



MEETING MINUTES

EiB Steering Committee

CGIAR EiB Excellence in Breeding Platform

April 13, 2021 / 7-830am (Mexico City time) / Zoom

Moderator: Michael Quinn, EiB (MQ)
Organizer: Brenda Bautista, EiB
Minutes: Adam Hunt, EiB
In Attendance: Please see annex

	Resulting Action/Decision Items	Deadline	Responsible
1	Review the TOR and Crops to End Hunger to determine what updates are needed due to changes since the PSC was formed. This includes the need to clarify roles and responsibilities so that accountability is clearly assigned.	TBD	Michael, Monica, Hugo
2	Relook at membership and roles on the PSC.	TBD	Michael, Monica, Hugo
3	Develop recommendations on needed subcommittees and membership to increase efficiency and to include more external subject matter experts.	TBD	Michael, Monica, Hugo

#	Agenda items
---	--------------

1	Welcome, Presentation – Dan Coombs <i>Summary:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction: Personal background with Monsanto, organizational behaviour studies. Currently executive coaching.• These meetings should be a conversation, rather than a presentation.• Governance exists to help drive success: commitment and compliance are part, but commitment is key here• Presentation: Enabling Governance to Support Success (See: PPT)
---	--

2	Discussion – All <i>Key points:</i>
---	---

- Circular accountability:
 - There may be some conflict of interest as some PSC members are on both the giving and receiving sides of EiB. (Hugo)
 - This is a steering committee rather than a board, so accountable for technical/scientific success of EiB. One CG board will be accountable on the admin side, currently CIMMYT (Kevin).
 - Mandate has changed for EiB, as it was initially somewhat of a thinktank to roll out new ideas, now executing more, expanded scope. Governance structure should follow mandate. (Hans)
 - EiB is now a driver of change in CG. Role is steering breeding teams on best practice, and to monitor progress as per Crops to End Hunger (CtEH). How can *partners steer us to steer them better?* (MQ)
 - TOR says to provide strategic direction – key is to relate that with current accountability questions (Felister)
 - Consider restructuring PSC with different expertise, subdividing research ambitions of EiB (Kevin)
 - Need balance on PSC that matches the new scope, represents the stakeholders. Need to identify weaknesses and then plan to overcome them (Monica)
 - Areas, Centres and projects that are not impacted by EiB might step aside (Chris)
- What happens to EiB in 1CGIAR?
 - Not yet clear how it will be mapped into 1CGIAR. (Hugo)
 - It will be a centrepiece and fits between modernization of services for breeding and the breeding initiative, which MQ leads. Will likely grow and vision long term is it will likely be pooled funding. (MQ)
- What should PSC look like?
 - Groups of 5-8 may work better than 8-14. But if we created that, do we still have this larger group? (MQ)
 - Subcommittees might fill specific needs. Large group is harder for doing deep dive. (MQ)
 - *Structure/subcommittee ideas put forth* (Kevin – also in comments)
 - Reconsider representation to ensure benefits, challenge the way we work, e.g. private sector, academic, NARS, seed industry, tech (Monica, Michael B)
 - Different groups could meet at different times, and the PSC does not need to meet much more than three times per year. More specialized groups on technical aspects could work at different times and compositions. E.g. NARS (Michael B)
 - Follow up this meeting with review/updated TOC and structure. Based on that we can best use our time. May not need quarterly meeting, but contribute in subcommittees. (Hugo)
 - Keep in mind CTEH meetings address some similar topics, e.g. how can CGIAR work with NARS and what is EiB's role. (MQ)
- How comfortable are you with independent oversight on funding and work? (Dan)
 - This committee is not legally accountable, but can accept more accountability. This is to support MQ's accountability. (Kevin)
 - Must clarify more specifically where PSC is accountable. (Hugo)
- EiB drives change, which we are accountable for, in your organizations/programs, which you are accountable for. We are successful if those in PSC and others/CTEH are successful. (MQ)

Conclusions/key points for future consideration:

- There will be an EIB in One CGIAR and it could be expanded, although the structure is to be determined.
- Funding in the future will come from a shared pool of money controlled by One CGIAR rather than directly from donors. How does this affect the thinking on accountability?
- The TOR (with reference to the work of Crops to End Hunger) defines what the PSC is accountable to deliver, including governance responsibilities.
- More external expertise is needed on the PSC to add diversity of perspective and ensure more independent oversight.
- Possible subcommittees could focus on: technical issues + partnership models + audit. What are other options?

Next Steps:

- Review the TOR and Crops to End Hunger to determine what updates are needed due to changes since the PSC was formed. This includes the need to clarify roles and responsibilities so that accountability is clearly assigned.
- Relook at membership and roles on the PSC.
- Develop recommendations on needed subcommittees and membership to increase efficiency and to include more external subject matter experts.

Annex 1: Participants: (screenshot @ 1 hour):

