena of agricultural development may include all of these functional areas..

- The \$100 million grant to the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa in partnership with the \$50M grant from the Rockefeller Foundation focuses on seeds systems, education, breeding, capacity building and distribution.
- Funding to agriculture is increasing significantly as the foundation doubles its annual investments. The Agricultural Development program is seeking to define the Gates Foundation's unique role within this sector. Aspirations are running ahead of capacity and the Foundation was very particular about setting the goals from the start; it was very open and sought input from outside.
- The Foundation fully appreciates the CGIAR system's contribution to and experience in agriculture and rural development and the foundation is becoming one of the largest supporters of projects at CGIAR centers. Participation in AGM represented an effort to learn.
- While impact was critical, long-term research activities that focused on being able to demonstrate the pay off are also important.
- Within the Foundation, there is recognition of a connection between agriculture and health but concrete links had yet to be made. Nutrition, an area under the Global Health Program is growing.
- On the subject of policy and advocacy and the importance of connecting to the policy environment in countries and regions to be able to make impact, the Gates Foundation was developing a policy framework and strategy. The goal was investment first so that our grantees and partners are in a position to advocate and influence policy.
- With respect to biofuels and biological solutions, the Gates Foundation's first interest is in staple food crops and cash crops although there was interest on the part some in the Foundation in this area.
- In terms of regional focus, the Foundation is developing a strategy for sub-Saharan Africa and has a strong interest in South Asia.

The joint meeting of the Alliance Board and Alliance Executive concluded after a meeting with the Gates Foundation.

Annex 1. Decisions and Actions Table- AE/AB

Alliance Joint Alliance Board (AB) and Alliance Executive (AE) Meetings Decisions and Actions Table (Draft version) IFPRI, November 30 and December 1, 2006

Decision Number	Agenda Item	Decision/Action
06/AB-AE/Dec/01	Agenda Item 1. Alliance principles regarding "equal partners" and the absence of hierarchy in decision making	<p><i>No decision made.</i></p> <p><i>Consensus reached that the group needs to continue discussing the issues arising from this session (concept of mandate in particular).</i></p>
06/AB-AE/Dec/02	Agenda Item 2. Follow-up from CIAT meetings, ExCo10 and ExCo11 Follow-up to specific reports requiring action on part of the Alliance (Pooled Reserves, SSA-MTPs, etc.) Report from ADE on the ongoing discussion on implementing the Priorities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>We ask for documentation regarding the points that led to the failure of the negotiations between the WB and the EU</i> 2. <i>The AE /AB Chairs are mandated to discuss and negotiate with the EU on behalf of the Alliance, if this can help resolve the current deadlock between the WB and the EU for the disbursement of the 2006 and 2007 EU contributions to the Centers</i> 3. <i>The ADE finance was asked to recommend a prudent course of action for the taking into account of the 2006 EU contribution in Centers budget. They subsequently proposed, and their proposal was approved, that:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>All Centers expense EU funding fully in 2006</i> b. <i>Recognize 2006 EU grant and show it as receivable at year end</i> c. <i>This accounting treatment must be consistent with previous year accounting treatment (consistency concept)</i> d. <i>Given the current information there is uncertainty that the year end receivable is collectable, therefore Centers to make doubtful debt provision in 2006 books (prudence concept)</i> e. <i>Impact on financial indicators</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>May result in some Centers falling below the benchmark of 75 - 90 days</i> ii. <i>CG Sec have confirmed that Centers would not be penalized for this in the review of the 2006 performance indicators</i> f. <i>If 2006 funding received in 2007, reverse doubtful debt provision through other income</i>

Decision Number	Agenda Item	Decision/Action
		<p>4. <i>The Alliance decided to proceed with the development of Framework Plans for the implementation of the system priorities. It decided to focus on the 4 priorities already analysed by the ADE-Science as a test case, to see how we can move forward and learn lessons from this, and discuss with the SC. The ADE Science is mandated by the Alliance to do so and to engage the SC in their discussions.</i></p>
06/AB-AE/Dec/03	Agenda Item 3. GRPC Proposal to modify the Alliance policy on Benefit Sharing for Improved Varieties	<p>1. <i>Unanimous decision to reconfirm that standard MTAs are used for all Annex 1 crops and for products of centres' research for those crops, as of January 2007</i></p> <p>2. <i>Unanimous decision to revoke the decision made in Cali on mandatory payments by the private sector</i></p> <p>3. <i>Unanimous decision that each centre needs to update its IP policy on its centre website</i></p> <p><i>Inputs should be sent to Emile Frison on questions 4 and 5 (in his background paper). These inputs will be discussed by GRPC and recommendations will be prepared by GRPC that will come back to the AE for endorsement.</i></p>
06/AB-AE/Dec/04	Agenda Item 4. Funding Formula for the Alliance Budget – different options and decision	<p><i>Unanimous decision:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>Centers can decide to opt out of SO units and the Marketing Group as from 2008. SO units and the MG will be funded, from 2008 onwards, on a user pay basis. Centers which do not support a unit financially will not have access to the services provided by the unit.</i> ✓ <i>Centers wishing to withdraw from participation in SO units and in the Marketing Group in 2008 must formally inform units at the latest by mid 2007.</i> ✓ <i>The current funding formula continues to be used for the 2007 budget of the Alliance, and all SO units and the MG are funded as per this formula until December 31, 2007.</i> ✓ <i>The current formula is retained to fund the Alliance Office in 2008 and beyond.</i> ✓ <i>The principle that one Center has one vote in all Alliance decisions is retained.</i>
06/AB-AE/Dec/05	Agenda Item 5. Developing a Shared Vision and Action Plan: mission, goals and objectives for the Alliance	<p><i>The 5 programmatic priorities developed in the discussion paper (climate change, horticulture, bio-fuels, human health, science-policy linkages) by Anne-Marie Izac, plus restoration of degraded environments, were endorsed as Alliance programmatic objectives for the short and medium-term.</i></p>
06/AB-AE/Dec/06	Agenda Item 6. Submission of New Challenge Programs: a process to move forward	<p><i>Unanimous decision that the Alliance adopts a collective approach to the submission of CPs to the SC. A coherent set of CPs ideas will be submitted by the Alliance to the SC.</i></p> <p><i>The process used to arrive at this coherent set of CPs is:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>The ADE-Science is responsible for taking this forward, on the basis of their current proposed list and of the discussion today, including up to 5 new topics to be identified. The ADE-Science current list of ideas/topics is:</i>

Decision Number	Agenda Item	Decision/Action																					
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Idea</u></th> <th><u>Convening role for CN</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Climate Change</td> <td>Chief Alliance Officer*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High value veggies & fruits</td> <td>Centers Global Hort Initiative-AVRDC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Biosafety/GM-crops</td> <td>CIP</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oasis (Desertification)</td> <td>ICARDA-ICRISAT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bio-fuels</td> <td>CIMMYT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SMART (Farms to Markets)</td> <td>ICRISAT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Food Safety/Agric & Health</td> <td>CIMMYT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Central Asia & Caucasus</td> <td>ICARDA (with PFU)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Asia</td> <td>IFPRI (involving RWC)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Idea</u>	<u>Convening role for CN</u>	Climate Change	Chief Alliance Officer*	High value veggies & fruits	Centers Global Hort Initiative-AVRDC	Biosafety/GM-crops	CIP	Oasis (Desertification)	ICARDA-ICRISAT	Bio-fuels	CIMMYT	SMART (Farms to Markets)	ICRISAT	Food Safety/Agric & Health	CIMMYT	Central Asia & Caucasus	ICARDA (with PFU)	South Asia	IFPRI (involving RWC)	<p>✓ <i>The ADE will circulate the set of CPs to be submitted to the SC to the AE for approval on a no- objection basis. Being a convener for the submission of concept notes does not automatically imply being the convener of a CP, as governance mechanisms are established with partners, by definition of a CP.</i></p>
<u>Idea</u>	<u>Convening role for CN</u>																						
Climate Change	Chief Alliance Officer*																						
High value veggies & fruits	Centers Global Hort Initiative-AVRDC																						
Biosafety/GM-crops	CIP																						
Oasis (Desertification)	ICARDA-ICRISAT																						
Bio-fuels	CIMMYT																						
SMART (Farms to Markets)	ICRISAT																						
Food Safety/Agric & Health	CIMMYT																						
Central Asia & Caucasus	ICARDA (with PFU)																						
South Asia	IFPRI (involving RWC)																						
06/AB-AE/Dec/07	Agenda Item 7. Alliance Budget Approval, 2007	<i>The recommendations from the sub-committee for the 2007 budget are approved. Unspent funds from 2006 will be used against 2007 requests.</i>																					
06/AB-AE/Dec/08	Agenda Item 8. Preparation for the meeting with the CGIAR Chair and Director w/ Centers and Members Day – update of program																						

Decision Number	Agenda Item	Decision/Action
06/AB-AE/Dec/09	Agenda Item 9. Wrap-up and Future Meetings	<i>Next Alliance meeting will be in Rome, April 27-28. Dates for future meetings will be circulated ASAP, with the intent to hold the non-AGM Alliance meeting in parallel with a SC meeting, to increase interactions. The meeting with the FAO DG is April 3, 2007.</i>
06/AB-AE/Dec/10	Agenda Item 10. Alliance Meeting with CGIAR Chair and Director	<i>Francisco Reifschneider agreed that the deadline for submission of the two page concept notes for CPs is mid February. We need to identify the person from the Alliance whom Kathy Sierra will contact to get Alliance inputs into the hiring process for the replacement of the CGIAR Director</i>

Future Meetings:

Spring 2007: During CIAT meetings, April 27 and 28, 2007 were discussed for the Joint AB-AE Alliance meeting. These dates do not allow for sufficient preparation time to meet Secretariat's deadline for ExCo12 documents from the Alliance. Consideration should be given to having future spring meetings at an earlier date to allow timely inputs to be made into ExCo meetings.

Annex 2. Synthesis of the Brainstorming Session

(Note: This synthesis was written by the CAO, based on the actual statements from the Centers, which were recorded. The statements from the participants are available through the Sr. Program Officer, upon request).

1. What are the principles of equal partnerships? Provide examples, and examples of violations of these principles

Principles of partnerships among equals	Examples	Violations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centers taking flexible roles in respect of leadership • Equal access to opportunities • Equal access to information and information sharing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An initiation of a new program within the Alliance to which all Centers receive a formal invitation to participate in the discussion of a new program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centre unilaterally takes the lead in a new collaborative action without consultation and without participatory decision making. • The use of mandates to allocate or arrogate responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtesy, transparency, inclusiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional collective action agreed upon by all the Centers concerned, as well as the governance of that collective action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use each other as subcontractors – contrary to the spirit of partnership • Using the name of a centre/partner to get additional resources without any intention of partnering
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unilateral claim to a donor of primacy in a particular area • The minority vote does not comply with a majority vote on a principle

2. Mandates: how do you define your Centers' mandate and what would constitute a violation of your mandate?

About half of the Centers feel that the very concept of mandate is not very useful, not to say outdated, and do not really use it. They talk about their areas of research, their areas of competencies. Some consider that mandates are of little interest to partners which also work in areas of common interest. The concept of mandate should not be used to exclude others from doing something. A mandate does not confer exclusive rights on to anything. If anybody should be concerned about mandates and monitoring what happens to mandates it is the Science Council. Centers cannot effectively do it (conflict of interest).

The other half of the Centers however are clear about what their mandate is. They concur that if another centre works in the same area as they do, then this centre should collaborate with them, and discuss with them, otherwise they become quite concerned that their mandate is being violated by the other Center.

3. Common themes emerging, areas of disagreement, implications of the findings and next steps.

The Alliance should be greater than the sum of its parts. We cannot be center-centric and need to define ourselves with respect to the outside and the real world.

We need to first have a clear vision of what it is we must deliver by working together. Then we work backward to see what we need to do to get there. This should be done in the context of our vision of the system. And we probably need to do this with external inputs, as we cannot do this by ourselves. We need to strengthen our ability to deliver. We cannot attempt to solve problems of the past. Rather we need to focus on what we are going to deliver.

What is our common objective? This is not immediately obvious to a new comer. Transparency is essential, as well as our respective comparative advantages. As an Alliance we need solidarity, not necessarily equality. How do we weave all of these strands together into a strategy?

If the Centers did not compete for money, would anything change?

We should not lose sight of the fact that we need to get concrete results and actions rapidly. We also must raise awareness of what the Alliance is and does with donors, but also with Center scientists, as awareness is currently very limited outside of senior management of Centers.

Annex 3. Final Meeting Agenda AB-AE

*Joint Alliance Board (AB) and
Alliance Executive (AE) meeting
Final Agenda
November 30 and December 1, 2006
IFPRI*

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
<i>Thursday, November 30, Main Conference Room</i>		
8:30	Light breakfast available at IFPRI	
9:00	Welcome and Agenda Approval	Chairs (J. Godfrey and J. Voss) and J. von Braun
9:15	Agenda Item 1. Alliance principles regarding “equal partners” and the absence of hierarchy in decision making	S. Hall
<i>11:15 Coffee Break</i>		
11:30	Agenda Item 2. Follow-up from CIAT meetings, ExCo10 and ExCo11 Follow-up to specific reports requiring action on part of the Alliance (Pooled Reserves, SSA-MTPs, etc.) Report from ADE on the on-going discussion on implementing the Priorities and other strategic issues	D. Pachico and A.M. Izac
<i>13:00-14:00 Lunch Break</i>		
14:00	Agenda Item 3. GRPC Proposal to modify the Alliance policy on Benefit Sharing for Improved Varieties	E. Frison
14:30	Agenda Item 4. Funding Formula for the Alliance Budget – different options and decision	R. Zeigler
<i>16:00 Coffee Break</i>		
16:30	Agenda Item 5. Developing a Shared Vision and Action Plan: mission, goals and objectives for the Alliance	A. Izac
17:30	Agenda Item 6. Submission of New Challenge Programs: a process to move forward	J. Voss and D. Pachico
18:30	Wrap-Up of the Day	Chairs
<i>19:30 Joint Dinner hosted by the Chairs: Cosmos Club 2121 Massachusetts Ave.</i>		

Time	Agenda Item	Person(s) Responsible
<i>Friday, December 1, IFPRI Main Conference Room</i>		
8:30	Light breakfast available at IFPRI	
9:00	Agenda Item 7. Alliance Budget Approval, 2007 Note: AE only, with AB meeting for special closed session on other matters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB budget • AO budget • SO Units, with recommendations from SO Sub-Committee from October meeting 	J. Voss W. Dar
<i>10:30 Coffee Break</i>		
10:45	Agenda Item 8. Preparation for the meeting with the CGIAR Chair and Director <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for meeting with CGIAR Chair and Director • Centers and Members Day – update of program 	Chairs and J. von Braun
12:00	Agenda Item 9. Wrap-up and Future Meetings	Chairs
<i>12:30-13:30 Lunch Break (with CGIAR Chair and Director)</i>		
13:30	Agenda Item 10. Alliance Meeting with CGIAR Chair and Director	Chairs
<i>15:00 Coffee Break</i>		
<i>Closing session: AB and AE to meet separately</i>		
15:30-18:30	See separate AB and AE agendas.	
<i>19:00 Reception hosted by IFPRI</i>		

- Note to AE and AB Executive Committee Members: Please arrive in D.C. for preparatory meetings at IFPRI, November 29 (p.m. only), and Saturday, December 2nd (full day) at the Hilton Hotel.
- **All documents/reports to be received by the AO by November 1, with electronic distribution to Alliance members on or before November 13.**